THE TEACHER THAT JACK BUILT:

THE CONSTRUCTION OF TEACHER SUBJECTS

IN AN EARLY FIELD EXPERIENCE COURSE

By

JACQUELINE MARIE BACH

Bachelor of Arts in English
Florida State University
Tallahassee, FL
1995
Master of Arts in English
University of West Florida
Pensacola, FL
2000

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
December, 2006

THE TEACHER THAT JACK BUILT:

THE CONSTRUCTION OF TEACHER SUBJECTS

IN AN EARLY FIELD EXPERIENCE COURSE

Hongyu Wang

Dissertation Adviser
Pamela U. Brown

Margaret Scott

Michael Taylor

A. Gordon Emslie

Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

If dissertations are meant to be learning experiences—this has been. If dissertations are meant to be incomplete—this is. If dissertations are meant to spark new research pursuits related to it—this will. I have read many acknowledgement pages in preparation for writing my own and wish there were really some way I could convey my thanks to all involved in this process without relying on stock phrases or revealing the private moments of this process. So, here goes:

Dr. Wang. I cannot imagine how different my educational path might have been if I had not taken your class my first semester at OSU. That following semester was equally as formative; your poststructuralist and education course helped me appreciate the possibilities for combining theory with practice. Thank you Dr. Taylor for your philosophy and education course during which you perceptively chose pieces that furthered the interests of those of us in your class. I also thank you for joining this committee and for the hardest comprehensive exam question, ever. Although my first course with you, Dr. Brown, was not until I was almost finished, you always made time for me and my concerns before I was your student, and I thank you for the countless resources and advice. Dr. Scott, you truly are a sincere, perceptive, determined teacher, and I can only hope to someday be as courageous and diplomatic as you. Thank you for looking out for me and taking the time to listen to my woes. All of you have been so important and flexible and understanding in this process, and I hope you gained some satisfaction from this experience.

I guess I'm supposed to thank my family now, but I have taken them for granted for so long, it seems awkward. Victor, you have managed to see me through a thesis and now a dissertation, and have made this entire endeavor possible. Emery, you're only 3 and may never read this page, but thanks for filling our lives with laughter and screams and sleepless nights. You have challenged my doctoral pursuits more than anyone else, and sometimes you even won.

Thanks to my fellow graduate students who had to listen to my research study for the past year and empathized with my struggles. If I only had listened to you guys . . . Final thanks must go to my students whose participation made this study possible. I hope to hear from you about your successes whatever they may be.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter Page

I. INTRODUCTION……1

Introduction to the study……1
The early field experience course…… 6
Research questions ……10
Significance of the study and possible contributions ……10
The researcher's subjectivity & limitations of the study…… 11
Conclusion……13

II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE…… 14

Introduction…… 14
Reflection and identity construction…… 14
Reflective thinking for the teacher one will become……17
Becoming a teacher: Socialization…… 19
Transition to professional …… 21
Pre-service teachers as research subjects…… 22
The role of reflection in early field experiences …… 25
Conclusion of literature on pre-service teachers…… 26
Subject-in-process/on trial theory …… 30
Conclusion …… 33

III. METHODOLOGY…… 35

Introduction…… 35
Theoretical framework…… 36
Research context ……39
Data collection…… 40
Field experience logs…… 41
Dialogue journals…… 41
Interviews……42
Data analysis…… 44
The rigor of the study…… 47
Credibility…… 47
Transferability …… 48
Limitations …… 49
Conclusion …… 50

IV. INTERLUDE…… 51

V. DISRUPTIVE, CONTRADICTORY, AND REAPPROPRIATING MOMENTS… 56
Introduction.…………...………………………………………………….... 56
Subject-in-process/on trial……………………………………………….. 57
Disruptions…………….……………………………………………………. 61
Contradictions…………..…...…………………………………………… 66
Reappropriations ……….……..……………………………………………… 71
IV. INTERLUDE ………………………………………..……………………83
V. PARTICIPANTS' WORDS…………………………………………………… 87
Introduction ………………...…………………….....…………………….. 87
Methods of analysis……………………....……………...…………………. 89
Susan: What's gonna make me happy?... 90
Peter: I used to think that I was ready to be a teacher—I realize that I am not..100
Tammy: "I would not mind being any type of teacher"…………………….. ..110
Jennifer: How do you teach someone to deal with that?.................................. 121
Summary…………………………………………..…………….…..... 131
VI. CONCLUSION……………………………………………………………….. 134
Introduction……………………………………………………………….. 134
Teacher educators as subjects-in-process …..……………………………....137
Limitations and directions for further research …….………………………...141
Epilogue……….……………………………………………………….... 143
BIBLIOGRAPHY……………………………………………………………….. 146
APPENDICES……………………………………………………………. .. 151
APPENDIX A—CIED 3712 COURSE SYLLABUS and Assignments...... .151
APPENDIX B—PORTFOLIO EVALUATION RUBRIC.………...............165
APPENDIX C—INTERVIEW PROTOCOL……………….……….........167
APPENDIX D—INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL…... 168

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Introduction to the study

I have now had the privilege of teaching CIED 3712 Field Experiences in the Secondary Schools for four semesters. While I don't claim to be an expert on early field experience students, I do feel a certain connection and interest in them. During the semester students take this course, they begin their formal induction into Oklahoma State University's secondary education teacher preparation program. In addition to balancing weekly assignments with forty-five hours out in the field, they prepare the first part of their portfolios and interview with the secondary education faculty. I have found that some of my students become quite frustrated with the whole course not only because of its heavy workload and the many hours spent in the field but also because they must pass the college's portfolio requirements and interview session in order to gain entrance into the secondary education program. If they fail any of these components then they are unable to enter the program that semester. As an instructor of this course, I have tried to balance the college's, the state's, and the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education's (NCATE) standards with my students' real concerns.

I've chosen Paul Klee's painting (1922), *Head of a Man, Going Senile*, to illustrate what I sense my students experiencing in this course. Klee's painting is a portrait of a man whose round head sits on top of an orange-red background. His peach-colored face, framed with yellow hair, is chopped into various geometric shapes and sits

atop a very skinny neck and shoulders. The mouth is a spot of yellow, not quite there but not absent either. I find this portrait pertinent to my study for two reasons. First his face, spilt by lines into several squares, conceals the true face of this man. In fact, to me, the squares seem to be pulling the two eyes out of alignment. I think that perhaps in initiating the early field student into the teacher-making process and its many facets, I, as a teacher educator, and other participants involved in the process (including my students themselves) might be pulling my students' eyes out of alignment. Secondly, I find that the mouth may or may not be there—a sign that might imply that he may or may not be capable of speech or of articulating his thoughts. I believe that this confusion of how to "talk" about teaching emerges in my students' writings for this course, especially in their philosophy of teaching statements, goals statements, and field experience logs. In this study, I examine my students' writings for ways in which they are negotiating their experiences with teaching out in the field, the teacher-making process, and their own perceptions of education based on their experiences as students.

Statement of the problem

"The one indispensable part of any teacher preparation program is the field experience" begins Posner (1996, p. 217) in the introduction to his field experience textbook. "All field experiences," he continues, have "four features in common: a teacher, at least one learner, the subject matter," and the "social and physical context," which he defines as "the rules, facilities, values, expectations, and personal backgrounds" (p. 4). Pre-service teachers, who are early in their field experiences, enter their education programs with a certain sense of what types of teachers they would like to be based on their previous experience of being students observing teachers, which may have little to

do with the learners, subject matter, and context. This focus on what it is like to be a student can shape what pre-service teachers observe, ask questions about, and interact with during the limited number of hours they spend in the field before student teaching and the tasks they engage in during their education courses. Furthermore, educational programs, which are shaped by federal, NCATE, state, university (Cochran-Smith, 1991; Lloyd, 2005), national organizations (Larson, 2005), district and school level rules and regulations (Geijsel & Meijers, 2005) and teacher educators' agendas (Moore, 2003) instruct teacher educators as to what early field experiences students should do while out in the field.

Caught between the intersection of personal and institutional expectations, early field experience students may feel as if they must only work within the parameters of this system in order to become licensed—or in this study's case—pass the course and be accepted into the teacher education program. Can early field experience students develop their own identities as future teachers or am I or the college determining that identity for them? The purpose of my study is to examine pre-service teachers enrolled in early field experiences in order to identify moments in which they interact, negotiate, subvert, or even transform the teacher-making process, which they officially enter during the semester they take this course. This process, as I define it and expand on Posner's (1996) definition of context, consists of the college's conceptual framework and regulatory tasks all secondary education students must complete at Oklahoma State University in order to gain entrance into the program, the state and national regulations and expectations, including the notion of becoming "highly qualified," their own expectations of becoming a teacher, and finally, my notions and expectations of them and this process. What these

moments look like and what might be done with them exists as a somewhat neglected area of study in teacher education programs. Rather than expecting them to respond and reflect according to a set of pre-conceived criteria on what they experience during their field observations, teacher educators should recognize when pre-service teachers are contradicting, disrupting, and questioning the system to which they are just joining.

In my experiences as an instructor for the field experience course at Oklahoma State University (OSU), pre-service teachers seem to be continually involved in tasks and reflective assignments that reveal how they regard the teaching profession yet seem to be rarely engaged in questioning how they have come to regard teachers, the field, and themselves as teachers-to-be in such a manner. Furthermore, my students and I spend quite a bit of time preparing for the steps they must take in order to enter the education program and become certified, but we rarely discuss the purpose or meaning behind these tasks they must complete. Like Alsup (2006), I also feel my students and I neglect certain aspects of our personal lives and experiences which may shape our teaching philosophies and future classroom practices. Julia Kristeva's theory on subjectivity, however, makes one wonder whether some of my students are already negotiating with the teacher-making process when they reappropriate educational terminology, contradict their own teaching philosophies, and disrupt the expectations those involved in teacher education have put into place for them. Kristeva's theories suggest that these negotiations are a useful component to constructing an identity and a challenge for teacher educators to reconsider how they treat these examples when they come across them.

The purpose of this study, which relies on poststructuralist theory, mainly Julia Kristeva's notion of the subject-in-process/on trial and hermeneutical methods, seeks to

identify how early field experience students construct and reconstruct their identities through the tasks[1] in which they engage during this course. Furthermore, this study can inform teacher educators, who might be interested in how these conversations and dialogue can subvert, accept, reject, and integrate these expectations, labels, standards, and qualities, of the ways early field experiences can expose pre-service teachers to the "complexities of teaching."

In other words, examining pre-service teachers' writing for these instances when they work with the structure of the teacher-making system and its language may be informed by Julia Kristeva's theory on the subject-in-process/on trial. When some students engage in the writings they are required to do as part of this course and to gain entry into the secondary teacher education program, they may transform the language in order to express how they perceive education. Those who are unable to express (Lipkowitz & Loselle, 1996) "the effects of meaning that are not reducible to language" (p. 21), may repeat the language provided to them by the teacher-making system. As they enter the teacher-making system, they may successfully or unsuccessfully negotiate their identities as students, observers, and pre-service teachers entering the profession.

Through these reflective tasks and dialogues, pre-service teachers resist, subvert, or accept the expectations of the teacher-making process; during such a process, they may be able to change this system of which they are a part. These interactions are closely tied to their writings in which they construct their identities as future teachers. For the purposes of this study, I will use Geijsel and Meijer's (2005) definition of identity as "the ever-changing configuration of interpretations that individuals attach to themselves, as

---

[1] By tasks, the researcher refers to the field experience logs, reflective writing assignments, interviews, and discussions on Blackboard with cooperating teachers which comprise the course work for this class.

related to the activities that they participate in" (p. 423). Acknowledging this fluidness of identity is one of the ways the post-structuralist notion of subject provides a suitable lens for this study. Subject, or self, according to some post-structuralists, changes in relation to the context in which the subject is immersed. Geijsel and Meijer's definition of identity then recognizes the importance of *context* in the construction of one's self, and in this study, context also refers to the writing assignments' guidelines because they serve as a set of boundaries in which the students can act, interact, and react. Researchers of pre-service teachers' identities might be misreading these negotiations as indicators of "weak" identities (Alsup, 2006; Kagan, 1992), which they in turn argue result in pre-service teachers not joining the profession or "unlearning" (Cochran-Smith, 2003) what they learned in their teacher education programs. Recognizing the ways in which this fluidness causes ambiguity in pre-service teachers' identities might inform a different way of reading the pre-service teacher's identity construction not as strong/weak or unlearning/learning but as a process.

The early field experience course

The field experience course is often the first chance pre-service secondary education teachers[2] at OSU have to spend time in public schools as undergraduates considering whether or not to continue pursuing careers in education. During this course, field experience students are matched with practicing teachers in schools surrounding the university and spend a minimum of 45 hours completing various assigned tasks in their cooperating teachers' classrooms. Students usually spend an average of three hours a week in their cooperating teachers' schools and then meet once a week in the university

[2] I will only be discussing secondary education majors in this study because the elementary education program differs slightly. However, several of my subjects are foreign language pre-service teachers who must observe at a high school and elementary school.

classroom, for fifty minutes, to comment on what they've seen and how they feel about it, while learning more about the secondary education program and discussing the various course assignments. These students are to complete eight writing assignments on topics associated with teaching, including a personal teaching philosophy and a goals statement. Throughout the semester, these pre-service teachers keep field experience logs in which they record events and personal reflections on what they observe in their cooperating teachers' classrooms. They note how teachers manage their classrooms, plan for lessons, and interact with students. Students are encouraged to reflect on episodes they observe and consider how they might have acted when faced with similar situations. At OSU, these field experience logs are collected and read by the course's instructor typically twice a semester.

While these assignments are designed to promote reflective thinking and growth in pre-service teachers, the very nature of the field log encourage pre-services teachers to pay particular attention to certain attributes of a classroom. A popular method used as a guideline for early field experience students asks them to report/record the sequence of events, report on an episode, and then analyze that episode (Posner, 1996). According to Adams, Shea, Liston, and Deever (1996), this type of experience directs the pre-service teacher to focus on the content or how the teacher handles a situation rather than reflecting on the students and their behavior or responses to the content, activity, or the teacher.

During the field experience course, student observe in the field and then return on a weekly basis to discuss as a group what they observed, their thoughts about education as a profession, and prepare for entry into the secondary education program. The

following is an excerpt from the standardized syllabus that is used by all instructors who teach this course at OSU:

> **Rationale for the Course**
>
> This course serves as the introduction to teaching and learning in the middle and high school. Preservice teacher candidates are provided opportunities to observe teaching and learning firsthand in a classroom setting. Students begin the journey toward becoming a professional educator by interacting with students, teachers, administrators, and the community in order to establish personal goals, a commitment to the profession, and insights into the "business" of educating students to become active participants in society.
>
> The department describes the unique combination of field work and class meetings as follows
>
> 1. **A public school experience of consisting of 45 hours** of observation and participation under the supervision of a certified teacher.
> 2. **Weekly seminars** designed to acquaint [one] with the issues of contemporary education, to develop [one's] skill in observation, and to introduce [one] to effective methods/strategies of teaching in the secondary school.

The statements "Students begin the journey toward becoming a professional" and "establish personal goals" indicate the importance of interaction with the system for early field experience students. However, the purpose of education (which sounds almost like a philosophy) has already been determined, in a sense, for them—it is to "educat[e] students to become active participants in society." Even the course's syllabus introduces

ideas to the pre-service teacher, such as "business," which interestingly is set apart in quotation marks. In what way can the early field experience student determine some of the answers to these personal questions for themselves? Are they already negotiating this space in their writings?

The participants of this study, who are pre-service teachers seeking entry into the secondary education program, represent a number of disciplines and are enrolled in a junior-level field experience course at Oklahoma State University (OSU). During this junior-level course, pre-service teachers are assigned to local public middle, junior, and high schools which they visit for an average of three hours a week for a total of 45 hours by the end of the semester. The purposes of observing and interacting with the teachers and students are many and include exposing students to a variety of schools (students may not student teach at the type of school where they did their initial field experience), levels of pupils, and styles of teachers[3]. They must report on their observations by keeping written records in the form of a field experience log, notebooks the pre-service teachers observe and analyze the activities they experience out in the field, and through weekly full class sessions. I propose that examining my students' written reflections on their experiences, the essays that they write for this course, and end-of-term interviews with several participants might identify how these pre-service teachers engage teacher-making process. These assignments, interview transcripts, and journals will be read and analyzed using Julia Kristeva's notion of the subjects-in-process/on trial as a theoretical lens to identify points during which the participants negotiate the different facets of the teacher-making system.

---

[3] In order to use the terms "pre-service teachers" and "students" interchangeably, the researcher will use the term "pupil" to designate the K-12 students the pre-service teachers observe and interact with during their field experiences.

Research questions

1. How are pre-service teachers who are enrolled in an early field experience course constructing themselves and being institutionally constructed as teacher subjects?

2. How can Julia Kristeva's notion of the subject-in-process/on trial inform a new way of reading the early field experience student's teacher-making process?

Significance of the study and possible contributions

While research shows that beginning teachers do better during their first year when they have a strong sense of themselves as teachers (Kagan, 1992), how they construct that identity and how that identity changes as *pre-service teachers* is still an area for study. Much of the criticism of early field experiences courses, however, is that they do very little in stopping the continuation of the *status quo*:

> The way that teachers are trained, the way that schools are organized, the way that the educational hierarchy operates, and the way that education is treated by political decision-makers results in a system that is more likely to retain the status quo than to change (Fullan, 1993).

Pre-service teachers (and possibly the researcher) who are placed in situations where they consider the context, which Posner (1996) defines as "rules, facilities, values, expectations, and personal backgrounds" and which also includes federal, state, and community standards, informal and formal, may not be "retaining" the status quo. Using Kristeva's theories as a lens might illuminate ways in which the early field experience student changes or might already be "resisting" the *status quo* in his or her early contact with the field.

Furthermore, part of teaching in a global society means rethinking the traditional ways of teaching. If teachers must adapt their work from teaching to the learning and development of their students (Geijsel & Meijers, 2005), then pre-service teachers must begin considering how those new expectations fit into their schemas of what it means to be a teacher. For teacher educators, this shift necessitates a rethinking of how early field experience courses facilitate or hinder this conversation.

Much of the literature on early field experience students to date focuses on teacher education programs' expectations of these pre-service teachers (Pryor, 2005), how they can become agents of change in their profession (Price & Valli, 2005; Fullan, 1993) or what can be done to strengthen their own sense of identity (Kagan, 1992; Cochran-Smith, 1991). I propose that there is a need to examine in a different way how pre-service teachers are creating their identities—what they do with their preconceived sense of what it means to be a teacher and how they reconcile that image with what I, OSU's program, and the state and federal regulations claim that identity should look like. Using Kristeva's notion of the subject-in-process/on trial, then, provides a framework for reading these initial experiences in a different way; perhaps these pre-service teachers are not inexperienced, but are subtly challenging, through the language they use in this course, these institutional expectations. The notion also allows us to complicate the image of the pre-service teacher in her subjectivity-in-making.

The researcher's subjectivity & limitations of the study

As the teacher of this course, it is important for me to maintain the expectations for the field experiences course which are closely tied to this university's core concepts of leadership, ethics and professionalism, academic achievement, diversity, and service.

Therefore, the research design for this study reflects a balance between the college's specifications which are governed by the NCATE and the researcher's agenda. This approach includes maintaining the academic rigor set in place for this course. While these pre-service teachers have the option of participating in this study or not, they will understand that the tasks, which are course assignments (See Appendix A for a copy of the syllabus) must be completed satisfactorily in order to pass this course. Therefore, the participants may perceive the instructor of the course, who is also the primary researcher, as the intended audience for their work, a limitation Anderson (Anderson, Barksdale, & Hite, 2005) identified in her research during which she served as a university supervisor for her participants. In order to clarify these assignments and provide guided direction for students, I spent time with my students discussing the purpose of these assignments, activities, and logs and explaining the parameters by which they can earn a pass or fail grade. These guidelines have already been established by the secondary education program and are based on their expectations, the college's conceptual framework, and NCATE standards. Furthermore, two of the essays are evaluated by outside readers who determine whether or not my students will pass the portfolio submission. I further address the implications of using one's own students as subjects in the interludes and chapter three.

Finally, it should be understood that the findings presented in this study cannot be generalized to other pre-service teachers or other field experience programs as each interaction between researcher and participants is unique (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) and the sample size is relatively small (n=18).

Conclusion

This study is divided into six chapters and two interludes. In the next chapter, I review the literature on the purpose of early field experience courses, the role reflection plays in identity construction during this period, and introduce my theoretical framework with references to two other educational researchers who use Kristeva's work. In chapter three, I explore Kristeva's concept of the subject-in-process/on trial and my reasons for choosing it for this study. Next, I outline my research design and data collection methods, including a description of my subjects. Before and after the fourth chapter are two interludes, or snapshots, of two class sessions which deal with researcher reflexivity and portray my own role as subject in this study. The fourth chapter focuses on my participants' writing and Kristeva's theory of the split subject. In chapter five, I examine four participants in particular as they negotiate the teacher-making process. Finally, in chapter six I present conclusions and implications for further research based on this study.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

In this chapter, I will examine the educational literature written about pre-service teachers, their reflections, and early field experiences. I will attempt to compare and contrast studies on the role of reflection in early field experiences courses, since many of the tasks in OSU's field experience in the secondary schools are designed to facilitate reflection. Exploring what research on reflection in teacher education has already accomplished and seeks to accomplish will inform this study's design and methodology. Then, I will discuss socialization into the profession as a way of introducing the expectations the profession has for its new teachers and studies which treat pre-service teachers as research objects. Finally, I will discuss Kristeva's theory of the subject-in-process/on trial, situate it within education, and examine the few previous educational studies that refer to her poststructuralist theory.

Reflection and identity construction

Reflective thinking, which for Dewey means "turning a subject over in the mind and giving it serious and consecutive consideration," (quoted in Posner, 1996) should be a major component of early field experience courses (Lee, 2005; Kagan, 2002; Posner, 1996). In fact, NCATE standards stress that field experiences are an important

component of a pre-service teacher's preparation when they include opportunities for students to reflect and receive feedback on their experiences. These experiences should

> Relate principles and theories from the conceptual framework(s) to actual practice in classrooms and schools; create meaningful learning experiences for all students; study and practice in a variety of communities, with students of different ages, and with culturally diverse and exceptional populations. Field experiences [should] encourage reflection by candidates and include feedback from higher education faculty, school faculty, and peers. (Cruickshank, 1990, p. 31)

Researchers dealing with the early field experience pre-service teacher turn toward the favored method of collecting reflections on their experiences in their cooperating teachers' classrooms: the field experience log. The field experience log meets NCATE standards by providing a place for pre-service teachers to reflect on their experiences out in the field and receive feedback on their comments. At OSU, the common syllabus for the early field experience course includes the following objective: "[We will] discuss the following topics in an informed, reflective manner"; therefore, the teacher education program and college of education recognize the importance of reflective thinking and try to design activities and tasks to encourage it.

In order to facilitate personal reflective thinking, secondary field experience students at OSU are required to keep field experience logs as part of their assignments for this course. These logs serve a number of purposes (meeting NCATE standards might be one), but for the most part, they are designed to assist students in examining, analyzing, and understanding their time spent in the field. The format for these logs varies from course to course, but they usually follow a similar format: title, sequence of events,

elaboration of one or two episodes, and an analysis of one of those episodes (Posner, 1996). Some teacher educators caution students not to make generalizations about teaching and instead instruct them to focus their entries on their particular situations and their own small amount of time spent in the cooperating teacher's classroom (Powell, Zehm, & Garcia, 1996).

Because these logs serve as a record of the pre-service teacher's time spent observing in a cooperating teacher's classroom, instructors designate them as private places where pre-service teachers show growth in their attitudes and understanding of education. In *Field Experience: A Guide to Reflective Teaching*, George Posner (1996) contends "although somewhat time-consuming, written records and analyses provide a unique opportunity to keep track of events and to privately reflect on the personal and public meaning of those events" (p. 25). According to Powell, Zehm, & Garcia (1996) who write in their field experiences textbook *Field Experience: Strategies for Exploring Diversity in Schools*, these logs are "intended to help you reflect on your study and record your personal thoughts that only you (or other privileged persons) will read. This kind of reflection is helpful, as Gonzalez found, for you [the field experience student] to critically examine your attitudes and educational philosophies" (quoted in Powell, Zehm, & Garcia, 1996, p.30). However, because these logs are intended to be read by another, usually an instructor, students may self-censor themselves.

There appears to be an increase of research on pre-service teachers records and reflections during their field experiences, but it focuses mainly on the reactions of the pre-service teachers to their time spent in the field rather than on how their reflections identify themselves as pre-service teachers. In addition, many researchers concentrate on

pre-service teachers' attitudes toward good and poor teaching (Fajet et. al, 2005) and pedagogical practices of other teachers, rather than their own perceptions of themselves as teachers to be.

Reflective thinking for the teacher one will become

Reflective thinking has always been a staple of early field experience courses. The literature on teacher reflection/reflective thinking reveals that it is not just meant to be a part of early field experiences but to be continued throughout a teacher's career in order to improve teaching and establish a strong sense of identity in order to mange the other aspects of teaching. Reflective thinking is an important skill for practicing teachers in order for them to improve practice and student learning; however, they rarely have the time or energy to devote to reflection once they are in the field (Moore, 2003). Even student teachers lack the time and energy to reflect on what it means to be a teacher and all of the guidelines and boundaries set in place by one's school, district, state, and nation. In a review of 40 studies of professional growth among pre-service and beginning teachers, Kagan (1992) finds that pre-service teachers should be given tasks in which they "(a) acquire knowledge of pupils; (b) use that knowledge to modify and reconstruct their personal images of self as teacher; and (c) develop standard procedures that integrate classroom management and instruction" (p. 129). For Kagan, reflection plays an integral part during this stage but she concludes that teacher educators expect sophisticated reflections from students with little or no classroom experience. She cites Berliner (1988):

> The teacher education programs that have tried to make use of the notion of reflective practice or to change the practical arguments of preservice teachers may

> be misguided . . . novice teachers may have too little experience to reflect on . . . [Until] extensive classroom experience has been acquired, there may be too little in the minds of preservice teachers about what actions might be realistic, relevant, appropriate, moral and so forth (quoted in Kagan, 1992, p 161).

After analyzing these studies, many of them longitudinal, naturalistic ones, Kagan (1992) concludes that the role of self-reflection should facilitate the identity construction of per-service teachers:

> The necessary and proper focus of a novice's attention and reflection may be inward; on the novice's own behaviors, beliefs, and image of self as teacher. Novices who do not possess strong images of self as teacher when they first enter the classroom may be doomed to flounder. . . preservice programs might include structured activities that forces novices to acknowledge where their personal images may be inappropriate, modify, and reconstruct the images. The image of self as teacher must also be adapted for the realities of teaching (p. 163).

In other words, reflective thinking conducted with pre-service teachers is almost meaningless and transitory unless they are able to (re)construct strong images of themselves as teachers. Part of that process begins with pre-service teachers reflecting on what they know—what it means to be a student. The process of moving from early field experiences, to student teaching, to classroom teaching is a relatively short one, and teacher educators' scholarship on providing time and ways for their students to consider their identities as teachers is brief.

Becoming a teacher: Socialization

"Occupations shape people . . . We have learned that conditions of entry play an important part in socializing members to a given occupation; and we expect those who study work institutions to pay close attention to both formal and informal processes of induction" (Lortie, 1975, p. 55).

Socialization into a new situation "force[s] one to relinquish earlier ties and commitments" and one either tries to avoid the situation that causes insecurity or finds other ways to cope with it" (Geijsel & Meijers, 2005, p. 424). Researchers also conclude that a necessary part of learning how to implement better pedagogical practices into one's practice is not just by reflecting but also engaging in discussion and collaborating with peers, mentor teachers, and other experts (Britner & Finson, 2005). Cochran-Smith has written numerous times on the importance of preparing teachers who are able to challenge the status quo when they become teachers. In "Teaching against the Grain" (1991), Cochran-Smith points out the need for pre-service teachers to understand that they are part of a larger "struggle" and that they have a responsibility to "reform" the field. She concludes that transforming the status quo is done best through partnerships between the university and the school site in the form of "collaborative resonance" programs in which cooperating teachers and pre-service/student teachers work together to learn how to "teach against the grain."

Lortie's work (1975), *Schoolteacher*, considers in detail the induction of teachers into education and analyzes practicing teachers' voices as they reflect on their inductions into teaching. He identifies three basic components of induction that all occupations share: "1) formal schooling, 2) mediated entry, and 3) learning while doing," (p. 57). He

further points out that teacher education programs tend to require much more formal schooling and a shorter mediated entry than other professions. The abruptness with which a student teacher finishes his or her experience and assumes full responsibility as a teacher within a matter of months should also be a concern of those who prepare teachers. Referring to his participants who reflected (sometimes unconsciously) on the influence of their former teachers, Lortie concludes that "the apprenticeship-of-observation is not likely to instill a sense of the problematics of teaching—that students, because of the limits of their vantage point and empathic capacity, will see it simplistically" (1975, p. 65). This transfer of teaching which results from years of pre-service teachers observing teachers from a students' point of view is the cause for another body of research which attempts to counteract the effects of this socialization process.

Teacher educators not only seek ways to change the way pre-service teachers enter the field but also attempt to (re)construct the way practicing teachers think and perform. In a recent article, Cochran-Smith (2003) attaches the words "learning" and "unlearning" instead of change when referring to what pre-service teachers undergo in early field experiences and steps that can be taken to encourage reflection among practicing teachers. Quality interaction and reflection about the field can also prevent what Larson (2005) calls "washing out" among practicing teachers when pre-service teachers begin to understand the role of professional development induction programs can play before entering the field (p. 2). The terms "unlearn" and "washing out" imply that things can be erased from one's identity; Kristeva's theory suggests that instead of those things being lost, they may be repressed.

Transition to professional

Often during early field experiences, teacher educators ask questions of their pre-service teachers to which they want specific answers. For example, Pryor (2005) points out when teacher educators ask pre-service teachers from the United States about their "visions of goals of education in society," "we are expecting teachers to define their vision of democratic practice" (p. 65). Those who conduct studies with pre-service teachers rightly point out that just because they identify "success" in helping their students rethink their roles as future teachers and the strategies they will use with their students, does not mean that they will carry those changes in thinking into their future classrooms or even during their student teaching (Britner & Finson, 2005; Price & Valli, 2005).

In a case study that follows four participants from early field experiences through their first year of teaching, Bickmore, Smagorinsky, and O'Donnell-Allen (2005) contend that the reason why English/language arts teachers practice seemingly contradictory approaches to teaching literature results from a lack of coherence in teacher education programs. Therefore, the transition from pre-service teacher to practicing teacher illustrates this lack of coherence. This result of the beginning teacher not having a strong foundation in a theory of pedagogy, for example constructivism, partly results in the beginning teacher turning to his or her peers and colleagues for lesson suggestions which in turn produces teachers who resemble the "norm." This longitudinal case study challenges teacher educators to develop a conceptual framework that will supply a firm foundation for pre-service and eventually practicing teachers reconciling the multiple demands made on them and the set of principles they developed during their coursework.

Pre-service teachers enrolled in their first field experience course spend much of their time observing and taking notes and are expected to show evidence of change through these notes or through interactions with the instructor (Adams, Shea, Liston, & Deever, 1996; Goldstein & Freedman, 2003). Although for the most part, researchers who use various ways of encouraging reflection, such as dialogue journals, find the experiences rewarding and informative, they are quick to point out participants' comments that they view as cause for concern. Goldstein and Freedman (2003) describe their hoped for results that their pre-service teachers "develop richer understandings of the relationship of caring and teaching and growing in professional capability and confidence—were not broadly achieved" (p. 442). Likewise, Lloyd (2005) noted that studies should also examine the "negative impact dialogue journals" could have on pre-service teachers, including the insertion of the instructor in the process (p. 289). A lack of change or the "negative impact" posited by researchers might reflect more about their agendas than the participants themselves.

Pre-service teachers as research subjects

Federal, state, institutional, testing, certification, and public systems are not the only pieces in the teacher-making process that turn pre-service teachers into objects. Educational researchers, including myself, turn their participants into objects, even with the best of intentions—creating in their students a sense of empowerment. By wanting them to change, we are imposing yet another set of expectations on them. Several teacher educators turn to the notion of change as part of their early field experience courses and add nontraditional components to the course such as inquiry leaning and service learning opportunities (Anderson, Barksdale, & Hite, 2005; Britner & Finson, 2005; Price & Valli,

2005). These teacher educators not only seek ways of equipping students to reflect on what it means to be a good teacher but also engage them in activities that will enable them to become agents of change (Liston & Zeichner, 1987). For example, Price and Valli (2005) employ action research with their early field experience students as a means of creating students who are agents of change. Referring to their own students' examples of acting as agents of change, they contend that it would be wise to situate action research "at the intersection of individual and institutional change" (p. 68). Similarly, Brinter and Finson (2005) added an inquiry-based aspect to their course in order to facilitate a change in their pre-service teachers.

Like Price and Valli (2005), Britner and Finson (2005) identified a change they wished to make in their pre-service teachers' thinking and used inquiry-based learning in an attempt to facilitate that change. In Britner and Finson's study, students enrolled in an elementary science methods course were allowed to choose their own topics for inquiry and received guidance from the instructor to focus their topics. Even though their students are in a methods course rather than a field experience class, they provide a model for evaluating new course components based on pre-service teachers' written reflections. Missing from their study as well as Price and Valli's is the peer-to-peer dialogue component; although both cite peer-to-peer interactions, they do not specifically analyze the language they use during these conversations.

Not all reflective thinking with early field experience teachers results in the effects their researchers desired. When researchers find that their pre-service teachers do not "change" or aspects of their students' thinking emerge that they do not find mature or thoughtful, they call those observations "negative," or "judgmental" (Anderson et al.,

2005; Goldstein & Freedman, 2003). In an attempt to get their pre-service teachers to reconsider their confidence in their abilities to care for their future students, Goldstein and Freedman incorporated dialogue journals as part of their early field experiences course. They "unexpectedly" discovered that their students were displaying "negative" even "adversarial" attitudes toward the parents of the children in their observation classrooms. One important lesson to be learned from their experience was that the students responded negatively to the restricted topic in their dialogue journals.

On the other hand, in analyzing their students' use of dialogue journals, Anderson, Barksdale, and Hite (2005) label written observations of cooperating teachers' actions as "positive" and "negative" although their students do not employ these terms. Classifying written comments or observations as negative or positive, simplifies the complexities of teaching and indicate reluctance on the researchers' part to uncover a deeper meaning of the process of making a teacher and how written reflections play a part in that construction. Neither should pre-service teachers and the conversations and reflections they engage in during their early field experiences be viewed as "contradictory" or "thoughtless" (Bickmore, Smagorinsky, & O'Donnell-Allen, 2005; Adams, et al., 1996). Alsup (2006) who followed six English/language arts pre-service teacher in their final years in a teacher education program also identifies the need for pre-service and beginning teachers to address the "contradictions" (which she calls tensions) in their burgeoning professional identities. Viewing contradictions in pre-service teachers' identities serves as an important component to understanding how they begin to negotiate the teacher-making system.

The role of reflection in early field experiences

Reflective writing in pre-service teachers' course is often used as a tool for measuring the effects of an experience on their burgeoning identities as teachers. Changes in thinking, therefore, become an important element for measuring the success of an experience. In addition to implementing opportunities for inquiry projects and new tasks, researchers point out possibilities for reflection in altering the focus of the field experience course from learning how to teach to analyzing critically school structures and the moral implications of pedagogical actions (Liston & Ziechner, 1987). Another conversation among researchers who work with early field experiences is the role of unguided versus guided (focused) observations. Two teacher education programs, in particular, seek to distance themselves from having students merely observe teachers by directing students to observe certain aspects of the classroom while encouraging some form of unguided approaches (Anderson et al., 2005). Peer interaction is also an important aspect of learning what makes effective teaching (Anderson et al., 2005). In an early field experience course, peer observation of peer teaching was used to improve pre-service teachers' observational skills of effective teaching (Anderson et al., 2005).

Finally, there are those who argue that some forms of reflection are not enough to reform or improve education and teacher practice. Zeichner (1993), for example, argues that the term reflective teaching practice has become meaningless. Recent attempts to improve reflection not only include the guided approaches but also focused approaches on topics assigned by the instructor or arising from initial surveys or focus groups (Lloyd, 2005). Attempting to illustrate the value of reflective thinking, Lee (2005) defines and identifies quality reflective thinking in order to deal with its multiple representations.

Lee's (2005) study, which was conducted in Korea, classifies three different levels of reflection:

1. the recall level-- At this level, observers reflect on what they see without considering views other than those based on their own experiences,
2. the rationalization level-- Besides considering various personal experiences, observers ask the question "Why it was" and may come up with guiding principles.
3. the reflectivity level—One approaches their experiences with the intention of changing or improving the future and views them from multiple perspectives.

Since this study seeks to engage pre-service teachers in thinking about themselves as subjects-in-process/on trial with the intention of examining how they construct themselves as teacher subjects, I looked for examples of this third tier of reflective thinking not only in my subjects' work but mine as well.

Conclusion of literature on pre-service teachers

Reflections, discussions, and conversations about the way pre-service teachers reflect can be beneficial to the field in a number of ways. Folden and Klinzing (1990) pointed out that research on teacher thinking could

> 1) [be a] valuable source of teacher education content,
>
> 2) . . . give teacher educators insight into the processes of teacher learning and functioning, insight that could help them plan methods of teacher education insight,

> 3) . . . influence educational policies that are important to teacher educators" (p. 17).

In 2005, Lee noted that reflective thinking can help pre-service teachers learn new ideas and sustain professional growth.

Many researchers seem to agree that more needs to be written on what happens to pre-service teachers when they begin to view themselves as agents of change (Price & Valli, 2005) or the way expectations influence the way teachers view themselves but little on how identity construction is actually a "learning process" (Geisel & Meijers, 2005). Moreover, Fajet, Bello, Leftwich, Mesler and Shaver (2005) find that the implications of their study of pre-service teachers' perceptions of good/bad teachers demonstrate a need for "teacher education programs [to] consider courses that will help pre-service teachers reconstruct and modify their preconceived perceptions about teaching in hopes that it will promote professional growth" (p. 725).

In a recent article, Geijsel and Meijers (2005) challenge teacher educator programs to help pre-service teachers develop a strong sense of identity through a process of creative identity learning. They call for the school leaders to foster the exchange of expertise within a school organization which in turn will benefit the school. They view identity construction as a cyclical learning process since new experiences can cause individuals to restructure their identities in order to avoid "suffering" (p. 425). While Geijsel and Meijers (2005) base their suggestions on those already situated in school organizations because they are capable of making changes, surely field experience courses can include members from school organizations outside of the college or

university to commence these conversations which can continue when these pre-service teachers become first year teachers.

Although Bickmore, Smagorinsky, and O'Donnell-Allen (2005) consider the influence of coursework, student teaching, and the first year of teaching on their participant, they do not reflect on the role of early field experiences on their participant. Observations and interviews with early field experiences students and their engagement with their cooperating teachers could corroborate what they conclude: that beginning teachers claim that their teaching is one way when it actually reflects another method or philosophy (2005). Pre-service teachers, who may point out hypocritical approaches or approaches that contradict what they are learning in their preparation programs might benefit from such a conversation when their response questions are discussed in an open forum, such as a full-class discussion with a practicing teacher.

Finally, many of these studies begin with the idea that they will "test" to find something in their pre-service teachers. They will "test" to see how they care (Goldstein & Freedman, 2003), or if they are connecting theory to practice (Moore, 2003) or inquiry-based projects (Britner & Finson, 2005). Researchers seem reluctant or unable to account for or deal with reflections that are inconsistent with what they associate with good teaching. They apply terms like "washing out" (Larson, 2005) when teachers fail to maintain what they've learned in their education programs, "unlearning" (Cochran-Smith, 2002) and "fluid" (Lloyd, 2005) to describe pre-service teachers' comments which do not reflect a systematic approach to change or improvement in thinking. These categories are too simplistic because they do not account for the changing nature of an identity. When researchers do note flaws in their attempts to develop more reflective pre-

service teachers' responses in early field experiences, these flaws usually do not result from the actual tasks but the ways in which the tasks are incorporated and implemented by the instructor(s) (Goldstein & Freedman, 2003; Moore, 2003). Furthermore, these teacher educators are disappointed when their pre-service teachers either decide on their own or follow their mentor teachers' advice to forget everything they are learning in their university classes and do "things this way" or when pre-service teachers adapt their mentor teachers' style to "please them." All of these factors contribute to pre-service teachers constructing themselves and being constructed as teachers and creating an environment in which one can explore how they are being made into subjects by their interaction with the objectifying structures that affect the teacher-making system. Under such a context, Kristeva's subject-in-process/on trial becomes useful because her theory complicates identity formation. First, her theory poses that subjects may already be negotiating boundaries whose "significance" is "brought into play" by the negotiation between their sensations and the language in place for them to use. Using her theories can reposition the pre-service's teacher language by associating contradiction and ambiguity with positive connotations rather than negative ones (I will address Kristeva's theory of the negative as productive in a later chapter). Her discussions of the subject-in-process/on trial may lead to a better understanding of the ways in which pre-service teachers construct their identities as teachers-to-be and how encouraging this negotiation can lead to a renewal of some of the aspects of teacher education programs by calling into question what that identity should look like.

Subject-in-process/on trial theory

A student of Jacques Lacan, Kristeva begins her discussion of the "subject in process" by departing from his work with the "mirror stage." Lacan's idea of the "mirror stage," rooted in Freud's work, postulates that one moves away from the safety of the mother to the mirror stage, during which subjects become aware of themselves, and then onto the Oedipal stage when they adopt the Symbolic Order or the "linguistic rules of society that need to be inscribed into the unconscious" (Crotty, 1998, p. 168). Kristeva enters into this conversation by positing that "subjectivity is a process that begins with the material body before the mirror stage. . . [which] has its beginnings in the maternal function rather than the paternal function (Oliver, 1993. p. 13). Aware of Lacan's contention that females can never fully internalize the masculine language of the Symbolic Order, Kristeva reformulates this notion and destabilizes the subject through the movement of the semiotic, which the Oedipal "self usually suppresses . . . in order to move away from the maternal body and enter into the realm of the symbolic order" (Wang, 2004, p. 90). In *Revolution in Poetic Language* (1974/1984), Kristeva refers to the signifying process of language in order to explain her theory. "For Kristeva," explains Wang (2004), "the signifying process of language is composed of two inseparable elements: the semiotic and the symbolic" (p. 89). Kristeva describes the semiotic first as preverbal (1974/1984), a sensory, unnamed aspect of language, and then as transverbal "which is not independent of language; it interferes with language and, under its domination, articulates other arrangements of meaning, which are not significations, but rhythmic, melodic articulations" (Kristeva, 1997/2002, p. 259). The symbolic, on the other hand, which for her is not only the assigning of linguistic signs and language

acquisition but also the syntactic structure (Kristeva, 1996), is stable. The symbolic represents a connection with a "'universal' bond with other members of [a] group" whereas the semiotic is "made up of archaic representatives of drives and the senses that depend on the mother and biology" (Kristeva, 1996, p. 269). Therefore, the interaction of the semiotic with the symbolic, according to Wang (2004) "depicts the human psyche as an open system" which results in a "creative meaning-making process that upholds both structure and surprise" (p. 91). Writers who are aware of the boundaries of the symbolic structure attached to language, according to Lewis (1974), "attempt to overcome the repressive structure of subject unity, to disrupt the status of the subject, and consequently of the individual" (p. 31). In other words, writers who are able to comment on the confines of language—do not *reject* the symbolic but *adopt* it and make it their own through attuning to the role of the semiotic. Meaning therefore becomes a process (Kristeva, 2002).

Kristeva (1974/1984) names this process "*le sujet-en-procès*" which means the subject-in-process and subject-on-trial, for the term can be translated either way. The process which results is one in which the subject uses semiotic drives to "confront it [the process which is ruled by the system], displace its boundaries and laws and make them manifest in his practice of them" (1974/1984, p. 101). Without such a practice, according to Kristeva, "the body in process/on trial is disarticulated. . . [o]utside the process, its only identity is inorganic, paralyzed, dead" (1984, p. 101). In the subject-in-process/on trial, the role of the semiotic is to challenge the "boundaries, laws, and constraints that it meets" (Kristeva, 1974/1984, p. 101) while the symbolic regulates the semiotic. For Kristeva, this process can pertain to teachers, criminals, and especially writers.

But Kristeva's ideas are not just applicable to those extremes: transgressors, anarchists, and avant-garde writers. In a further clarification of her theory, she likens her theory to a biologist's open system. She (Lipkowitz & Loselle, 1996) explains:

> They [biologists] think that a living being in not merely a structure but a structure open to its surroundings and other structures; and that interactions occur in this opening that are of the order of procreation and rejection, and that permit a living being to live, to grow, to renew itself, eventually destroying something outside itself, but at the same time giving something to the outside. (p. 26)

The subject-in-process/on trial, then, like a pre-service teacher, who interacts with other "structures" undergoes a "renewal" not only of the boundaries in place but of herself. Lechte and Zournazi (2004)) reminds us of Kristeva's contention that "The subject cannot be anticipated. It is a subject-in-process, after all. The subject has that quality of individuality that avoids the 'blue-print', or idea model approach, where the destiny of the self is found in the origin and given in advance" (p. 186). Examining the interactions of pre-service teachers as subjects engaged in a process can give mobility to those structures in place.

A few scholars who write about education turn to Kristeva for help in assessing the current state of education. Stone (2004) applies Kristeva's idea of the "subject-in-process" to the current crisis in American education in her essay "Crisis of the Educated Subject." In the current climate of No Child Left Behind, there exists only the educated subject, or a student who is measured by his or her performance on a test. This culture is in direct contrast to Kristeva's notion of a "subject-in-process" or the understanding that a test score is not the final depiction of a subject's education. In this work, Stone calls for

American education to adopt Kristeva's conception of subject-in-process instead in order to create/creating psychically healthy persons who might become aware of reform limitations and who just might foster future educational revolt" (p. 114). Stone does not specifically suggest ways students might already be engaged in tasks that put the United States' current educational policy on trial, but she does contend that Kristeva's subject in process "offers insight" for persons who may become "aware of reform limitations" and "might foster future educational revolt" (p. 114). In this study, I hope to first recognize how pre-service teachers might already be aware of these "limitations" as a starting point for "fostering future educational revolt."

In *Nourishing Words*, Atwell-Vasey (1998) applies Kristeva's notion of the semiotic and the symbolic to the classroom and practicing teachers. By examining three autobiographical narratives from three practicing English/language arts teachers, she exposes the ways in which the semiotic not only emerges in their writings but also in the experiences of their students. Pulling from several post-structuralists' and psychoanalysts' works, Atwell-Vasey (1998) concludes that our mothers' and fathers' languages are both nourishing and regulating (p. 173) and that it is important to incorporate both into educational practices. For Atwell-Vasey (1998), Kristeva can help us understand why "we have respected these dry, abstract structural forms" like phonics and grammar (p. 52); the power of maternal love and (p. 63); and ways of linking students' personal lives with the public, which she describes as the texts already selected for them and their interactions with the curriculum, by making space for them to choose texts and assignments. Atwell-Vasey's book is extremely instructive in reading texts of teachers through a Kristevian lens and suggests many ways for teachers to incorporate the

semiotic into their own practices. In order to do so, teachers must be able to create safe spaces for students to expose their private selves without fear of penalty or ridicule. This advice is one that has guided my own study, and I have tried to treat my students' writings and experiences with reverence and create an atmosphere where they can feel free to share with me these private moments.

Conclusion

A review of the literature on pre-service teachers' experiences reveals that reflection is an integral part of their education, that reflection is used to make judgments about pre-service teachers, and many scholars are interested in forming strong teacher identities. But there appears to be little research which focuses on the *changing* nature of pre-service teachers' identities, while there is much literature on improving beginning teachers' professional identities. Kristeva work on the semiotic and the symbolic challenges these intentions of reflection in pre-service teacher education. Furthermore, her theory brings into question the motives of those who conduct research on pre-service teachers. Are they seeking to validate their own contentions about teaching through the reflections of their students? Is there only one way of viewing agents of change? Stone's (2004) and Atwell-Vasey's (1998) work show that there are numerous benefits for using Kristeva's theories to examine educational practices. They open up possibilities for exploring teacher education but neither of them addresses this issue directly. My study with its focus on pre-service teachers promises to contribute to teacher education with new insights and different lenses for understanding a teacher's identity making process.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

Early in the spring 2006 semester, one of my students asked me, “Jackie, what should I call myself in this essay? Am I a future teacher? A teacher-to-be? A future teacher educator?” Before I responded to her question, I asked the rest of my students what their answers were. There were some mumbled responses as students referred to their essays to remember what term they had used. Then, I sent a student out into the hallway to consult the framed NCATE poster to see if that organization had an answer (it didn’t), but I told my students that I thought NCATE preferred the term “teacher candidate.” I felt uncomfortable instructing them as to which term they should use to describe themselves in their own philosophy of teaching essays.

As I stated in the introduction, I have now had the opportunity to teach the early field experience course for four semesters and have read many pre-service teachers’ thoughts about the profession through their assignments and class discussions. As I read through these pre-service teachers’ field experience logs, I found myself stopping to reread with great interest about my students’ thoughts on their cooperating teachers, the pupils with whom they interacted, and their own perceptions of teaching. I was impressed by those students who choose to record and follow one pupil during their experience as much as I was concerned with students’ comments which reflected a lack of sensitivity or

a naïve understanding of what it means to be a teacher or a pupil. Were my students were discussing teachers from the point of view of the type of students they were as some researchers suggest (Kagan, 1992)? During our weekly meetings, we never seemed to have enough time to address their comments and questions. In my mind, there clearly existed a need to discuss their reflections, especially in order to have them think deeper about their roles as teachers in the making. Peer-to-peer dialogue about their recordings in their field experience logs seemed to offer one way of introducing multiple voices into the classroom discussion and devote more attention to individual concerns.

The creation of teachers reaches an interesting point during the field experience course, a time when pre-service teachers enter the field for the "first time." As I read their teaching philosophies, I've noticed that some of them have trouble using OSU's terminology, have a tendency to resist being "pinned down," or just have moments when their sentences resemble little more than a repetition of the instructions. Since the theory I'm using to read my data focuses on subjectivity and the split that can result in a subject's identity when the semiotic drives interact with the order of the symbolic, I've tried to isolate my participants' statements that speak to this characteristic.

Theoretical framework

Before I begin to discuss Kristeva's theory on the subject-in-process/on trial, it might be beneficial to examine how her work detours from the work of one of her teachers—Jacques Lacan. Lacan, keeping Freud in mind, proposes that infants (6-18 months) enter what he calls the "mirror stage." During this stage, an infant recognizes himself in the mirror and must leave the maternal in order to enter the paternal stage in which he seeks to name his identity. Once he begins using the language of the father

(words, syntactical rules), he can never return to the stage before the mirror, or the mother's "language." Kristeva redefines Lacan, in a sense, by calling this break/separation from the maternal the *thetic phase,* a phase in which separation is enabled by bodily experiences rather than a complete loss of the maternal connection. She contends that the infant begins to use language to identify things in his world by identifying with them by "separat[ing] from and through his image, from and through his objects" (Kristiva, 1974/1984, p. 43). She gives the example of a child attaching the onomatopoetic "woof-woof" to a dog as an example of how an infant identifies himself through the similarities and differences of another person or object before he sees the Other (himself) in Lacan's mirror (p. 43).

Once the thetic break has been made the self usually tend to suppress the semiotic. However, for Kristeva, as Wang (2004) points out, the "post-Oedipal stage of the subject can release more creative potential if the semiotic returns to renew signification" (p. 91). The subject-in-process/on trial, then, refers to the subject (an ever-changing entity depending on which context it is in) who uses the objectifying system and gets in touch with the semiotic flow—maternal drives and sensations. This interaction also holds the possibility of changing the symbolic system. Kristeva (1974/1984) uses many verbs to describe this negotiation—subvert, resist, undermine, even transform—but not "reject" (p. 101, 149, 175, 233) because the subject constructs and is being constructed by this system.

The pre-service teacher, then, in these early stages desires to construct an identity as teacher and in order to do so, must use the language in place. That language is provided by those institutions associated with teacher preparation: NCATE, the state, the

university, the teacher, and the field placements where the pre-service teachers spend much of their time observing. In fact, sometimes these writings which incorporate this language are a challenge to decipher. Kristeva's notion of the subject-in-process/on trial can provide a "new" way of reading pre-service teachers' writing and perhaps assist teacher educators and pre-service teachers negotiate, maybe even transform, the ways teachers are constructing themselves and being constructed. Examining their writing through this theoretical framework might illustrate how some of them are not only subjects-in-the making but they are also remaking the system they are entering. They are students engaged in what Kristeva calls an intimate revolt, "certain human beings possessed by their sensibilities and passions," who "nevertheless continue to ask themselves questions" (1997/2002, p. 5). Faced with the "tension toward unity, being, or the authority of the law" they use language that is "accompanied by centrifugal forces of dissolution and dispersion" (1997/2002, p. 7). They do this by making the language in place their own, possibly by using it in ways other than it was intended.

Kristeva's theory of the subject-in-process/on trial provides a lens for pre-service teachers and teacher educators to challenge and transform the teacher-making system which consists of laws and boundaries set into place by federal, state, and institutional regulations. As pre-service teachers begin to attach language to their experiences, they can begin to interact with the language already in place and possibly allow the semiotic to recharge the symbolic. They can also submit to the symbolic, and in a sense become trapped by it. But when pre-service teachers deal with the tension between their semiotic drives and the symbolic boundaries their subjectivities are mobilized.

Research context

The participants

The participants for this study are 18 secondary education majors enrolled in a required field experiences course at a midsized (approximately 15,000 students), land-grant Midwestern university. 16 of them are women; seven plan to teach foreign language,[4] five plan to teach English, 3 plan to teach social studies, two plan to teach science, and one plans to become dually certified to teach art and biology. Generally, the students in the spring field experiences course are in their junior years, will enroll in their appropriate methods course the next fall and will student teach the following spring. During this semester, they begin the steps necessary for being fully admitted into the secondary education program and must complete several requirements in addition to their criteria for this course. They must submit the first part of their three-part teaching portfolios, interview with professors in the secondary education program, and have already passed the state's general education test and achieved the necessary grade point average.

The course

CIED 3712 Field Experiences in Secondary Schools is taken primarily by students who will student teach a year after they take this course. In this course, students are required to spend 45 hours in a school observing and interacting with the cooperating teacher and his or her students. My students wrote eight essays and keep field logs which are graded by me, the instructor, using the College of Education's rubric for grading the essays they will submit as part of their first portfolio submission. We met once a week,

[4] Even though pre-service foreign language teachers are in the secondary education program, they spend 23 of their 45 field experience hours in an elementary school.

for fifty minutes, to discuss their experiences, answer questions about the program, and explore the current state of education through various current events and topics.

The cooperating teachers with whom the pre-service teachers were placed are from the surrounding schools and represent the content areas of those pre-service teachers enrolled in the course. The schools vary in size as do their populations, for the most part. While Cochran-Smith (1991) contends that pre-service teachers should be placed with mentor teachers who are challenging the status quo, I do not know if these teachers are reformers, per se. Participants do notice and discuss their cooperating teacher's attitudes and actions as part of their other tasks and reflections during this course and their influence on my students should not be underestimated.

Data Collection

The students in my section of CIED 3712 completed eight essays, a field experience log, a dialogue journal, and a final presentation during the spring 2006 semester. Each essay was to be at least 500 words and follow the instructions supplied in the syllabus (see Appendix A for a copy of the syllabus). The statement of the teaching philosophy and statement of goals were the only two essays that became part of their portfolio. Here is a brief description of the instructions for each essay in the order that they were assigned: in the first essay, students were asked to explain the purpose of secondary education and why the subject they have chosen to teach is especially important in meeting this purpose; in the goals statement, participants were asked to describe where they would like to be teaching in five years and outline the steps they would need to take to achieve those goals; for the philosophy statement, participants were asked to discuss the roles and responsibilities of teachers, students, families, and

communities in fulfilling the purpose of education; and for the cooperating interview, participants asked their cooperating teachers questions about the profession and then reflected on their responses. The classroom management and discipline essays may have been intended to introduce the difference between the two concepts and provide and opportunity for participants to consider the ways in which their cooperating teachers were successful or not in their endeavors with classroom routine and creating rapport with students; the assessment and evaluation essays also create a space where participants can consider the difference between assessment and evaluation while learning more about the "realities" of grading. In the teaching a lesson essay, participants describe and reflect on the lesson they taught for their cooperating teacher's students.

Field experience logs

The field experience log is comparatively informal when compared to the written essays. I, and several of the other instructors, chose to follow Posner's (1996) model for the keeping of field logs. In these logs, participants include a heading (date, time, subject, teacher observed), a numbered sequence of events, and elaboration of one of those events, and an analysis of that event or another.[5] The selected events could be in relation to the curriculum, the teacher, the students, or any other experience with the schools. I required my students to make at least ten entries, and some made just those ten entries while several made many more.

Dialogue journals

Dialogue journals are written exchanges between a student and a teacher about topics they choose (Stanton, 1987). Unlike field experience logs, dialogue journals

---

[5] What is interesting is that a number of subjects did not adhere to those guidelines and instead for whatever reason, devised their own means of recording and reflecting on events in spite of the rubric in place for evaluating their field logs.

provide pre-service teachers with an opportunity to engage in a more unguided reflection of their experiences within their cooperating teachers' classrooms (Anderson et al., 2005). For the most part, researchers who use dialogue journals with their pre-service teachers find the experiences rewarding and informative, yet they are quick to point out participants' comments that they view cause for concern. Goldstein and Freedman (2003) describe their hoped for results that in the journals their pre-service teachers would "develop richer understandings of the relationship of caring and teaching and growing in professional capability and confidence"; however, those results "were not broadly achieved" (p. 442). Likewise, Lloyd (2005) noted that studies should also examine the "negative impact dialogue journals" could have on pre-service teachers, including the insertion of the instructor in the process (p. 289). Part of creating an opportunity for pre-service teachers to "talk" about what they wanted would be offering a space for participants to engage in a somewhat unguided conversation without the intrusion of the "expert" at all stages. Therefore, I chose to depart from the traditional definition of a dialogue journal and let them choose a classmate with whom to engage in a dialogue.

Interviews

The next data source came from interviews conducted with four CIED 3712 students held at the conclusion of the semester. The interview conducted during the final week of the course will serve several purposes in this study. One, it will allow me a way of comparing what my participants write in their journals and their essays with what they tell me. The answers to these questions will be analyzed by the same hermeneutical methods as the dialogue journals. Furthermore, I will be able to discuss in their essays and the process of writing them. My interview approach is based on Patton's standardized

open-ended interview (2002), a style which allows the interviewer to control the direction of the conversation in order to ensure that all participants answer the same questions in the same order. In the standardized open-ended interview, the researcher carefully plans out the wording of each question before hand, including possible probes for acquiring extra information or clarification, and often submits these questions to a institutional review board before conducting any interviews (Patton, 2002, p. 346). He also teaches that “In qualitative inquiry, ‘good’ [interview] questions should, at a minimum, be open-ended, neutral, singular, and clear” (Patton, 2002, p. 353).

Patton (2002) lists four major reasons for using a standardized open-ended interview format:

1. The exact instrument used in the evaluation is available for inspection by those who will use the findings of the study.
2. Variation among interviewers can be minimized where a number of different interviewers must be used.
3. The interview is highly focused so that the interviewee time is used efficiently.
4. Analysis is facilitated by making responses easy to find and compare (p. 346).

In addition, this type of interview “facilitates organization and analysis of the data” (Patton, 2002, p. 349) and many of the questions in my interview protocol deal with subjects on which these participants have written and discussed during the spring 2006 semester. In the following interview protocol (See Appendix C), the researcher has specifically worded each question as it is to be asked. However, as qualitative studies rely on emergent strategies, the wording of these questions may change during the course of

the study and probing will necessitate the asking of questions based on individual answers.

Data Analysis

For my data analysis, I will be pulling from two traditions—hermeneutics and poststructuralism. I believe combining the poststructuralist's attention to the written word (Crotty, 1998) with the hermeneutist's "relating parts to wholes and wholes to parts" (Patton, 2002, p. 497) will be a valuable approach to answering the research questions for this study. The combination of poststructuralist theory with hermeneutics strategies provides a means for me to concentrate on the writing of my students as teachers-in-the-making without having to resolve portions of their essays which I may interpret as contradictory, "incorrect," or confusing. While the combination of these two may also seem like overlapping because of their privileging of the text, I believe that there are several instances where the use of the two may uncover important findings.

Hermeneutical strategies provide a means of keeping the post-structuralist strategy in place. Hermeneutics reminds researchers to be formal in one's interpretation (Patton, 2002, p. 498) and "in practice, a researcher can impose closure on this process when some kind of meaningful understanding has been reached" (Prasad, 2005, p. 35). It can also remind researchers not to get carried away with the analysis of the written word to the point where one undermines herself (one characteristic of post-structuralist's methods is to undermine one's own findings) so repeatedly that there is nothing left or what is left is "solipsistic cynicism"(Sipe & Constable, 1996). On the other hand, hermeneutic strategies may lead to an analysis that neglects the position of the interpreter as maker of the subject's meaning—a facet of post-structuralist theory. The tension

between these two traditions—one with a history of "recognizing the tricky nature of interpretation," the other which regards texts as "unruly" and lacking "some kind of unique essence" requires a researcher to consider how to balance "a sympathetic treatment toward the text and an incessant interrogation of it" (Prasad, 2005, p. 31) while remembering that there is a subject who uttered these texts. However, because both traditions are concerned with the context in which texts are written allows for the exploration of multiple influences on texts, other than just the author.

For the purposes of answering my research questions, I will turn to Kristeva's theory of the subject-in-process/on trial to perhaps identify moments when my students, through their writings, reveal their feelings (maybe Kristeva's semiotic flow) toward the teacher-making process. For the hermeneutical analysis approach I hope to undertake, I will attempt to identify moments in my students' writings when their language and thoughts intersect with the context and language of the teacher-making process in which they are immersed. (As it did with the simple task of trying to name themselves). In this way, I will undertake what Smith (1991) describes as "a deep attentiveness to language itself, to notice how one uses it and how others use it" (p. 199).

What Kristeva can lend to ways of analyzing this stage of identity formation is a "new" way of reading these moments in which student's use of the language is choppy, lopsided, questionable, contradictory, and unexpected. Pre-service teachers might not be rejecting the language of their chosen profession, but instead they are working through it to express their negotiations between what they have known to be true and what they are being asked to do. Kristeva's notions on desire remind us that pre-service teachers, for the most part, desire to find their identities as teachers and perhaps unconsciously

understand that search means they will have to use someone else's language to talk about their own sense as teachers to be.

Atwell-Vasey's (1998) study of three English/language arts teachers' narratives on their personal and school reading experiences was an influence on the way I approached the analysis of my students' writings. Atwell-Vasey, who applied autobiographical narrative inquiry to her study, uses psychoanalytical theory, in particular Kristeva's, to read her participants' writings. She notes sections of her participants' writing which are choppy, rhythmic, and repetitious. She examines her participants' use of memory and how those "reminiscences" can be "described in Kristeva's terms as semiotic" (p. 115). My analysis resembles parts of Atwell-Vasey's. For example, like Atwell-Vasey, I found myself weaving in statements from all of my participants and then focusing on a few participants in particular and separating those analyses into different chapters. I also paid attention to my participants' memories and tried to locate Kristeva's semiotic in their writings. However, there are obvious differences in our participants, under what conditions they wrote their essays, and the context to which our findings can be applied.

What do these moments look like in pre-service teachers' writings? Is a fragment, just a fragment? Is a sentence when a pre-service teacher addresses her hesitation at not wanting to "teach to the test" an example of the subject putting the process on trial? What about the feelings that surface within a nostalgic portrayal of a favorite teacher? What about the sensory details associated with memories or silences, the unmentioned in their writings? These moments will be informative to understand the interplay between the semiotic and the symbolic.

The Rigor of the Study

Credibility

In order to establish credibility, which Lincoln & Guba (1989) explain as a way of "establishing the match between the constructed realities of respondents (or stakeholders) and those realities as represented by the evaluator and attributed to various stakeholders" (p. 237), I have engaged in four steps. The first was a prolonged engagement (Lincoln & Guba, 1989) with my participants (just over four months). During that period, I collected several different sources of data, a strategy which I hoped helped me build relationships with my subjects and gave them time to reflect and respond to events that occurred during the semester. The second way I tried to establish credibility was through a strategy Lincoln and Guba (1989) describe as "progressive subjectivity" which begins before, during, and after a study. The researcher records what she expects to find and then revisits those notes with the understanding that "the inquirer's construction cannot be given privilege over that of anyone else" (p. 238). This form of monitoring for me was kept through a number of formal and informal writings that I completed during the course of this study, and excerpts of those writings can be found in the two interludes.

The next two techniques I employed were triangulation and member checks. According to Patton (2002) triangulation can "mean using several kinds of methods or data" (p. 247), such as different data sources and theories as a way in order to "*test for* [his emphasis] such consistency" in the hopes of "**understanding inconsistencies in findings** [his emphasis]" for the purposes of being "**illuminative and important** [his emphasis]" (p. 556). Mathison (1988) also points out the productive nature of methods of triangulation which "provides more and better evidence from which researchers can

construct meaningful propositions about the social world" (p. 15). For this study, I collected several different kinds of data sources including formal and informal writings by my students, classroom observations, and individual interviews with several of my participants. I also collected secondary education program documents, such as the conceptual framework and portfolio guidelines in order to compare that language with my students' writing. The fourth way I tried to establish credibility in this study was through periodic member checks, which Lincoln & Guba (1989) consider "the single most crucial technique for establishing credibility" (p. 239). I performed member checks several times during the class meetings by either asking my students to discuss or clarify comments they made in their writings for this course or recording when they referred to something they had written. We also used hard copies of their philosophy statements and goals statements to refer to during our interviews. This way I could not only ask them about certain events about which they had written but refer to the particular language that they used to record them. After I interviewed each of my four participants, I sent them drafts of what I had written and asked them for feedback. (I provide that feedback at the conclusion of this study.) I chose these prolonged, progressive, multiple techniques to lend credibility to my findings, but I also tried to provide a thick description for my readers to determine any applicability to their own situations, which matches the expectation of transferability, another criteria for the rigor of a qualitative research.

Transferability

Lincoln & Guba (1989) define transferability as "parallel to external validity or generalizability . . . is always relative and depends entirely on the degree to which salient conditions overlap or match" (p. 241). They suggest employing this description as one of

the ways to address transferability. In order to provide a thick description, I have tried to include enough details about my participants, the course, and the context of their tasks they must complete during the spring 2006 semester. In addition, I include details about my stance as teacher researcher and my own impressions of what I want to do and am required to do as instructor of this course. I also provide copies of the syllabus and course assignments in Appendix A for readers to compare with their own experiences with a secondary education field experience course. In these ways, I follow Lincoln & Guba's (1989) advice to include detailed descriptions of the time, place, culture and context for those who may wish to apply this research to their own.

Limitations

These students were asked to voluntarily contribute essays to this study. Some chose not to submit essays; therefore, I do not have 18 copies of their teaching philosophies, for example. Furthermore, I am unable to guess how many drafts each of their essays underwent. Some of these essays may have been written for an earlier course (some instructors of SCFD 3223 The role of the teacher in American schools), and I can't be sure whether or not that instructor's feedback influenced their later drafts. In addition, some participants were placed with multiple cooperating teachers, which may have influenced the ways in which they discussed the differences in assessment and evaluation, discipline and classroom management, and philosophies. Furthermore, the findings presented in this study cannot be generalized to all other pre-service teachers or other field experience programs as each interaction between researcher and participants is unique (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) and the sample size is relatively small (n=18).

Conclusion

In this study, I will examine the writings of 18 pre-service teachers enrolled in a field experience course during the spring 2006 semester for moments when they interact with the teacher-making process. At the conclusion of the semester, I will interview several participants about their experiences and the writings they did for this course. Using Julia Kristeva's notion of the subject-in-process/on trial will lend a new way of examining pre-service teachers as negotiators of the teacher-making system whose semiotic drive transforms the symbolic order and may demonstrate a different way of reading the construction of a teacher's identity.

INTERLUDE

Before I begin presenting my analysis of my students' writing, I think that it would be important for me to reflect on my own participation in this study in a set of two narratives. The first one concerns my role as writing instructor in this course. The second one concerns several important class discussions which occurred during the end of the course. While I feel that these narratives may downplay the complexities of my students by shifting the focus on me for awhile, these recollections based on notes I had taken during and immediately after classes in the spring 2006 semester, further demonstrate the ways that "ethical practice . . . amounts to using the semiotic to bring about changes in the symbolic order itself" (Letche & Margonzi, 2005, p. 108). Putting into writing the emotions and reactions I had during the 2006 spring semester presents a way for me to act as a subject-in-process/on trial.

In rereading my students' goals statements and philosophy of teaching statements, what once stood out as good organization in their writing now seems to be their just mechanically filling in of the blanks that I and the college of education provide for them. But now, after choosing chunk after chunk from their writings that resemble each other not only in form but also in wording, a crucial examination of myself as teacher is needed to answer the question "What role does my teaching play in the construction of their written identities as pre-service teachers?" Also, if they didn't use my language is that a sign of resistance or of simply not listening/ understanding? While I cannot answer the second question without further inquiry, the following description of what happened the

day I explained the assignment is an attempt to answer the first one. In order to set the scene, I should disclose that my students came to class with their philosophies ready to turn in, but I sensed through the many emails I received from my students before this day, that they were not ready to submit them yet.

Before class, a few students trickle in and remark that they didn't really understand how to write their philosophies or they ask me specific questions about the assignment. I tell them to wait and I try to smile reassuringly. They sit at the first five groupings of tables, two rectangular tables that have been pushed together to make one larger one, four to five at each table. These tables are angled toward the front, where I stand for most of the period, close to the dry erase board and computer which I use for referencing a copy of the portfolio handbook, which can be found on the college of education's website.

At three thirty, the scheduled time for class to begin, my students take out their essays. "We are going over the philosophy statements before you turn them in," I say "You can swap papers with your neighbor, if you like, to offer suggestions." A few of them swap papers. I begin reminding them that Sally[6] showed them last week where to find the instructions for the philosophy statements on the COE's website. After we begin going through the components of the essay, a few of them swap their papers back. I move onto introductions: "You need a catchy first sentence," I say, "Reviewers will be reading many essays and it gets tedious to see that so many of the essays begin the same way: The purpose of secondary education is to blah, blah, blah. Try beginning with a quote or an interesting fact" I say.

[6] OSU's COE's LiveText support person. LiveText is the platform they use to submit their portfolios online where outside reviewers can access and evaluate them. Part of their tuition/ fees supports her position.

A student at one of the front group of tables raises her hand. I walk around the room and notice that she hasn't turned the first page of her essay. She looks up at me, arms folded across her chest, and makes no movement. I reach over and tilt her paper toward me. "It's too long" she says. I look down and see that the first page consists of one long paragraph. There are a few pencil comments, but I don't bother to read them. I set her essay back down and back away a few steps. "That's okay," I say "Do you have any idea what you can cut?" At the adjacent table, I hear another student explaining to the girl who sits next to her that she had me last semester and has already written and rewritten her philosophy statement for me before and that's why she receives threes on the papers in my class[7]. I stand at the edge of their table for a moment before moving onto thesis statements.

"Your thesis statement should be the last sentence of your first paragraph," I state. I continue to instruct that this sentence should reflect the content of the essay and should say that the teacher cannot accomplish the purpose of education alone but only with the help of the students, family, and community. I circulate the room again and pause next to someone in the back who is text messaging on his cell phone. I stand there until he finishes and puts it away.

"Next," I say, "You discuss each of the following in a separate paragraph-- the role of the teacher, the students, the family, and the community." I proceed to tell them the importance of specific examples on the reviewers' evaluations. "They like stories," I say. "The community does more than provide money," "Use examples from your own experiences," "What do you remember about your own communities?" We share a few

---

[7] I have adopted the same grading system and rubric used by the COE for evaluating the philosophy of teaching and goals statements. They are awarded a score between a 0 (Unacceptable) and 3 (Exceeds standard).

examples of our past but it seems as if they are "trying out" possible ideas rather than confident in their own decisions.

By the end of the first twenty minutes, I've written the following words in brown marker on the dry erase board:

1. Introduction
2. Teacher
3. Students
4. Family
5. Community
6. Conclusion

This list can be compared with the list of instructions provided by the college. Mine is even sparser. I proceed to tell them that they can turn in their essays next week, if they wish, after they revise them. No one turns in his or her essay that day.

After writing this descriptive narrative, I realized that what I in the past took for "good writing" by my students might be more than just a regurgitation of the program's philosophy and a carbon copy of what I thought a "good essay" should look like. I really didn't consider how prescriptive the whole process was or the ways in which my students' own selves emerged in spite of my prescriptive instructions and insistence on conformity. Organizing and writing what they did possibly was not easy for them to do. When I came across these moments in their writings, I returned their papers to them and sometimes even "let them try again" before assigning them a passing grade! There is more "riding on" these essays for my students other than just passing my class. They are also submitting the first part of the portfolio in order to be fully accepted into the

secondary teacher education program. The philosophy of teaching essay and one another are evaluated by outside readers, and I, of course, want my students to pass. Some of them, however, want not only to pass but to "ace" the essays. Therefore, after rereading and reflecting on my own performance, I am not pleased with the pragmatic, didactic way I presented this material. I approached this discussion as if there were two parties in opposition, and I was on the "good side"—the side that wanted them to pass. I did not enjoy telling them to suppress the ways they desired to write these essays or to give them a "fill-in-the-blank" formula. Those of us who teach this course are asked to deal with far more topics and tasks than there is time for (aren't all educators), which is another reason for examining my students' work even more closely, but only if I critically examine my own role in the process. I, too, am part of the system.

CHAPTER FOUR

DISRUPTIVE, CONTRADICTORY, AND REAPPROPRIATING MOMENTS

Introduction

In "The Perpetual Pedagogy of Surveillance," Reynolds (2003) explores the effects of standardization and ethics codes on educational discourse. With Foucault's theory of productive power in mind, Reynolds notes: "As pre-service teachers, teachers, and others in education internalize these discourses their subject positions are formed" (p. 77). Continued internalization of these discourses, he argues, creates "a particular subject position and we become who we say we are, because we have internalized who the discourses say we are and we produce the discourses that say who we are" (p. 78). While Reynolds is speaking to national standards and certification opportunities like the National Board Certification (NBPTS), I believe his description of "internalized discourses" can also be applied to the essays my students write for their portfolios, which are created and governed partly by those in education, from the teacher educators who create the rubrics to the nationally board certified teachers who evaluate them. However, I refer to Reynolds *not* to introduce a Foucauldian interpretation of my data but to posit the idea that my data reveals something about pre-service teachers' "subject positions" and how a Kristevian analysis can help illustrate that those "subject positions" are not only "formed" but also "forming." In this chapter, after I briefly discuss Kristeva's subject-in-process/on trial, I will focus on three ways my participants' identities are

formed/forming in the essays and field experience logs entries they write during the early field experience course, in particular on those moments which are disruptive, contradictory, and reappropriating. For each of these sections, I will present the concept used to describe this category, locate it within Kristeva's work, offer examples of it from the data, and highlight how this analysis illustrates the formed/forming identities of pre-service teachers. Finally, I will summarize this chapter and offer a brief description of the next interlude.

Subject-in-process/on trial

In *Revolution of Poetic Language*, Kristeva (1974/1984) introduces the subject-in-process/ on trial and how it manifests itself through language. In this text, Kristeva does not restore an authorial persona[8] but instead argues for a "reconstituted poetic subject" that "is not stable . . ." but "constructs itself (its self, its identity) within the structure of language" (Lewis, 1974, p. 30-31). Kristeva (1974/1984) describes how the semiotic (the maternal) "distributes" itself through a text: "When instinctual rhythm passes through ephemeral but specific theses, meaning is constituted but is then immediately exceeded by what seems outside meaning: materiality, the discontinuity of real objects" (p. 100). Therefore, two representations of the subject exist simultaneously in language—and she calls these parts the semiotic and the symbolic. It is important to note that this quality does not eradicate any notion of the subject at all; instead, her emphasis is on the glimpses of the subject's duality in his or her writing. To support her notion of the subject-in-process/on trial, Kristeva refers to authors from avant-garde poetry and prose

[8] See Roland Barthes' (1968) essay on "Death of the Author" for a further explanation on how he separates the author's persona from his or her text.

(she often refers to James Joyce and Stéphane Mallarmé) and how their practices work to subvert the symbolic system with the semiotic process:

> That this practice assumes laws implies that it safeguards boundaries, that it seeks out theses, and that in the process of this search it transforms the law, boundaries and constraints it meets. In this way such a practice takes on meanings that come under laws and subjects capable of thinking them . . . questioning and transforming them (1974/1984, p. 101).

In order for subjects "to have access to the process" they "would be able to break through any given *sign* for the subject, and reconstitute the heterogeneous space of its formation" (1974/1984, p. 100). Kristeva contends that subjects must negotiate those boundaries in order to transform them: "This practice, a continuous passing beyond the limit, which does not close off significance into a system but instead assumes the infinity of its process, can only come about when, simultaneously, it assumes the laws of this process . . . (p. 100)." Subjects' language, therefore, is transformable because it contains traces of both the semiotic and the symbolic. This transformation may occur as my participants write as part of the process, incorporating the guidelines for their portfolio essays and class assignments, they continually "reconstitute" their identities depending on the context of the assignment and what they bring to it. The fluidity of my participants' identity formation may be seen through the disruptive, contradictory, and reappropriating language they use in their writings[9] thereby negotiating the very "reality" of such institutional language and expectations.

---

[9] Another interesting practice, and somewhat violent (Kristeva, 1974/1984, p. 101) of the subject-in-process/on trial would be its representation of memory. Kristeva believes that memory is represented in writing as fragmented pieces that transform the original memory. Since many of my participants refer to memories when describing how they decided to pursue a career in teacher or as examples of the teachers

As mentioned in the introduction, participants are asked by numerous parties to use certain terms in conveying their perceptions of teaching. Those terms included but are not limited to the COE's conceptual framework and core values L.E.A.D.S.: Leadership; Ethics and Professionalism; Academics and Professional Roles; Diversity; and Service Orientation/Community Outreach. Furthermore, the COE's instructions are quite specific in outlining how students are to write their teaching philosophies and goals statements.[10] The online portfolio handbook to which students refer when writing these essays states:

> Your Philosophy of Teaching statements are descriptions of your own values and beliefs about education in general and about teaching and learning in your content area. You will refine, augment, and develop your philosophy for the rest of your career. You will want to begin the planning process by reading the OSU PEU [Professional Education Unit] Mission and Core Values and any philosophy statements of the programs to which you are applying. Reflect on how these concepts and professional stances relate to your own beliefs and ideas about teaching and learning.

While these instructions seem to urge students to consider their own ideas about teaching, they encourage students to *start* with the PEU's mission and core values and those of the program "to which they are applying." Can students disagree with those core values or decide not to use them? Not if they want to pass the portfolio submission. The rubric used to evaluate these essays states:

---

they would/would not like to become, this notion would be extremely interesting, as would the idea of repetition.

[10] I would like to remind the reader that all of the assignments for this class are just as specific and those instructions can be found in the Appendix.

> Exceptionally well written and logically organized essay that develops a detailed plan to accomplish professional goals based on OSU Core Values and essential skills and attitudes needed as an educator. Content follows handbook guidelines. Excellent control of written expression.

Similar instructions are given for the writing of the goals statement:

> You will want to begin the planning process by reading the OSU Professional Education Unit Mission and Core Values and any professional goals statements or teacher performance objectives of the program to which you are applying. Reflect on their implications for your own educational and professional development. Think about the knowledge, skills and dispositions that you have seen exhibited by successful teachers whom you have observed and whom you may wish to emulate.

Pre-service teachers are able to use this language as they are part of this system now, but in doing so, they may reveal themselves as subjects-in-process/on trial. Smith (1998) describes Kristeva's process as a "revolt against constraint and against the signifier which announces fixed identity," (p. 24) which arguably, the COE's instructions and rubric do by encouraging/ requiring students to begin with their framework and terms such as knowledge, skills, and dispositions (which are NCATE terms). Next, according to Smith, the subject "propelled by the desire to situate subjectivity, brings into play a never-ending struggle between the social—the arena in which one can speak and be heard—and the need to speak one's singularity" (p. 24). In other words, they are attempting to negotiate their language between the semiotic (the instinctual, historical) and the symbolic (the

rules, the established). This split can be identified in the disruptive, contradictory, and reappropriating language of their writings for this course and for their portfolios.

Disruptions

For Kristeva, the semiotic disrupts the linear order of texts, whether it is the syntactical or structural aspects of language. While some disruptions in my students' writing are possibly a result of poor proofreading or editing, these moments do raise questions as to why they may have changed something and what they might have decided not important enough to include or upon which to elaborate. Disruptions are one way the semiotic emerges in language as it is a means for the real, a "traumatic, unexpected, even violent" (J. Lechte & Zournazi, 2004, p. 217) way for subjects to negotiate the boundaries put into place by the symbolic. Examples from my participants' writings which disrupt the symbolic tend to resemble a subject who is no longer willing to "go along" with the rules but needs a moment to express how he or she "really" feels about something. They reach out to the reader, alerting her that this essay might be a total farce or a product that itself will continue to be engaged in a process.

Statements that stand out because they are not in line with an assignment's parameters seem to be associated with a growing understanding of the "realities" of the teaching profession. Students "play" with the language and with the tasks they must complete as part of this course. For example, Nina questions the very notion of what it means to observe during the early field experience course.

> Before this course, I believed that the main objective when going into both my elementary and secondary school placements was to *observe* [her emphasis] the

teacher and their classes. . . And honestly, isn't that what this class, and more specifically, this assignment, is all about?

Nina openly addresses the boundaries of the task by adding her own impressions of the purpose of the lesson. In this way, she is not only negotiating with the writing assignment but also with the course and with me, the instructor.

Perhaps the best example of my students' disrupting the structural aspects of my assignments comes from their field experience logs. At the beginning of the semester, I provided my students with a guide for preparing a field experience log and the minimum number of entries they were to complete during their 45 hours of observations (See Appendix A). Karen's field log serves as an excellent demonstration of how participants may contradict these guidelines in order to "reconcile" themselves to the structure I provided them with. The four parts to an entry are 1) Heading, 2) Sequence of events, 3) Elaboration of one or two episodes, and 4) Analysis of one of these episodes. In Karen's journal, she stapled the instruction sheet for the log entries to the first page of her notebook. On the second page, she listed the four parts again with notes for herself on the content that was to be included in each section. Here is a sample entry from her log (All of her entries are handwritten). I have kept her line breaks exactly as she recorded these words:

> 2|24|06
>
> AP English 6th Period
>
> One of the students puts a saying
>
> of the day on the board

Fridays are quiz day

Some come in late—not sure why they are late.

They are a funny bunch.

Nice feeling. Comfortable.

Kids are working on Cross word puzzles

Very casual

Joke a lot—witty

The students made crossword puzzles

And then they traded and completed it.

While some of her entries contain more detailed reflections, they all lack numbered lists or the four distinct sections recommended in the instructions. Furthermore, sometimes she marks certain lines with asterisks; sometimes the date is recorded in the upper right hand corner. Many of them, like this entry, have the "look" of poetry—fragments, stanzas, and references to the emotions, images, and atmosphere of the classroom. Karen is not the only student of mine to "thwart" the careful instructions I provided for writing their field log entries. Becky doesn't include any analysis of the episodes she records, and Peter, possibly confused by the differences between the dialogue journal and the field log journal, has a friend, who is a teacher, answer the question "What would you do if you were in that situation?" after each one of his entries.

Another disruption that occurs in my students' writing is what they decide not to put into language. These moments of silence emerge in several ways in my participants' essays and may interrupt the traditional syntactical or structural flow of an essay when

students fail to elaborate on statements they make or connect these statements to the rest of their work. These silent moments might indicate a time when the semiotic or the symbolic cannot function together to express a subject's experience. As Oliver (1993) points out "Without the symbolic function within the symbolic order, the semiotic could never be transformed into a practice, and certainly not a revolutionary practice" (p. 97). In other words, because there exists an expectation that writers would elaborate on such statements, the awkwardness that occurs when one does not becomes a practice of questioning the need to do so in order to make a "statement." The most common example of how my participants employ silence occurs when they do not comment on certain statements they make about their experiences in observing their cooperating teachers. For example, in an essay on assessment and evaluation, Krissy slips in the statement "I think her [the cooperating teacher's] assessments are very authentic," without explaining what she means:

> Lab time is a reward for the students. So, she [Krissy's cooperating teacher] had to modify her lesson plan according to what happened during the day. I think her daily assessments are very authentic. She had been teacher for quite some time and is an excellent teacher.

The lack of further elaboration or providing an example of what it means to be "authentic" contrasts with those students who reappropriate the term to fit their notions. (I speak to this phenomenon in the third section of this chapter.) Krissy simply chooses not to discuss it; perhaps she is assuming her reader is already familiar with the term or maybe she is not. There is a distinct choppiness to this paragraph and perhaps Krissy is

merely answering the questions in the order that they are presented in the assignment's directions.

Nina employs a similar type of silencing in her writings. She, too, disrupts the otherwise smooth structure in her writing by not elaborating on a statement she makes about her cooperating teacher's school. In an essay on her teacher's discipline practices, she notes:

> In my opinion, there seems to be a complex hierarchy of discipline at this school. Here are assistant vice-principals, vice-principles, assistant principals . . . I cannot keep track of them all. However, those men seem to be who the teachers call if there is ever a problem they cannot handle.

Nina does not elaborate any further. Is her remark directed toward the overabundance of male administrators at the school she observes? Is she commenting on the females turning toward the males as a last resort? Oliver (1993), working with Kristeva's theories, notes that "There is always something that cannot be said and that is why we keep talking" (p. 97). Nina keeps writing about discipline without revealing her feelings about her observation.

Secondly, and more difficult to spot in polished writings, are moments of self-censorship, another type of silencing but one in which a subject attempts to "fit" the semiotic into the symbolic. For example, in a field experience log entry, Sarah may be "silencing" herself from assuming that she knows what it must be like to teach world history. In her field experience log, she crosses out one verb and replaces it with another word; however, it is still possible to read the original word: "To me, World History ~~is~~ seems to be [*sic*] one of the most difficult subjects to ~~ever~~ [*sic*] teach." Sarah seems to be

cautious about making assumptions about a profession she hasn't actually entered yet, but what is interesting is for whom she is making her revisions and under what conditions. When she crosses out the word "ever," for example, is she correcting a split infinitive, and if so, why would she revise a piece of writing that is informal and not evaluated by a rubric?

Finally, silencing of behalf on commenting on their cooperating teachers' habits might be signs of disapproval or disagreement with certain practices. I'm not sure why my students did not feel comfortable elaborating on some of these sentiments. It would be very rare that anyone either than I or their fellow classmates would be reading their work. Wang (2004) contends that "usually the site of silence is where articulation can take a form of social critique" (p. 110). Perhaps, as the instructor of this course, their silence was directed at me, in the hopes that I could initiate some changes in the field experience coursework, fear of me as an authority figure, a cultural or personal reluctance to critique someone with more experience with teaching, or a lack of self-confidence. If students are able, as Kelly is, to disrupt the symbolic then that might be a way for them to use the semiotic to bring about productive changes in the symbolic.

Contradictions

Contradictions are another way the semiotic emerges in the symbolic and the symbolic crosses into the semiotic. To illustrate how contradictions are inherent in Kristeva's theories, Bové (2006) traces the contradictions in Kristeva's *Revolution in Poetic Language*. Bové points out that Kristeva "frequently states that the semiotic exists within the symbolic and that the symbolic is required . . . to avoid psychosis. . . Yet, ultimately, it is the role of the semiotic that she stresses as a fundamental, liberating, and

pleasurable moment" (p. 15). However, according to Oliver (1993) there does not exist a traditional contradiction in Kristeva's explanation of the role of the semiotic and symbolic but a "reversed reactivation of the contradiction [that] is a *reactivation* [her emphasis] between the semiotic and symbolic because it points up the heterogeneity, the contradiction . . . which the symbolic negates in order to simulate the unity that taking position requires" (p. 98). In this way, "the reversed reactivation pulverizes the thetic [the moment when the semiotic and symbolic coexist]" to which it "gave rise" and this "reversed reactivation of the contradiction exposes the symbolic sham of positional unity" (Oliver, 1993, p. 98). Therefore, participants are able to expose the split sides of their identities. Kristeva addresses these contradictions in reference to her theory of a subject-in-process/on trial.

For Kristeva, contradictions are a means for a subject to reconcile the semiotic/possibilities with the symbolic/laws and therefore release some of the tensions associated with their relationships. In her chapter titled "How does one speak to literature?" Kristeva (1977/1980) mentions the role contradictions play in her theory of the subject-in-process/on trial:

> It is a trial where the subject reaches both its limits (the laws of the signifier) and the objective possibilities (linguistic and historic) of their displacement, by including the tensions of the "ego" within historical contradictions, and by gradually breaking away from these tensions as the subject includes them in such contradictions and reconciles them to their struggles (p. 97).

When participants practice contradictions in their language, they embody the tension between the semiotic and the symbolic. For Kristeva (1977/1980), contradictions are a

necessary component for identifying the split subject. They are unavoidable because language must contain elements of the semiotic and symbolic.

> By practicing contradiction within the material element of language as the generator of ideas or meaning through the biological and historical body of a concrete subject. . . Any sentence is both syntax and nonsentence, normative unicity and disorderly multiplicity; any sequence is both myth and the melting pot where it is engendered and dies through its own history . . . specific subjects cipher the normative language of everyday communication by means of extralinguistic, biological, and socially unforeseeable. . . (p. 99)

This tension, which she calls "stumbling blocks for contemporary sciences" (1977/1980, p. 99) are stumbling blocks for me as well. When I read my student's assignments that do not adhere to the given instructions but do not exactly disregard them either contradictions inevitably arise. These "stumbling blocks" in pre-service teachers' writing then may be a sign not only of the ambiguity concerning their future professions but also a way for them to demonstrate the idea that their future identities are not fixed or static.

Contradictions arise occasionally in my students' philosophy and goals statements. In these assignments, they discuss the purpose of secondary education, its many participants, and their future objectives—all within a format provided by the secondary education program at my school. Once again, some of their writings illustrate a struggle between identifying what they feel is important and perhaps what they think the evaluators feel are important about teaching. In Michelle's teaching philosophy, for example, she shows signs of negotiating the roles knowledge plays in learning. She writes:

> If every teacher specializes in one area and learns the most that they can in that one area than [*sic*] the student is getting the most out of every teacher that they can. A teacher cannot possible [*sic*] know everything there is to know in all areas of education. . . I think it is important for students to gain knowledge in every area because they will use this knowledge and implement it into their lives. A student that only has knowledge in one single area cannot do much with this.

In other words, Michelle is saying that a teacher should "specialize in one area," but the student should "gain knowledge in every area" because a student with "knowledge in one single area cannot do much with this." However, if that student decides to become a teacher, specializing in one area is exactly what he or she should do. Teachers, having been students, somehow must "gain knowledge in every area" yet specialize in one area. Contradictions, like this one, might appear to undermine the message a subject is trying to send but perhaps they are examples of students experiencing the teacher-making process in tension. For example, James states of his philosophy:

> My philosophies will definitely change and evolve as I do my observations and eventually student teaching. I feel like right now my philosophies are solid, but I definitely want to get out and learn more teaching styles. . . I understand that this [essay] will be a very rough copy to what my philosophies may be in the future.

James seems comfortable with the notion that as of this moment his philosophies are "solid" but that they will evolve as his schooling does. He appears confident in knowing his preference yet equally comfortable with reconciling those strong ideas with those he will discover during his preparation. Yet, he feels it important at the end of his essay to reiterate the characteristics of his current philosophy: "I feel at this point my philosophies

of teaching are really similar to the stereotyped teaching styles of the past, or could maybe even be considered “old school.” It is not clear if he is critiquing his philosophy by referring to “stereotyped teaching styles” or aligning himself with past teaching practices which he feels have been successful. Perhaps, as he might admit, he does not know the answer yet.

Rebecca also displays the contradictions inherent in writing a philosophy statement at the inception of one’s entry into a secondary education program: “In fact, by the time I finish this paper, I may not agree with certain things that I stated.” Rebecca does not openly refute the assignment; instead she prepares the reader for any contradictions she might make in the course of her essay. Similarly, Ginger speaks to the pre-existing contradictions in an assignment in which she has to state her professional goal statement: “When I began to attempt to determine what I considered to be my professional goals, I realized something very important: I do not plan.” She again tries to account for her nature not to plan or perhaps be rather whimsical: “However, as I stated above, the “plans” are just speculative, and who knows if in a month I will change my mind completely and want to teach Spanish in Kansas.” In spite of her continual assertions that she does not plan, Ginger makes clear her one goal: “In conclusion, my lone professional goal for the future is simple: I want to be the best teacher I can, no matter who is sitting in my classroom or where I am.” Ginger completes the assignment and follows the parameters, but she feels the need to maintain her views of goal-setting. In fact, not planning seems to be an important role in the way she conducts her life. She does admit to having a goal, but like James, she recognizes the possibility that her goals will inevitably change as she continues in the process of becoming a teacher.

Some contradictions arise out of a student's use of a "teacher term" to mean something that traditionally has meant the opposite. For example, in describing the strategies he will use as a future English teacher, Peter claims,

> As a future teacher, I plan on using lectures in my lessons, they allow the students to constantly be active while allowing them the ability to think and form their own opinions. It is creative activities like lectures . . .

In calling lectures "creative" is Peter being contradictory or is he basing his contention on personal experience? Or does he have a different idea of what has traditionally been called a "lecture?" (Perhaps by "active" Peter is referring to active listening or actively taking notes.) He certainly seems to contradict the traditional notion of lecture. While contradictions like Peter's may provoke laughter in the reader, he might not find them funny: "when the contradiction takes place within a subject, it can hardly be said to make him laugh" (Kristeva, 1974/1984, p. 224). However, laughter, like contradictions can promote productive conversations on the taken-for-granted. In fact, the inherent contradiction in laughter is what "breaks through prohibition . . . to introduce the aggressive, violent, liberating drive" (Kristeva, 1974/1984, p. 224). In the next section, I would like to discuss what happens when my pre-service teachers take terms often associated with teaching and colleges of education and assign them different meanings.

Reappropriations

Students wishing to enter the secondary education program at my school must also pass an interview with two members of the department. Two of the predetermined questions candidates are aware beforehand that they must answer are "What do the Professional Education Unit's "L.E.A.D.S." values mean to you? What do you find most

interesting or challenging about the conceptual framework that will guide your preparation as a new teacher?" I remember one student, while listing the words that stand for each of the letters, say *ethically* instead of *ethnically* diverse. She used the term *ethically* a few times before the other interviewer corrected her. Similarly, there are moments in my students' writing when they either use a word in the wrong context or substitute another word for the word that they may have meant to use. In keeping with the notion that participants' language is embedded in both the semiotic and the symbolic, reappropriation of certain terms associated with symbolic order illustrates the subjects' transformation of the system of which they are a part. These terms sometimes are supplied to them by the college of education or they are terms they associate with the profession. Sometimes those moments occur when a subject assigns his or her own definition to a term. At other times, participants rewrite a term or change its part of speech. In this way, participants are adding these terms to their identities or their identities to the terms. Lewis (1974) explains that for Kristeva, reppropriation is an action undertaken by the avant-garde artist to "overcome the repressive structure of the subject unity, to disrupt the status of the subject, and consequently of the individual, in the bourgeois system" (p. 31). When pre-service teachers reppropriate, they not only disrupt their identities but since they are also part of the system, they disrupt that as well.

While I cannot make assumptions about how my students define terms associated with the profession, which the instructions and guidelines for the writings in this course asked them to use, I can point out moments where participants use those terms in ways other than they are traditionally used. Rather than asking for clarification or possibly looking up the terms, participants may use these terms in ways that they think they are

supposed to be used. Or they may believe that they understand these terms already and use them according to how they have used them in the past. In any case, finding examples of reappropriation is tricky because of the ambiguity in the reasons for the participants' decision to use these terms in a particular way or their decisions not to question how they have used them.[11] For example, in her essay on classroom management, Jennifer observes: When dealing with passing in papers, *absentness*, and other things of the sort I think my cooperating teachers could be a little better organized." She uses the term "absentness" twice in this essay, both in reference to absences or perhaps absentees, it's unclear. Natalie also changes the part of speech of a term associated with a teacher's classroom procedure—suspensions: "She [her cooperating teacher] shared with me that she requires copies of every source the students consulted to be handed in with their papers so she can refer back to each and every source if she finds any *suspensions*." This use of "suspensions" might be a result of discipline or classroom management terms slipping into her writing or Natalie may have meant to use the term "suspicious." If this is the case, then the sentence would be incomplete.

Some terms in particular seem to garner more reappropriation than other terms (perhaps the ones students have heard/discussed in classes, but not yet tried to put into their own words), and these are the terms students use in writing about their experiences. In the assessment and evaluation essay, students are asked "Are the cooperating teacher's daily assessments 'authentic?' Give examples from the classes you've visited. Give examples of 'inauthentic' assessments you have witnessed" (from the course's syllabus). Authentic assessment "refers to gathering information or evaluating students'

---

[11] In the following excerpts, I italicize the terms and how my participants use them to bring them to the reader's attention. These terms are not italicized in the original documents.

performances on the basis of activities that are meaningful to them, ones that they can relate to or that tap into their interests" (Woll, 2002) and inauthentic assessments have little connection to students' lives or needs. The terms "authentic" and "inauthentic" assessment receive multiple definitions in my students' essays. Although we did spend a little class time discussing assessments and evaluations, I did not specifically define authentic/inauthentic assessments. Neither did any of my students ask what these terms meant. Therefore, in the following excerpts from my students' writing, they assign their own definitions based perhaps on what they already know about assessment or have learned in their courses. Peter uses them in this way: "Almost all of the assignments that I observed were *authentic* in that they were either read from the book or came from a reliable source."

Peter explains "inauthentic" as

> The only thing that I saw that may of not been *authentic* was that she once passed out some explanations from spark notes [*sic*], however from Mrs. Kerr's character I can not imagine her passing out something that either did not support what she was teaching or was incorrect.

It is not clear exactly what terms Peter should have used, but in his essay, these words mean "reliable/unreliable" or perhaps "pertinent/ impertinent." Annette also reappropriates the terms "authentic" and "inauthentic" in her essay and attempts to define them according to her cooperating teacher's assessments. Annette writes:

> I think assignments such as her vocabulary assignments are *authentic* [my emphasis] because the students not only have to define the word, but also to use it in a sentence that they made up. This proves that the students understood what

they were writing down, rather than just copying words. An *inauthentic assessment* [my assessment] might be when Mrs. Logan makes them write down their feelings about what they have read. Because they discuss what they have read before they do the assignment, their learning may not be because they have actually done any reading but could just be them but reciting back what Mrs. Logan had taught them.

Annette was not as tentative in her use of the terms “student-centered” and “teacher-centered” in describing her own lesson. Annette writes “This lesson was both teacher-centered and student-centered. It involved the students answering questions posed by the teacher and actively participating in their learning.” One paragraph earlier, Annette mentioned that her “lesson [was] done by the teacher asking students questions” and that she tried to pose questions that would lead them to the correct answers without me having to explicitly tell them what the answers were.” While Annette’s ideas about authentic/ inauthentic are closer to Woll’s definition (2002), and she is tentative in her usage, she perhaps assumed that she already knew the meanings of “teacher and student centered.” While it is unclear as to whose definition of authentic/inauthentic assessment they are reappropriating since I did not supply them with one, they are creating their own definitions. They could have used their own terms rather than using the ones from the assignment but perhaps they felt a need to use them for the same reasons some of them choose to self-censor themselves, maybe because they sense I or the portfolio reviewers expect them to.

Some of the terms which are reapproriated by my participants may have come from their cooperating teachers rather than the instructions for assignments. In her essay

on assessment and evaluation, Kelly remarked on how her teacher decides when it's time to assess students' knowledge: "Lastly, Mrs. Robinson also tests the students at the end of each *Objective* as well as giving quizzes every week." The decision to capitalize the word "objective" seems odd. Is Kelly referring to the state's objectives? The teacher's objectives? Was it a typo? Kelly does assign a different meaning to the word objective as it is used in education today ("Students will be able to . . . by the end of this lesson" is a common use in education today). In the lesson she created to teach to her cooperating teacher's students, she listed under the category of Objectives just one, "Students write a persuasive letter to the community." This usage seems consistent with how she defines her cooperating teacher's objectives. While a teacher educator might read this sentence and assume that Kelly has a limited knowledge of the complicated reasons behind assessment and evaluation, Kelly may be incorporating the terms she has learned or read in association with these areas. While some teacher educators might attribute these examples of reappropriation as evidence of students' limited vocabulary or carelessness, the fact that participants did not change or revise these particular examples might be a sign that they place little importance on the term, what it represents, or the assignment. The unconscious, the semiotic, may be at work through reappropriation.

Another interesting case of reappropriation occurred during one of my student's observations. In this example, she noticed a high school student reappropriating one of his teacher's terms. Her cooperating teacher asked her students to find five "credible sources" on the internet for their research papers. Lindsey recounts her experience helping a student with this task:

He [the student she was helping] was under the impression that he had to use five

> different *search engines* [her emphasis]; [*sic*] not find five different *source* [*sic*]. I told him that made no sense, but he stuck to it. After class I told Mrs. Moth about it and she rolled her eyes and said he does not know how to listen, but he blames it on dyslexia all of the time.

This example of reappropriation differs slightly from some of the previous examples. Like the avant-garde artist Kristeva refers to in her definition, this student deliberately chooses sources to mean engines rather than five separate web sites. While it is unclear as to whether or not this decision is a result of his dyslexia, my pre-service teacher is unable to convince him otherwise. Sources for him mean search engines.

Moments of disruption, contradiction, and reapproapriation exist together in some of my participants' writing. One place where these practices coincide is my participants' use of pronouns when referring to themselves, their cooperating teachers, and the notion of teacher as a body of professionals to which they may or may not feel a part of. By examining closely how participants use pronouns in reference to these relationships, the fluidity of their identity construction emerges in an interesting and transformative way. I've noticed some of the students using the first person plural, we and us, when referring either to duties belonging to their cooperating teacher or they may be inconsistent in their use of the first person singular. I think this might signify a transformation of their identities in a number of ways, including visualizing themselves as teachers or a blending of their roles and the roles of their cooperating teachers. Also, when my participants replace the third person objective pronoun with the first person plural or the second person plural or the first person in spaces traditionally reserved for the cooperating teacher they are perhaps passing into the role of teacher, which they are not asked directly

to do in this course but may find themselves doing. This is just one of the ways they may be assuming their future identities during their early experiences in the field[12].

Some participants seem comfortable picturing themselves as a part of the classroom, even as a teacher of some sort when assuming additional duties or participating in their experience. In the following excerpts from an interview with a cooperating teacher, Jennifer switches to the first person plural only once during the middle of the interview when indicating a transition to the next question:

> When I asked him about the textbooks he uses. . .
>
> I moved on the conversation to talk about the school . . .
>
> *We* then shifted the conversation to focus on parental involvement . . .
>
> Next, I began to ask . . .

It is interesting to imagine what occurred at this point of their conversation that Jennifer felt the need to use "we" instead of "I" during this point of the interview. Did her cooperating teacher bring up the subject of parental involvement or did the conversation naturally progress to that point? And why did Jennifer return to the first person "I" for the next question? Perhaps because she and her cooperating teacher are both parents, during this segment of the interview they relate more as peer-to-peer rather than student-to-teacher. In remarking on teaching philosophies, Jennifer states: "Finally, I think that overall, Mr. Taylor's relationships are good with his students. *We* seem to have the same philosophy on how a teacher should act." In this example, Jennifer is already picturing herself with a philosophy. This use of "we" is in direct contrast to how other participants refer to their cooperating teachers when they share beliefs in how a class should be run. Sarah, for example, writes "I really enjoyed seeing Mrs. Smith teach. *She* seems to have a

[12] In the following examples, I will italicize the pronouns I wish to bring to the readers' attention.

similar style to what I would like to do in my classroom." Sarah does not seem as far along in her confidence as a teacher because, unlike Jennifer, she speaks of applying her philosophy to a future classroom.

Another disrupting use of the first person plural pronoun occurs in Peter's cooperating teacher interview essay. Like Tammy, Peter uses the pronoun "we" in his essay. He writes the question as it exactly appears in the written instructions:

> Peter: Where do you get other instructional materials? Do you spend your own money on your class?
>
> *Cooperating Teacher: We get a lot more materials on the internet, I also use some instructional materials that have piled up over the years . . . [his use of italics]*

To whom is the "we" referring? Peter does not indicate whether or not he has quoted his teacher directly. Might the "we" then, if it is the cooperating teacher's use of "we" a reference to those other teachers in her school? Does it then imply that they share resources? Or has Peter inadvertently included himself in this group? (Peter's lesson came from an Internet source.) Or as with many "disruptions" in my students' writing is it just a typo? The answer may be found on the second page, in the teacher's last answer to a question about why her school is a good school in which to teach: "*Murphy is also blessed in that we get a good deal of funding in which we purchase technology for our classrooms* . . .[his use of italics]." The use of "we" now seems to refer to the other teachers in the school.

As in the previous case, pronouns continually cause ambiguity in my participants' essays, especially when they use the second person (something I ask them not to do in

their writing). Is it the cooperating teacher's use of "you" in referring to the pre-service teacher's career or is it the pre-service teacher including herself or himself as part of the profession or (and this is the reason I ask them repeatedly not to use the second person) are they including/ addressing me as a teacher? Tammy, as stated earlier, shows signs of already picturing herself as a teacher:

> That was the best advice I think she [her cooperating teacher] has given me, to keep them busy from the time they sit down to the time they leave otherwise they will be hard to get their attention when *you* want to start class.

More moments which reveal something about my participants' fluid identity formation arise in their use of possessive pronouns. Some participants refer to the cooperating teacher's students as "my students" when they reflect on the teaching of their lesson, while other participants consistently refer to the cooperating teacher's students as "the students." Clearly, how pre-service teachers use pronouns in reference to their experience during early field experiences demonstrates what type of role they play in their cooperating teachers' classrooms and where they see themselves on the journey to becoming teachers.

One message teacher educators may take from Kristeva's notion of the subject-in-process/on trial is the understanding of how pre-service teachers are negotiating the teacher-making process and how that negotiation surfaces in their writings. Teacher educators, following Kristeva's notion, even have a responsibility to their pre-service teachers. As Ziarek (2003) notes, Kristeva's

> reference to responsibility suggests that the linguistic instability does not suspend the necessity of judging but reverses the stakes of judgment. If the aesthetic of the

> uncanny points to the impasse of judgment, ethics shifts the priority from the subjective faculty of judgment to the experience of being judged. As Kriteva's famous formulation of the subject-in-process/on-trial suggests, the instability of the symbolic order and the fragility of subjective identity do not imply subject complacency or the "happy" celebration of linguistic multiplicity but impose responsibility in the face of judgment coming from the other. (p. 151)

While Ziarek is referring to how Kristeva's work connects to Freud's notion of the uncanny and nationalism and argues that the stranger is already, always part of that system, her point pertains to the position of the pre-service teacher and the teacher educator and the system with which they are a part of.

Furthermore, Letche and Margoroni (2004) challenge that "Ethical practice, then, amounts to using the semiotic to bring about changes in the symbolic order itself" (p. 108). What then is the teacher educator's responsibility to the writings of their pre-service teachers? Kristeva, I believe, would suggest that it is not the teacher educator's duty to "pass judgment" on students based on their writings, but at least at this college, that is exactly what is being done through the evaluating of their essays in order to determine whether or not they should gain entry into the program. Instead, Kristeva might encourage teacher educators to revisit these moments of disruption, contradiction, and reappropriation with their students. In the case of my experiences with my students' field experiences logs, rather than asking them to follow Posner's (1996) format, I might ask them to reconsider alternative ways of allowing them to respond to their cooperating teacher's classrooms. The next interlude concentrates on the final sessions of my spring 2006 field experience course in order to position myself once again as teacher/researcher.

Then in chapter five, I analyze four students from this course and examine moments when the semiotic may fail to "work" along with moments of transformation as a result of the interaction between the semiotic and the symbolic so as to (as I did in this chapter) highlight their complex subjectivities. In the final chapter, I will also suggest how noting the contradictions, disruptions, and reappropriations pre-service teachers' writings can lead to conversations about transforming pre-service teacher education in the early field experience course.

INTERLUDE

It is the first day of CIED 3712-002 Field Experiences in the Secondary Schools, Spring 2006, and students are already seated in room 107. I walk in, greet the few students I have already met, and begin arranging stacks of papers to distribute the first day on the desk at the front. In addition to the syllabus, there are folders of paperwork which they are to give their cooperating teachers and stapled packets of detailed instructions for each assignment for themselves. There is a sheet for those students to sign who have not received a placement in a school. There is the computer-generated roll sheet. For the past three years, I have spent the first day of 3712 going over each piece of paper with my students during the next fifty minutes. Knowing that this semester is special and that I will be asking these students to participate in research that will contribute to my dissertation makes my routine a little different from previous semesters.

Unsure of when to mention my intentions, I ask my students to get into groups and to list their expectations for this semester, and then I go through the syllabus. Finally, I introduce my research plans. Without mentioning Julia Kristeva or anything that "smacks" of theory, I tell them about how I think that what has been construed as poor or inexperienced writings by pre-service teachers might be a sign that they are negotiating the expectations that the College of Education (COE), the state, and I have for them. Next, I briefly explain to them that they will have the option of participating or not participating in my study this semester, and if they choose to do so, there will be no additional work. Several weeks will pass before I officially pass out consent forms and

give them more details pertaining to my study. In the meantime, I emphasize the fact that I, like they, am a student in search of a degree and that I hope my study will make some changes in teacher education programs. It is a strategy of mine to connect with them—a reminder that I too am just a student in a process over which I have little control.

After wondering all semester how to talk about the progress of my research without "talking" about it, I am suddenly jolted back into the "realities" of the course during the last class meeting in May. Complacency in teaching prevents me from engaging with the subject-in-process/on trial. When I fall back on traditional strategies and fail to provide my students the means to determine what we learn, I recognize that I too need to be included in all of the parts of the teacher-making system.

On the last day of this course, it is "traditional" (here I mean this part is part of the course's syllabus) for students to present what they have learned this semester to the rest of their classmates. While this year's presenters covered topics ranging from classroom management techniques to advances in record-keeping software, two presentations stand out for their unexpectedness and challenge to the curriculum of this course. (Because, even though there is a set syllabus, I still can decide how to cover the topics for discussion.) One student who had been placed in an inner-city school spoke on how the COE's curriculum, so far, had failed to address the ways of teaching to a diverse group of students. She contrasted her experiences so far (white, middle-class, small town) with the school's population in which she had been placed (mainly African American and Hispanic in a large city). It seemed to me as if she was not only trying to make her peers aware of the need for knowledge on how to reach those students from various backgrounds but also sending me a message (remember I'm just making an assumption)

of what this course lacked. I realized that we had not specifically addressed this topic in this course. “She’s right,” I thought. My first reaction was defensive, but I agreed that we had not devoted much time this semester to that topic.

However, the presenter who immediately followed this presentation reminded me of why I might have been hesitant to address this topic. This particular student, in response to a MetLife survey I shared with them earlier in the semester which reported that new teachers desired more help in communicating with parents, had asked her cooperating teacher for suggestions on how to reach out to parents successfully. Her cooperating teacher provided her with handouts that she had received at a workshop on the subject, and my student distributed these documents as part of her presentation. One section of the handout dealt with parent conferencing and offered tips on how to meet and treat parents of different socio-economic classes (no mention of race was given) in order to make them more comfortable. After briefly highlighting some of these suggestions, my student asked if there were any questions. Another student in a shaky voice described her experiences with teaching in the northeastern part of the United States. This document, in particular the suggestion that teachers offer coffee to parents of lower socio-economic status, she argued could open one to a lawsuit and was offensive. I braced myself for the influx of emotional comments that no doubt would follow as I saw several students turn away, look down, or tense their facial muscles in response to her comments.

The discussion that ensued was one of the most dynamic, if not uncomfortable, ones of which I have been a part. Some students pointed out the need to recognize the differences between culture and class while others argued for a case by case decision on how to treat parents of different classes. Our conversation oscillated between those who

might generalize about people based on religion, culture, and ethnicity and those who reserve judgments. It was one of those moments when I wanted to stop a discussion partly because I did not have the answers and also because I didn't want people to hurt one another while trying to persuade someone else to see the world the way they do. On the other hand, I felt that this conversation was exactly the one we should be having and one that held potential for transforming each other.

I often find myself unable to deal with those moments in the previous chapter I categorized as disruptive and contradictory. When I led one of the discussion sessions of the introduction to education course the previous semester, I showed a student-created documentary chronicling two boys who attended the same elementary schools but different middle schools. The film highlighted the inequalities between the facility and faculty of these two schools. After finishing the film, I asked my students why they thought I showed them this film. Many of them decided that it was to help them determine where not to get a job. In observing how pre-service teachers might be putting the teacher-making process on trial, I too must be constantly aware of my position as a subject-in-process/on trial. "Do I make space for the semiotic in my classroom?" and "How do I react to those moments" are two questions that I must continually ask myself as a future teacher educator. Even as I write those words, I, like my students, struggle with my own identity. Am I a "future" educator, was I already one, or can I be both?

CHAPTER FIVE

PARTICIPANTS' WORDS

Introduction

In this chapter, I will examine four students whom I interviewed after the spring 2006 semester was completed. The following four students were not chosen randomly, although all of them did volunteer to participate in an interview on the original consent form. They were not even chosen by a particular methodology. I chose Jennifer because this was the second semester I had her as a student; she was non-traditional; and she often spoke out in class regarding the profession. I hadn't intended to interview Peter, but I decided I wanted to interview a male, and he was the only one available, after the only other male dropped out because his grade point average was not high enough to enter the secondary education program. I interviewed Tammy because I felt that she wouldn't mind coming to see me after her finals, and I knew that her commute wasn't far. Finally, I asked Susan to interview because I knew that she, too, lived close to campus and would probably agree to an interview during finals week. Once again, I felt uneasy about researching my own students. Even though I waited to ask Tammy to interview the week before finals, she told a classmate that she was meeting with me. The next week that classmate jokingly asked me why I didn't want to interview her. It was then that I realized the complete "arbitrariness" of my methods. No doubt other students who had volunteered may have felt left out. Interestingly, each of these four participants either had previous careers or majors before choosing teaching. Jennifer was in the Navy, Peter

considered becoming a graphic artist, Tammy was a cosmetologist, and Susan began pursuing a career as a concert oboist. I cannot be sure how much these former pursuits complicated their identities as future teachers, but they referred to these experiences throughout the courses of their writings and interviews. I did enjoy our one-on-one conversations[13], and I once again regretted that we had not spent more time during class exploring how our pasts, not just as students, influence our identities as future teachers.

Keeping Kristeva's work in mind and the purpose and possibilities of interviewing my participants in addition to just using their writings, led me to revisit my subjects' work paying particular attention to repetition of stories, words, or stylistic characteristics throughout all of my data sources. In particular, I considered the role memory plays in their retellings of their experiences this semester. For Kristeva, stories serve as one way for us to "tell ourselves" to another (quoted in Oliver, 2002, p. xxv). For the subject-in-process/on trial, memory is related to the semiotic. Memories exist "out of time" and can resist the symbolic when they are re/told in indirect ways. Kristeva (1974/1984) explains that the subject-in-process/on trial "breaks up the totality of the envisioned objects" into fragments which they link to "sounds, words, and significations, which the process rearranges in a new combination," (p. 102). Some of my participants, like Peter, are able to perform the type of memory work which "permit[s] a renewal of the whole subject [participant]" (Kristeva, 1996/2000, p. 28). Patrick not only repeats stories which contain traces of humiliation; he also works-through and works out his reasons for repeating stories related to humiliation in the classroom by concluding in his teaching philosophy a statement about how as a future teacher he does not want to humiliate his students. He remembers situations, evoking the "temporary resistance" to

[13] For an explanation pertaining to the wording of the questions in this chapter, please see Appendix C.

the “symbolic barrier” which Kristeva (1974/1984) sees as the way to turn the process into practice. Patrick may be unaware of how the semiotic drives associated with his memories have worked their way into his identity as a future teacher. However, what is important for this study is not just the repetition of a certain story, but the repetition alluding to an archaic maternal memory which may be implicated in concrete memories of situations or persons. Memories are also an important element for Kristeva's (quoted in Oliver, 2002) notion of “intimate revolt” because the semiotic can “question and displace the past” (p.5). Many of my participants' stories reveal their memories of themselves as students, although some lack the negotiation with what the symbolic represents in recalling a memory which does not encourage the semiotic resistance.

Methods of analysis

In order to prepare for this chapter, I collected all of the writings and the interview transcriptions for each one of these four participants. Having already read these essays for the first analysis for examples of disruptions, contradiction, and reappropriations, I returned to them and read through them once again, noting points of interest and marking spots where my participants repeated themselves, commented on something that surprised them, or described their writing for this course. I also noted those moments when I thought they were addressing the reader or trying to convey something that was important to them. In addition, I paid special attention to how they spoke about their relationships with former teachers, cooperating teachers, and other parties involved in education. After recording all of these moments into a new document, I cut each participant’s responses into separate strips and separated them into the emerging themes I sensed from their responses. Instead of arranging the data according to these themes, I

will present my analysis of each participant in the hopes that I will be able to demonstrate those moments when my participants engage the play of the semiotic with the symbolic and when the semiotic does not emerge in their responses.

Susan: What's gonna make me happy?

Susan had already received her BA from a liberal arts university in another state and was attending OSU in order to become certified to teach secondary social studies. She was sixteen hours away from student teaching, which she planned to do in the spring 2007 semester. Susan communicated several times in her essays and during class discussions that because of her husband's job, she would be looking for a teaching job close to the university and was worried about whether or not she would find one. I have grouped Susan's responses into comments about writing for the course, how her previous experiences with teachers influenced her future and current identity as a teacher, and the negatives she associates with teaching, in particular how she views herself as a female in a subject area where she believes the teachers are mainly male coaches.

Filling in the blanks

When writing for this course, Susan begins with the assignment's instructions and then answering the questions posed by considering her own experiences and how they fit within the parameters of the assignment. She discusses about how she prepared for the portfolio essays by referring to her process of writing— a process she describes as a way of "filling in the blanks."

> Jackie: Talk about how you went about preparing for the goal statement, philosophy statement and the process of writing.

Susan: Okay. My first thing I always do when I am writing a paper is look at the (unclear)[14] and that just basically gives me my plan. And I just fill in the blanks and go from there. But, beyond that it was easy, I think, to put in my own experiences, I think, the real (unclear) link that's often being able to think back and analyze your thoughts and your feelings and why you are where you are, "why I'm in this class and why I'm here," and then, that's really how I went through it. Just to think about why I am here and what do I want to do and went from there.

For Susan, writing is closely linked to identity construction, a process for thinking through one's motives and relation within a system. Skilled writers, in addition, are able to negotiate following the parameters of a process and knowing when to incorporate their own knowledge. In a conversation about how other students write, Susan went on to explain that she felt her colleagues were not skilled writers because they neglect the "filling in the blanks" process to composition.

Jackie: Well, how did you find out that this is a skill that students are lacking?

Susan: I think probably through actually talking with other classmates of mine in college and they would get back papers and not understand why they didn't do so well and they would ask me, "Well, how did you do?" I said, "I did all right." Well, "What did you do?" And I would read papers, or whatever, and grammar can be a problem and just making it flow and going through the steps as opposed to writing down everything you know. And so, I think it is more from not what I

[14] I use the word "unclear" several times in this chapter to indicate sections of the interviews I could not decipher during transcribing. Rather than try to guess what the participants might have said (including myself) or ask them to recall during the member check what they might have said, I have chosen to leave them as such—thereby, I hope, preserving the original conversations.

> have observed in a classroom, per se, but what I have heard from talking with people my own age, or in my own classes.

Listening to Susan talk about writing as "going through a series of steps" was intriguing when I noticed that she took two very different approaches to the writing of her own portfolio essays. As I was concluding our interview, I glanced down at Susan's two essays for the portfolio: her goals and philosophy statement and remembered looking at them in order to prepare for our meeting. The goals statement's opening sentence read like many other openings to this essay: "My career objective is to teach high school social studies," but the philosophy statement opened with a quote from Diogenes Laertius, an ancient Greek philosopher. I asked her about why the introductions seemed so different stylistically.

> Jackie: Well, I want to ask you about this, if you don't mind. As I was walking down the stairwell, I saw these two essays side by side, and I noticed two very different ways of opening . . .
>
> Susan: Um-hum.
>
> Jackie: …do you think they are different?
>
> Susan: Yeah, oh, completely different . . . I think that I came across this one, the goal statement has more. I just need to get my goals out there. It seemed a little more concrete, whereas your philosophies are more abstract. They are more how you think and how you feel. And so, I think I approached those two different assignments in different ways.
>
> Jackie: Which one did you prefer writing?

> Susan: The philosophy one was more fun for me. It was definitely more interesting, and I thought the career (unclear) is important but it is kind of like, "Well, where do you want to be?" "What do you want to do," kind of thing. And this is how you feel, how you think and I like that one.

Susan fails to recognize that she could have approached the goals statement with a similar approach to the philosophy statement by examining *why* these goals are important to her or *how* she feels about them. Although Susan claims to have approached each essay differently, one aspect shows her adherence to the symbolic, in this case the instructions for these essays. Both thesis statements from Susan's teaching philosophy and goals statement bear a strong resemblance to the suggested format and include language from the portfolio guidelines. For her goals statement, she writes (I have italicized the COE's language): "My professional goals are to show *leadership skills*, be understanding and knowledgeable about *diversity*, exude *ethical* behavior, and have a firm *academic* knowledge of my subject areas," and for her philosophy statement: "Being a great teacher involves possessing a mosaic of *skills*, characteristics and *knowledge*." For the goals statement, participants were supposed to refer to L.E.A.D.S. and for the philosophy, they were to refer to what knowledge, skills, and dispositions they felt are important to teaching. Both of these sentences lack any notion of what Susan characterized as "feelings" toward the profession. (However, it is interesting that Susan chooses not to use the word "dispositions" but instead use the term "characteristics." Perhaps that was a term with which she was more comfortable or a way for her to include her own knowledge.) She has in her terms "filled in the blanks" with the COE's language but not completely. In her way, Susan becomes a "subject-in-process/on trial . . . because it

assumes that we recognize, on the one hand, the unity of the subject who submits to a law—the law of communication, among others; yet who on the other hand, does not entirely submit, cannot entirely submit, does not want to submit entirely" (Kristeva quoted in Oliver, 1993, p. 184). This negotiation may explain why Susan chooses "characteristics" and does not use the COE's exact language in her essays.

Ah-ha moments of becoming a teacher

An interesting aspect about Susan was how she not only pictured herself as teachers she had in high school but how she pictured herself as a particular teacher—a male AP US History teacher. She begins by explaining how his strategy was one that she admired, and during our interview she described how she put herself in his place. She does this by telling a story; narration for Kristeva remember is a way to "tell ourselves to another"   (Kristeva in Oliver, 2002) also points out how the writing of memory positions the subject in relation to an other: "Writing is memory regained from signs to flesh and from flesh to signs through an intense identification (and a dramatic separation from) an other who is loved, desired, hated, and rendered indifferent" (p. 124). Susan identifies with this particular teacher several times during the semester. Here is an example from her philosophy statement which illustrates the importance she places on experiences in formulating her philosophy:

> I remember how well my AP US History teacher used his knowledge of history and current events to make connections that otherwise would have been lost to me. He made us explore what was going on in the world around us and how we could find parallels from past events. By doing this, he encouraged us to learn from the past in order to make good decisions for our future.

This memory is something she repeats during our interview, when I ask her about her interview for gaining entrance into the secondary education program:

> Susan: They [the two interviewers, both professors in the secondary education program] asked me, "When did you know you wanted to be a high school teacher?" And I told them that I had kind of two "Ah-ha" moments where I thought that I wanted to be a teacher. The first was in high school and I was in my AP US history class, and my teacher was just wonderful. He was fantastic. And he would sit in the front of the classroom and we would have a conversation. He would never really lecture. It was a conversation and we would all pitch in and talk about things and it wasn't just the names and the dates and the places, you know those kinds of things, which are boring. Everybody that says they don't like history, I think that's what they are thinking about, it's memorizing names and dates and places. That is not fun, and he would get up in the front and we would talk and he was going to explain the things that aren't in your textbook, about why things happen, and what were the consequences of things happening and not just your basic textbook knowledge, and I thought, "This is really neat." "I can do this, I can learn this stuff, I could really embody this," and I could get up here and do this. This sounds fantastic.

In choosing the word "embody" to describe this experience, Susan sets up an ambiguous situation. Does she mean she will "embody" this male teacher's style or the experience of his students? Without generalizing, it appears as if her teacher assumed a "maternal/semiotic" approach to teaching by focusing on creating an experience which occurred outside of the symbolic/text yet within the subject—AP history.

Susan also employs memory as a way to introduce the idea that her present self is not her former self; teaching was not Susan's first choice for a career, and she recounts why she made the decision not to pursue teaching after high school. She wishes she could return to the past and counsel her younger self:

> But, then I was 18 and I thought I had to do some things bigger and better and I just wish I could tell myself where there's bigger and better than those aspirations, you know, to try and help somebody learning. To see where they come from and where they fit in and mull over who we are and, you know, kind of a civic duty I think, to teach these kids these things. So, it wasn't until later that I actually thought about it and I was like, "what's gonna make me happy," and I remembered having this feeling and I came back to it. And I kind of wrote about that and my philosophy statement, not that that's my philosophy, but the part about using these moments that you are up there and you are speaking to really teach somebody something of importance, of value, not just names and dates that you can get by reading a textbook.

Susan is careful to differentiate an experience from a philosophy. It seems as if she is attempting to demonstrate what she describes about her approach to writing for this course. She thinks and then she "fills in the blanks." She seems to recognize the significant experiences of her putting herself in the role/ identity of this particular teacher on her philosophy. However, as explored in the next section, Susan might have a more complicated relationship with this teacher, whom she admires, but must also reject as she recognizes the role of male social studies teachers.

The negatives of teaching

As mentioned in the interlude which preceded this chapter, the final project for this course was to present a topic the students found interesting and wanted to share with their classmates. They were asked to bring in some form of visual aid to assist them in their explanations. Susan brought a poster. At the top were the words, “Will I get a job teaching social studies in Oklahoma?” Susan explained that based on what she had heard from a couple of male professors and fellow students were that most schools in Oklahoma only hired male coaches who also taught social studies. Susan, claiming that she was certain that there were more female social studies teachers in her home state, did a comparison of how many social studies teachers in her school were also male and coaches with those in the school she observed. Illustrating the results of her study in a bar graph, she revealed that there were actually more male coaches in her high school than the one she had done her observations. She did not however make the connection between a male teacher inspiring her and the disturbing realization that she would have a difficult time entering this masculine profession. Does she have to in order to identify with this teacher? She also chose to recount this story to two male professors, another factor which may or may not have influenced her decision on how to answer their question.

Whether from contemplating her experiences during the semester or because she listened to and researched current educational practices, Susan reflected several times on the realities associated with teaching, in particular, the negatives associated with teaching. When I asked her what she learned this semester, she responded:

> Susan: I think I definitely learned how much time and how much work go into behind the scenes that you don't really see. I went to a parent-teacher conference and did that and it was setting up schedules and so, it was like four hours each night and then again the next day. And it was just a lot of work, and then I also know that my teachers (unclear) cooperating teachers would talk about what they did the night before and their lessons and how they planned stuff. I guess to you, you are always going and you see these lessons and you figure, "Well, they've been through with that for a year. They've had these lessons for years and years and years." Well, it still takes (unclear), so it takes time away from the classroom to really make it work.

Throughout the course of the semester, Susan would comment on the "downsides" of teaching which usually resulted from experiences like the one above. These moments often resulted from her learning more about the teacher's role. Occasionally, she characterized those realizations as negative. She begins her essay on her cooperating teacher's discipline practices with the following sentence: "Though the joys of teaching outweigh the *negatives*, [my emphasis] teachers face challenging time in the classroom." Susan also uses the term "negative" to describe other aspects of education which seem to have resulted from a growing understanding of the profession. In her reflection on her cooperating teacher's assessment and evaluation practices, Susan points out when assessments become standardized and too important in determining the success of a student that too is the "negative" side to assessment and evaluation: "I think that this is one way that evaluations can turn into a *negative* [my emphasis]."

Finally, Susan comes to understand that change is not always for the better. During her interview with her cooperating teacher, Susan learns how change is not always positive. She asked her teacher if her philosophy of teaching has changed over the years and reflects on their conversation:

> According to Mrs. Keith, her style/philosophy definitely changes with the students as she explained earlier. . . She is also a strong believer that people learn from their experiences, and therefore overtime teachers' philosophies can change. And she acknowledges a possibility of change in her own philosophy. She also told me that sometimes these changes can be *negative* [my emphasis]. For example, teachers may become cynical or burnt out.

Susan considers not only the realities she will face as a teacher but also those of her students and other teachers. Even though she seems to focus on the negative [her word] realities more often than the positive ones, Susan's reflections enable her to include her own impressions of the profession based on her memories and experience with it. Placing her concept of the negative within Freud's work on rejection and Hegel's work on negativity, Kristeva (1974/1984) argues that the "negative" is actually "part of what remains outside of the symbolic order . . . These are instinctual, corporeal foundations stemming from the concrete history of the concrete (biological, familial, social) subject" (p. 162). In Susan's case, the emergence of the semiotic in her experience is painful—not getting a job, burning out—yet she engages in voicing these concerns. Because Susan faces the "negatives" of teaching and tries to articulate her feelings about them, she may be better able to negotiate the challenges of teaching. However, she stops short of addressing her concerns and the unjustness she must feel about them. This reluctance is

in line with Kristeva's explanation of the limitations of negativity. She (1977/1980) explains that language is partly responsible since

> negativity reaches the edges of positivity because it operates within language and the subject. By obeying strict, abstract rules also involving corporeal and historical materiality . . . The new signifying process welcomes negativity in order to remodel language into a universal, international, and transhistoric writing-language" (p. 108).

Susan, in obeying the "strict, abstract rules" of writing for this course, possibly censors herself (as illustrated in Chapter 4) from creating a piece of writing that disregards all of the assignment's instructions.

Peter: I used to think that I was ready to be a teacher. . . I realize that I am not

Peter, an English Education major, started out studying graphic arts. For various reasons, including his discovery that the graphic arts program was not what he thought it would be, he switched to teaching. Peter was one of only two males in my section (The other one had to drop the course by the middle of the semester because he had not met the grade point average requirement). Peter did not pass the portfolio submission the first time, but he passed after resubmitting his teaching philosophy and goals statement. I decided to ask Peter to interview with me partly because of the interesting stories he shared with us during class that semester and because I knew he had had trouble with the portfolio submission. I was curious how he felt about the portfolio process. Finally, I wanted a male point of view for variety, and Peter was the only one available. During our interview and in the analysis that followed, I found that he views his experience this semester as a series of "realizations," his memories as a student influence his teaching

philosophy, and he feels strongly about the different types of writing he was asked to compose this semester.

Realizations about the teaching world

Like Susan, Peter mentions the "real" world of classroom teaching, but he does not appear to be concerned with the hardships or the possibility of getting a job. Instead, he focuses on the realities of teaching and what this experience has shown him about the profession. In his goals statement, he writes:

> The student observations program has opened up more ideas and realizations about the teaching world than any other program I have gone through. . . [they have] opened up what it is like to be an actual teacher. . . When you start viewing the classroom through the eyes of a teacher, you see possibilities, potential problems and the variety of students. . .

For Peter, teaching can offer "possibilities" and "potential problems" and his comments demonstrate another type of complicated understanding of his chosen profession. He, like several of the other participants in this study, has tried to "see through the eyes" of his cooperating teacher. When he does so, however, he feels unprepared. This semester "realizations" speak to the core of his learning experiences. He confesses in his field experience log: "I used to think I was ready to be a teacher but the more I watch Miss Carr teach the more I realize that I am not."

Susan and Peter (and also Jennifer, whom I will discuss in the next section) do not solely observe the teacher but try to observe the class *as if they were* the cooperating teacher—an exercise in which they merge their imagined identities as teachers with a practicing teacher. The teacher, then, may represent the boundaries of what a teacher is

(the symbolic) and the imagined identities may represent the unknown (the semiotic). These combinations are not just restricted to the participants' identifying with teacher but with student as well. In addition, Peter also reflects on imaginary scenarios of what the profession will be like for him. He writes "I often like to imagine what characteristics make a good teacher from a great teacher, how I will handle certain situations, and how prepared will I really be, when it is *real* [my emphasis]." The role of the imagination plays an important part in Peter's identity construction and includes the contemplation of previous scenarios experienced by his cooperating teacher. Kristeva also considers the role imagination plays in identity formation. Imagination can be a process as well because "it is still in the imagination and symbolic realizations that their [subjects'] faltering identity will best find a way to construct itself as necessarily false—imaginary" (quoted in Oliver, 2002, p. 177). A crisis occurs, then, when the subject realizes that these images are false (p. 177) and he or she will need to adjust to his or her own teaching situation. Doing so, however, will remove the guilt associated with the "stable image" and "actualize the seeming, the imagination" (p. 177). In other words, imagination is integral in Peter's identity formation because it is another way for him to interact with the symbolic.

It is interesting that Peter's notion of learning is so closely linking to "realizing"--in a way similar to how Kristeva employs the term. The "realizations" he has made this semester have been important to him, and he seems to understand the implications of learning as "realization" might have for his students. When he discusses his own future students (once again engaged in the process of imagination), something he does in a number of writings, he maintains his idea of learning as realizing:

> As a future English teacher, I can apply this same philosophy [here Peter is referring to his plans to incorporate strategies from the art classes he has taken] in my teachings by introducing new creative materials that will allow my students to learn without realizing they are doing so.

Being open to the possibilities of art and the imagination also activates the interplay between the symbolic and the semiotic. These "transitional activities" (A.-M. Smith, 1998), activities which encourage creativity, are "hard work since the imaginary must be made constantly aware of the demands of the symbolic, and as the individual grows in subjectivity he is bound to play with the rules and at times revolt against them and transgress" (p. 50). But right now, Peter has no students on which to incorporate these practices. I asked him if this is philosophy Miss Carr, his cooperating teacher, uses in her classroom. In his answer, he repeats his desire for his students to "learn without realizing":

> Jackie: When you observed Ms. Carr, did you see a lot of what you would like to do?
>
> Peter: A little bit. She does a lot more of just discuss. Her methods mainly tell the kids what to do at the beginning of the day. A lot of them do it throughout the day.
>
> Jackie: Um-hum.
>
> Peter: And just sit back and – most of the times we [Peter and his cooperating teacher] will walk around and help them if they need help, which I did like that. But, other times she will sit at the desk. And I would prefer to be more hands on with my students because I know I will get bored and I do not want to get bored

> with my occupation either. So, I want to be more hands on with my students as well. And sometimes I can see the – not frustration, but sometimes the kids will be distracted or they kind of get tired of looking or doing. I want to make it seem like they do not even realize they are learning.

As Peter practices and imagines being a teacher in his cooperating teacher's classroom, his approach to teaching changes from what he wrote in his philosophy of teaching statement about wanting to use "creative lectures" with his future students. He now plans to design more "hands on" opportunities for his students based on his experiences with his cooperating teacher. Kristeva (1974/1984) contends that "practice encloses and brings to knowledge the *direct experience* [her emphasis] of reality" (p. 202). This direct experience can cause subjects to renew themselves, as it does in Peter's case. "The fundamental moment of practice" she continues, "is thus the heterogeneous contradiction that posits subject put in process/on trial by a natural or social outside that is not yet symbolized" (p. 202). According to Kristeva, "a subject in conflict . . . with those systems of representation" may "defer and delay the violence of rejection" (p. 203). Pre-service teachers like Peter are not in the position to reject the practices of their cooperating teachers; these are not their students. However, practicing in their cooperating teacher's classrooms may result in their rethinking or contradicting earlier statements they made about their identities.

Because it seemed as if Peter had been thinking about what constitutes a "good teacher," I decided to follow this question by asking him about his expectations for his methods class, another term for the course CIED 4713, Teaching and Learning in the

Secondary School. In this course, students study the issues in English/language arts courses, teaching techniques, and curriculum design.

> Jackie: So, what do you look forward to learning in your upcoming semester in methods?
>
> Peter: In what?
>
> Jackie: In methods, you know? Do you know what methods is?
>
> Peter: No, not really.
>
> Jackie: It is a class you take in fall where you learn teaching strategies, how to make a lesson, you know, all sorts of the nuts and bolts.
>
> Peter: Yeah, I guess just how to make, like fine tune what I learn?
>
> Jackie: Um-hum.
>
> Peter: Because right now it seems kind of raw and I would like to fine tune it where it is like real good. Like, down to almost an art. And I learned that, kind of, in educational technology…
>
> Jackie: Um-hum.
>
> Peter: …but I bet I learn it a lot better.
>
> Jackie: So, what do you mean by fine tuned?
>
> Peter: Well, just make it run real smoothly, maybe, and make some options if things do not go as planned, maybe some backup options or some questions I can always ask.

In this exchange, Peter refers to teaching as art, an interesting metaphor considering his background (and perhaps identity as artist). Furthermore, he feels he has already begun to learn how to "fine tune" what he knows in his educational technology course. Finally,

Peter uses the term "real" again only this time as an adverb (real good and real smoothly) instead of as an adjective or noun.

Humiliating Memories

Another theme keeps repeating itself throughout Peter's writings and interviews and this one is linked to memories of his experience as a student and his experience as a field experience student. Peter reveals that he has been embarrassed as a student: "I remember that when I did not read for a discussion I often felt embarrassed and left out" but he does not reveal if the teacher humiliated him or if it was self-induced.

One incident in particular, which he shared during a class discussion, in his dialogue journal and his field experience log, concerned his own embarrassing moment during his observations of a sophomore English class. In his recording of this incident in his field experience log, he complicates the notion of how he handled this situation as pre-service teacher, as practicing teacher, and as his cooperating teacher:

> There is only situation that stood out in my mind as noteworthy during this hour. That event was a boy, who I was told was a troublemaker, made the comment of "have you seen my balls", hearing the comment I looked over at him in which he pointed at me and said "OOOO you looked, and you like my balls don't you"? This comment gained lots of attention and laughter by several of his peers and disrupted the class. Mrs. Carr was not in the class at that time, she went to the office, so I told the boy to keep reading.
>
> Although I have never had another problem out of this student I still view him differently then the rest of the students in the class, I never really thought about the role this could have on a teacher before but it could have an impact. While I

> know the student was just playing around with his comment, he did embarrass me. I do think that I handled the situation right in not showing any emotional change. If I were a teacher I would probably handle the situation the same because I know that the student was just trying to get a reaction out of me, in not showing one I did not play in his game.

Peter refers to this incident again in his essay on his teacher's discipline practices: "A child wanting attention trying to get a reaction out of me on my first day, never had another problem out of him." In this statement, has he placed himself into the role of a teacher as opposed to field experience student by using the phrase "never had another problem out of him"? Peter continues to imagine himself as future teacher in this essay. Later he provides a hypothetical situation and how he would handle it:

> For example, if I were to catch a student cheating, I would remain professional and speak with the student one on one outside the classroom. I would never use humiliation in front of his or her peers, to punish a student for mistakes.

In his description of what type of teacher he would like to be, Peter notes that he would like to be "approachable." When I asked him to explain what he meant, he "I don't want kids to be able to walk up to me and be hesitant about asking me a question . . . not belittle them or make them feel like they have a stupid question." These three stories reveal that Peter has reflected on humiliating or uncomfortable situations as a student, as a pre-service teacher, and in his imagination. Reflecting and returning to this topic has a powerful influence on his identity formation. Peter, remembering, picturing, and sharing uncomfortable, even traumatic experiences is engaging in the memory work Wang (2004) explains is most often confined to the private domain and is kept from productively

shaping educators' practices (p. 169). Clearly, there are valuable possibilities for making room for memories in the pre-service teacher program, but do teacher educators also attempt to confine them to the private domain? Here I teeter on the cliff of psychoanalysis, but Kristeva, a psychoanalyst herself, notes the role of trauma within memories. Peter's philosophy is directly linked to his memories, his feelings, associated with being humiliated and observing humiliation in the classroom.

Being forced to write? Or think?

Peter revealed that initially he did not think that the writings for this course would be beneficial to his learning. For him, writing about what he was observing at the same time he was supposed to be observing was difficult. In the following exchange, Peter tries to express the benefits of writing for this course and the challenges it posed:

> Jackie: How did you feel about the writings that you were supposed to do for this class?
>
> Peter: I liked them. They helped me out a lot. I was really impressed with how they helped me out. I didn't think they would help me out that much but they really did.
>
> Jackie: And, what about the field log? Did you find that was something that you enjoyed writing or – you can be honest.
>
> Peter: I didn't enjoy writing in it. It was a pain … because I'm more of a visual learner and I don't really learn by writing down something as much . . . I am always looking for stuff I can do in my class to help. I am always thinking, "Yeah, that is really good." And it's hard for me to write down stuff and to

observe at the same time. I am always feeling like I'm going to be missing something . . .

In this exchange and the following, Peter explains the different components of his writing and the process with which he composes his essays. Again, he refers to realizing that he is not ready to be a teacher yet and the importance of remembering one's own experiences as a student:

> Jackie: Right. Well, let's move to your philosophy and goal statements and just take a moment to sort of refresh yourself…
>
> Peter: Okay.
>
> Jackie: …as to what you wrote. How much did that change from what you turned in?
>
> Peter: Quite a bit. I would definitely make it more detailed now. At the time, I did not have a real exact idea of what I was getting into…so I didn't know exactly what to put. Now I have pretty good ideas. I would make a lot more detail. It is really hard to predict your whole life – look into your future and all of a sudden did not like and think. "This is what I am going to be like. This is what I need to be like that's satisfactory." And you want to be good enough for the students that you teach, so you want to make sure that you're that way. And you want to set some good goals that you are going to be that way. And I guess you look back to your teachers and things and see what you liked about your teachers that were good.

Peter demonstrates how he is working to express his philosophy of "hands on" teaching with the format of these two writing assignments. He recognizes the challenge of setting

goals when one is uncertain of where or what he or she will be doing in the future. Yet, for Peter, the writing of the philosophy and goals statement would be easier now that he has spent a semester in the field.

Tammy: "I would not mind being any type of teacher"

The experience of pre-service teachers majoring in the foreign language program differs slightly from those in English, math, science, and social studies, because they are required to split their 45 hours of field experience time between elementary and secondary schools. Tammy, who hopes to teach Spanish, worked as a hair stylist and "facialist" before entering the university. She is of Mexican descent and has spent some time in an immersion program in Mexico to strengthen her language skills, an area of self-acknowledged weakness for her. In her teaching philosophy, under the section in which she was supposed to explain the community's role in education, she tells an interesting story about how she regarded education before deciding to go to school to become a teacher:

> In my previous occupation as a hair designer and facialist, I came across an older man that did not understand why he should vote in favor of raising taxes for the schools. His argument was that he should not vote for the bond when he does not have any children or grandchildren in the Stillwater school system. . . I was amazed at his unwillingness to hear my points of view. As I stood there I realized that no matter what I said to this man he would still not vote for the bond. . . This incident has been over 6 years ago and I still remember the man and the conversation that we had because I never realized, up to that point, that people might really feel that way.

What makes this memory stand out from the other participants' memories is that it did not occur in the classroom, with a teacher, a student or a parent, but as an interaction with another member of the community. For Tammy, this man signifies the symbolic-- the boundaries to what she thinks will improve education, and she uses this recollection as part of her present and future practice in education. In this section, I will discuss how learning for Tammy is an expansion of what she already knows, her admiration for her cooperating teacher and her students, and her views on the writing for the field experience course.

Expanding her knowledge of teaching

For Tammy, learning is not so much as a "realization" as it is for Peter but an expansion or adding onto of what she already knows. As indicated in the previous section, Tammy participated in her cooperating teacher's classroom and assisted her in many tasks. In her comments on her approach to writing her philosophy and goals statement, she reveals a confidence in her teaching philosophy but not as much ease in the writing of her goals statement.

> Jackie: How about writing of your philosophy and your goal statements? How did you approach that? Did you approach it differently?
>
> Tammy: Yes, definitely.
>
> Jackie: Why was that?
>
> Tammy: That was more – because it's just, I don't know, it's is just different. I just think the philosophy of teaching is something – I didn't have to search for the answers, I don't think, as much as like for the other papers – I don't know, like assessment and discipline and, what else was there? Classroom management.

Those you had to search for the information, but with classroom teaching, you just know. I felt like I knew what that was. It was easier to develop that.

Jackie: Have your answers changed about why you want to become a teacher?

Tammy: Uh, no, no. They have still been the same. They have expanded, I guess. They have changed in that way. They have expanded – more detailed more facts to back up what I have thought. You know, I have always felt a certain way about teaching, but now, I'm learning information to help support that idea that I have had about teaching.

Tammy refers several times during our interview and her writings to the "knowing" (she even uses the word intuition) which comprises part of what she considers teaching to be. Unlike many of my other participants, it is not the love of a discipline that attracts Tammy to teaching, but the act itself (his may be attributed to Tammy's becoming certified to teach k-12 rather than just a particular discipline, like Peter, Jennifer, Susan, and myself.)[15] In continuing to talk about her teaching philosophy she explains:

Tammy: I do not think, in my philosophy teaching, because you guys geared it towards your subject area and stuff, which is important to know why you are teaching that. But, for me, the teacher – it did not mean just the subject, it meant all different areas. So, I would not mind being any type of teacher – in general.

In discussing the various types of lesson plans she has created in her courses, Tammy reveals how she negotiated the writing of her philosophy statement—she admitted that being a teacher was more important to her than being a teacher of Spanish.

---

[15] It seems important to remark here of my own background. As a secondary education teacher, I chose to teach a particular discipline as opposed to elementary school teachers who teach a variety of disciplines. My own experience might explain why Tammy's comments stood out to me from my other participants' perceptions of teacher preparation.

In fact, during much of our conversation, she spoke about general issues associated with teaching as opposed to teaching Spanish. Even in her discussion of writing lesson plans for her subject, she resisted speaking about topics or content and instead spoke to the process. In regards to her own lesson plans, she appreciates how her foreign language methods professor encourages her to provide more "depth" through the use of details in her lesson plans. Her explanation resembles her ideas about expanding on what she knows:

> Jackie: Do you find that there is one set lesson plan format that you use, or how do you determine...?
>
> Tammy: Well, I have been using kind of a set one where you do like the basic parts of a lesson plan, including the standards and stuff like that. But, then Nadine, in her class, she has kind of a different set of lessons. The same type of concept but it is a little bit more in depth, I think, more detailed.
>
> Jackie: Um-hum.
>
> Tammy: And that is what she really pushes in the first place, is really detailed lesson plans. Those have helped me as far as that. And also, definitely going out and seeing school firsthand, and the kids and the everyday things that happen. I think that observing – sometimes people will go and just observe like one day or two days, but this – you are there for a long period of time you get to see – because the first few times you go, the kids kind of impress you. And they try to act good. And then, after a while they start getting used to you, so you get to really see the true classroom setting and stuff.
>
> Jackie: Describe one or two things that you have learned this semester...

Tammy: I have learned...

Jackie: ...other than what you just explained?

Tammy: I have learned that a full school day is tiring – waking up early, going through the whole day and then, by the time the end of the day is over, you get really exhausted. That is something I will have to work on.

Tammy also comments on this aspect of teaching in her goals statement, which may explain her admiration for her teacher's actions outside of the classroom. However, she ties being able to wake up early and the need to be alert throughout the day to the well-being of her students:

> A teacher is one of the first people that a child sees in the morning, and if I am still tired how am I to be a leader for these children. Practicing waking up early is a way for me to get in a routine that will be very beneficial to my career as a teacher.

Tammy continues to elaborate during our interview with why she feels being able to wake up early is an important aspect of teaching and how learning about that is an expansion of her knowledge of what it means to be a teacher.

Tammy: Waking up early, you know, teachers have a lot to do before class and after class. I know my high school teacher, she always talked about anytime any kids needed to make up stuff, she was always staying late and all the kids would always come in, "Can I come in after school and do this?" "Can I come in during lunch and do this?" So, it takes the whole day. It's not just you come and go. And I knew that but I did not know the extent of it...

Jackie: Um-hum.

Tammy: ...and actually seeing it in the real life. It kind of put it more into perspective for me.

She is able to tie in something as "trivial" as waking up early to being a successful teacher. Being able to wake up early means students will have a better prepared and enthusiastic teacher. As in with her philosophy and lesson plans, Tammy seeks to work on the physical aspect of teaching, something that was put in more "perspective" to her and added to her understanding of what a teacher is/does. This physical aspect of teaching ties into Kristeva's notion of the semiotic being related to bodily drives and emotion. According to Payne (1993), "Because the human body, too, is caught up in the dynamic of the text, the process and trial of the subject, as it breaches the boundaries of definition and law, are energized there" (p. 180). Tammy chooses to discuss the physical aspect of teaching in her goals statement and in doing so she "ruptures" the traditional expectations for this essay which asked students to describe the "knowledge, skills, and dispositions for successful teaching. Waking up early cannot easily be categorized as a skill or disposition but is important, for Tammy, for successful teaching and is a goal she sets for herself.

Finally, Tammy comments on the way she envisions a teacher runs her classroom and how this experience added to her knowledge in that area. Here too, she compares herself with a beginning teacher, a comparison which illustrates the fluidity of her identity from pre-service teacher to beginning teacher.

And especially, even the teacher, too. I think in the beginning, teachers kind of, you know, they try to make sure they do everything the way – that is the way I think. I do not know. It may not be that way. But as you get further along, you

> start to see what they really do in the classroom on a regular basis and how it acts and how it runs and stuff.

When Tammy says the "way" she is referring to the way she is being taught how to construct lesson plans and all of the details that her professors ask her to include. She admits that she is not sure if beginning teachers really try to write daily detailed lesson plans, but she is sure that they wind up writing lessons in their own way after a period of time. It almost seems that Tammy is more confident of what experienced teachers do, perhaps because she has been working with them rather than novice or beginning teachers. Spending time with novice teachers may be an important component missing from teacher education programs.

Admiration for teacher and students

Tammy is also impressed with other conditions under which her cooperating teacher at the elementary level must work. For example, she remarks on her teacher's status as a "traveling teacher," a teacher who travels from classroom to classroom and school to school to teach short lessons:

> My teacher is a traveling teacher so she is only able to see her kids once a week for 30 minutes. . . She has a class that is filled with all the motional disturbed and the lower academic children. She tells me that this is the hardest class for her, but I really think that she handles them well.

Tammy not only admires how well her elementary teacher handles not having her own classroom but also how perceptive her teacher at the high school is. According to Tammy, quite a bit of cheating occurs during her brief stay with this cooperating teacher, but her teacher is quick to catch students in the act. She records one instance in her field

experience log in which her teacher catches a student cheating: “I did not even see this kid cheating [sic] she [the cooperating teacher] has good eyes & intuition.” Now on the “lookout” for cheating, Tammy has her own interaction with a student who cheats during a quiz. In this incident, Tammy finds that she may be able to occupy the same status as her cooperating teacher:

> Another thing that happened was when they were taking their quiz the teacher had to step out of the room when she left I had one girl that was looking around trying to get answers from someone. It is very obvious I was shocked that she did not even care. I made eye contact with her and she realized that she better keep her eyes to her own paper.

This interaction illustrates not only the space pre-service teachers occupy in a cooperating teachers classroom as part student, part teacher, but also how Tammy has “expanded” her knowledge of what to look for while students are taking a quiz. She has become more comfortable with her shifting role in the classroom as opposed to her first day there. She provides this story about her first day at the high school:

> The first day that I was in the High School the teacher introduces me and how I go to OSU and the student proceeds to make fun of OSU and then the teacher tells him jokingly that she knows what he will make on his test-she is from OSU also. I really did not care. I thought it was funny what she said.

The insult of the university she attends does not bother Tammy. Although she does not explain why it does not bother her, she focuses more on the teacher’s reaction rather than the student’s remarks. However, Tammy seems to stay comfortably within a system represented by the teacher in which she sees herself as teacher who polices the room for

cheaters and embarrasses students for their “inappropriate comments.” Unlike Peter, who takes steps to remember actions his cooperating teacher takes and then relates them to his memories in the classroom in order to transform his philosophy, Tammy does not negotiate, resist, or question her cooperating teacher’s treatment of her students. In other aspects, however, Tammy is able to stretch beyond the confinement of the symbolic, as I show in the next section.

Expansions about the students

For Tammy, one of the greatest rewards from teaching her lesson on Talvera pottery was the students’ positive reactions. In her reflection on the lesson that she taught, she supports her belief that the students enjoyed her lesson by the unexpected behavior of one student:

> I feel that the children enjoyed the lesson also. I had one student ask if she could stay after school and finish hers. Then she proceeded to say with shock that she has never asked to stay after school. That comment made me feel really good.

Tammy also tells a story about a boy who captured her attention at the elementary school and how she misunderstood his behavior in her cooperating teacher’s classroom:

> Tammy: And he wanted to do good at something, he didn’t. He just did not have control over himself I don’t think. And so, he – sometimes he just decided to raise his hand and answer a question. And I thought the whole time he wasn’t even paying attention. But he was and he is so smart and I didn’t realize – I’ve never seen a child like that in, you know, it goes to show you always say you do not judge a child before and that really put that in perspective for me, you know,

to see that. That, you know, he was paying attention and that even though we did not think he was. And when you wanted him to participate, he would participate.

Because Tammy is able to interact with the unexpectedness of this memory and attach a signification to it for her future practice, she seems to be on the verge of expanding her knowledge of students' motivation-- that students will participate if strongly interested in an activity or topic. Through these two incidents, Tammy "represent[s] and giv[es] meaning to the primarily unsayable" (A.-M. Smith, 1998, p. 45). In both instances, the female teacher and Tammy awaken these students through maternal gestures: encouragement, caring, and the arts.

Teacherly Writing

Tammy has already begun to recognize how time and practice help her in her own journey to become a teacher. When she discusses her lesson plans, she mentions how much easier it becomes to write them over time and the influence art has on her own progress. Once again, she refers to an unexpected experience with the symbolic, in this case the writing of lesson plans:

Jackie: What have you done this semester, like in your classes (unclear)?

Tammy: We had (unclear) … That and lots of lesson writing – lesson plan writing.

Jackie: Um-hum.

Tammy: I am also taking the Intro to Art class.

Jackie: Are you?

Tammy: Yes, as an elective.

Jackie: Um-hum.

Tammy: And she makes you do lots of lesson plans. And, as much as I hated them, it really did help me making up, you know, when we had to do lesson plans for this, it was a breeze.

Jackie: Do you think there is a difference between writing – observing and then writing for reflection?

Tammy: Yes, I do. Because when you observe something you can just write down what you observed, like the facts. And reflecting is more of a personal development, I guess. You think about it more as to how it relates to yourself. But observing, you just write down what happened. No (unclear) ... Is that possible?

Jackie: How did you approach the writing for this class?

Tammy: I reflect – I would read the topic and I like to start at the papers, read the prompt. From there, reflect on what I had seen. If it was an assignment – a lot of them towards the end you had to have read the prompt first and then go and ask your teacher some questions and stuff. So that was what I would do. And then from there, write my paper off of what I had researched from the teacher or what I had observed in the classroom with the teacher.

In her description of her approach to the writings of this course, Tammy illustrates how she began with reading the topic, then reflecting and then asking questions of her teachers. This combination of components that create her writings parallels the construction of her identity. Just as her experiences in the classroom expand her knowledge of teacher, so too does her approach to the writings for this course. She must shift between what she knows, what she sees, and what her cooperating teachers tell her,

and all of these voices merge into the voice she uses in her writings. Kristeva (Oliver, 2002) regards a writer as a "subject in process, a carnival, a polyphony without possible reconciliation, a permanent revolt" (p. 446) because it is impossible to separate "the intrinsic link between culture and revolt" (p. 446). In Jennifer's section, I will explore how the multiple perspectives of those involved with education surface in her writings, especially in regards to the different identities she attributes to herself as mother, teacher, and learner.

Jennifer: How do you teach someone to deal with that?

I think that it is important to begin this last section with a confession: I like Jennifer. She was in my introduction to education course the previous semester, an English major seeking teacher certification (as I did) and a mother of a young child (as I am). She was not afraid to ask very difficult questions of me and to challenge comments made by her colleagues. I knew very early on that I wanted to interview her, and I was glad when she volunteered. Two characteristics stand out about Jennifer. One she is very perceptive about what is going on in the classroom and refers to the intuition of the students and the teacher. Secondly, Jennifer tries to view situations from multiple perspectives. The way Jennifer talks about her image of herself as future teacher stretches beyond the day-to-day considerations and into her non-school identity.

I want to have more babies

One area Jennifer considered about her future profession was the need to balance her family plans with a career—both of which are important to her (and to me as well). Coincidentally, she was paired with a couple of cooperating teachers who were pregnant and she was able to consult with them about being pregnant while teaching. This topic

was another one that was neglected during our class discussions and one Jennifer brought up spontaneously during our interview while she was recalling the different teachers she was able to observe:

> Jennifer: Yes. They could read anything they wanted, and she liked because she read for pleasure during that time, too, which you might not have time to do otherwise. But that class, I never observed. I would also go observe some other teacher during that time.
>
> Jackie: Um-hum.
>
> Jennifer: But she was also . . . this is very interesting for me, the second teacher that I observed was pregnant and . . . those [meetings] were interesting because I want to have more babies and I will be a teacher when I do it, and I just talked to her a little bit. I did not want to get too personal with her and she was fine with me asking questions. I asked her a little bit about the time off that she would get and she has had – I think her last child she had while she was teaching also. Maybe all of her children, I don't know.
>
> Jackie: I think she has.
>
> Jennifer: I guess she has been teaching for eight years and none of her kids are eight years old. And that was interesting to see how she handled it. But she was not sick. When I was early pregnant like she is, I was sick all the time. So, I have wondered about how you run to the bathroom to throw up without leaving your class all by themselves. I don't know. I will have to figure it out, I guess, when it comes.

Although not all of her questions had been answered, Jennifer still considered this experience to be valuable because of the many teachers with whom she was able to spend time.

> Jennifer: Anyway, it [her semester] was good. It was good on a personal level, I mean, personally because I had teachers that would talk to me and were flexible with me and wanted me to have lots of different experiences. I was invited to teacher meetings and parent-teacher meetings and they encouraged me to go watch other teachers and they showed me their grade books and the way they did things, and let me ask lots of questions.

Jennifer was one of the few students who actually participated in the assignments that the students did and recorded them in her field experience log. For example, she wrote three *cinquains*, two of which were about mothers. I've included the first one as an example

Momma

giving, strong

shopping, laughing, loving

I love you so friend

because love and caring seem to be part of Jennifer's philosophy of teaching. In her conversation with a sixth grade teacher, Jennifer listens to her talk about showing affection to her students:

> Ms. Star says that she loves to give hugs and receive hugs and is disappointed that this is such touchy subject now. She doesn't force hugs on any student but students know they can hug her and get hugs of encouragement from her.

The body, especially the maternal body, is an essential part of the semiotic and is capable of subverting the semiotic, for the symbolic cannot subvert itself, according to Kristeva. However, for this teacher and Jennifer introducing the maternal/semiotic into the classroom becomes risky and they seek ways to continue to pursue the maternal within the limitations of the symbolic. For Jennifer, creating a caring environment in which students learn is as important as a caring teacher.

Environment

Another characteristic that makes Jennifer stand out from some of the other participants was the way she commented on classroom environment. She remarks how her cooperating teachers alleviate the pressure of high-stakes testing by manipulating the environment in which the students are to be tested:

> I thought I'd first write in general about how the exam was administered and monitored. . . It was good to see what goes into preparing to give a standardized test. It seemed to me that Mrs. Moore and Mr. Jumpster tried to create the best test taking environment for the students. . . As a student taking standardized tests I never thought about the preparations, etc.

Environment also plays into Jennifer's comfort in her own high-stakes undertaking—the teaching of her lesson. Part of Jennifer's identity as teacher seems to be entwined with the actual facility, the classroom, and ownership over it. She keenly feels her status as "not these students' real teacher" in this moment which is tied to the environment in which she must teach.

> Creating and teaching a lesson is a difficult enough task under a normal classroom setting but to do it in another teacher's classroom for students that you only know from weekly visits to their room was perhaps even more difficult.

When the classroom environment also differs from how she prefers it, Jennifer also feels out of place and positions herself as a peer to her cooperating teacher.

> The whole event seemed chaotic and out of control to me. I think that Mrs. Miller has a higher tolerance for what seems like chaos to me. It made me irritated when the boy said, "I can't hear you" because I knew he was first being defiant but in a playful way. . . . but my tolerance level for the extra noise & activity is lower than hers.

Jennifer is constructing her identity as teacher by imagining her future classroom. She does not criticize her cooperating teacher in this observation instead she is positioning herself as teacher. Part of her teacher and yet not teacher, and she can express her feelings through comments like this one.

Envisioning her future classroom environment is another part of Jennifer's identity construction as a future teacher. In at least two different assignments, my students are asked to comment on what their cooperating teachers' classrooms look like and what their future classrooms might look like. Jennifer's first question during her interview with her cooperating teacher concerned her classroom:

> The first question that I asked was, "Why your room is arranged and decorated the way that it is?" She explained that surrounding herself with encouraging and brightly colored things makes her feel better and it can inspire students. "Students

> can walk into my room and get a feel for the kind of person I am and the things that I love."

Classroom environment also ties into Jennifer's goals for herself. Like Tammy, for whom being awake and energetic lends itself to a successful classroom environment, Jennifer too places value in the unspoken, unwritten aspects of teaching. For them building a supportive, comfortable, learning environment is important. Jennifer remarks on the parallel between preparing her "internal traits" with the external ones which will comprise her as a future teacher. She writes in her goals statement:

> As I pursue my goals, I believe that it is important to maintain Oklahoma State University's core values outline in L.E.A.D.S. . . I would like the walls of my classroom to be covered with student work as well as with thought provoking displays about current events. The type of environment that I develop as an educator is just as important as the internal traits that I would like to develop in my career.

This excerpt illustrates how smoothly Jennifer is able to align her personal feelings with the parameters in place. When it comes to Jennifer's writing, in particular, my instructions, she was more uncertain as to how to pursue.

Writing

In the following conversation about writing for this course, Jennifer reminds me why the interludes I've included between these chapters on myself as teacher are so important. I was not aware that in my explaining about how they were to write in their field logs, I made it seem as if they were to record and analyze "negative" episodes during their observations.

Jackie: Think about what you've written and your field experience log and talk about something that you saw.

Jennifer: I guess when I set out – when you first gave us instructions on the field log, I was thinking that every time there was going to be some big issue in class to write about and sometimes there wasn't and I kind of had to search for something to focus on as far as an issue and I think I approached it as finding – I was looking for a negative issue that happened and then I realized that that wasn't necessary and so some of the things I wrote about weren't negative.

Jackie: So did you want to (unclear)… I do not expect you to have it memorized.

Jennifer: I know, but I was just thinking about; I'm always interested, not because I really want to read what they, I would just be interested to see someone else's field log because I sometimes feel like, "Gosh, this is so much writing just to list the activities of the day," but then I started thinking about me and the way that I write about things and that I always have more to say or write, and that's probably necessary.

At the end of this exchange, Jennifer is wondering if the other students in this course have as lengthy entries as she does. But as she points out, it is not necessarily because she is interested in their observations but because she wants to see if they are as long as hers. Once again, where does this place me as the teacher in this system? In the following section, Jennifer considers teaching from multiple perspectives.

Multiple perspectives

When Jennifer talks about teaching, she talks about it from a number of different perspectives. For example, when she discusses her field experiences and how her

perception of what it means to be a teacher has changed, she includes parents and their roles in education:

> Jackie: Has it [spending time out in the field] changed your perception of what it means to be a teacher?
>
> Jennifer: I don't think so. I think I was still modeled that the important thing is your students, but I think it just gave me a more realistic perspective on what that entails and how many obstacles there are to just actually teaching kids what you think, when you first set out, and that's what school's all about and being a teacher's all about. But, there are so many more things to juggle and so many things to hurdle and something I was surprised by because my parents have always been so important and so involved and not involved when I didn't really need them to be involved. My parents were never overly, like, pushing themselves into my school life, but if I wanted them to be at something or if they were concerned with how I was doing they were there. But something that surprised me that I saw was apathy on the part of parents that just really, I just never thought about. I guess I knew that I had to be there because I saw kids that I went to school with that there's no other explanation for them and their behavior than just parental apathy, but I just was surprised.
>
> Jackie: So when you say realistic, what do you mean?
>
> Jennifer: I guess just that it's not perfect, there's something. You are never going to have the perfect day where your lesson goes exactly like you want it to and the kids learn exactly what you want them to learn and everybody gets good grades on their tests and you have a perfectly supportive principal or vice principal that

thinks on the same level and thinks the same way that you do, those things. I guess just that it's not – there is way more going on at school than just teaching kids.

For Jennifer, teaching seems to be about relationships. A teacher does not work alone or again or with others necessarily, but others influence the teacher and her performance. When I asked Jennifer about the course's final presentations, specifically, about the student who felt she had not been prepared for teaching in schools with diverse populations, Jennifer once again considers the student's point of view in relation to her own.

> Jennifer: Well, because I didn't have the experience that she did where she was actually kind of frustrated by her lack of skills in that situation. She found herself in a situation where there was a lot of tension because of racial diversity and she didn't know how to handle it. It was hard for me to completely empathize with her statements but, I understand what she was saying that were not taught, but at the same time there's so much danger just like we saw with the girl that gave the presentation about tips on how to talk to parents of poverty and parents of affluence and that caused such a controversy in the classroom.
>
> Jackie: Um-hum
>
> Jennifer: I think that trying to teach how to deal with racial or cultural diversity in the classroom would bring up those same things, because how do you avoid being generalizing or stereotyping by saying, "This is how you teach whenever you have gangs in your class," or "this is how you teach when you have a classroom full of, you know, Mexican-American students." Because people, so many people

would be like, "how can you tell me how to teach those kids because they are all different?" "You don't tell me how to teach white kids so, why are you telling me how to teach these kind of kids?" So, I think that maybe there could be a little more discussion about it but I do not think it would be like, "these are your skills for dealing with a richly diverse classroom." I think it just – it has to come from just having an experience in that situation because I do not think – how do you teach somebody how to deal with that? I think you just apply the same kind of classroom management skills that you would do any kind of student. But with the mindset that those are issues, that that does create issues in your classroom so…

Jackie: Um-hum.

Jennifer: …I do not know what the answer would be but I guess something. I think I see attempts being made to talk to us about being open-minded and how to start learning about other cultures and understanding that that really changes sometimes the way a student learns or a student approaches learning because of the culture that they are from. But I think it is a lot of personal responsibility. Instead of saying, "You need to teach me how to deal with these students," sometimes we just need to take the personal responsibility to figure it out on our own to educate ourselves.

I again refer to a classroom discussion of which Jennifer was a part last semester in the introduction to education course. I wanted to see what she felt about her colleagues' response to the film I showed.

Jennifer: I was surprised how many people are really so – I don't know if honest is the right word, but it is so easy for them and they are not ashamed at all to just

say, "I don't want to teach it (unclear) …way too hard." But at the same time, I appreciate that those people feel like they know their limits and they're not going to try to go there when they don't feel like they can handle it.

I admire how Jennifer continues to examine situations from a number of perspectives while referring to her own responses. She shares a story with me about a friend of hers who may have not known his limits when it came to teaching. However, she does not place all of the blame on him or his chosen education program. His situation is not that simple:

> Jennifer: But, I have a friend who became an English teacher and he got a job out in North Carolina. And he was raised in Shawnee, Oklahoma and not a very culturally diverse place and he is very idealistic about teaching kids English. And he went to an inner city school, which was something he had never experienced before. . . And it chewed him up.
>
> . . .
>
> Jennifer: He has not taught since then. And it was awful for him. And part of it is him. Part of it is issues that he dealt with on his own that just personally had nothing to do with school. I do not think he was emotionally prepared to deal with that and he was far away from home and he did not know anybody and he just moved out to North Carolina, and he got thrown into this classroom and it was very, very difficult. But I'm not sure what would have prepared him. I think that he probably could have done a lot more to help himself, but – anyway, it was hard. So, I can see why people would say, "I don't want to do that," but I think I

> would be embarrassed to say that and I would just find a way for that not to be what I thought. So I did not have to say it out loud. I don't know . . .

Jennifer's story is a good example of how one's identity can be complicated by multiple perspectives. She is able to relate his story back to the class' conversation and her own reactions to the film.

Summary

The data, interviews, writing assignments and field experience logs from CIED 3712, Field Experiences in the Secondary Classroom, in this chapter comes from four participants. The themes in regards to their identity construction deal with memories, the imagination, bodily drives, and relationships with important others. Kristeva's psychoanalytical interests and their embeddings in her theory further complicate the role of gender and identification in each of my participants. With Susan, writing memories is a way for her to negotiate her admiration with and negative feelings with a white male. The fact that she has not made the connection herself further complicates her subjectivity. With Peter, the power of memory and its productive power (not always positively or negatively) emerge as he remembers being as a student, observing students, and imagining his future students. Imagination also plays an important force in his teacher identity making process, because it enabled him to interact with the symbolic and consider ways of incorporating his knowledge of the arts to subvert it. Memories and responding to the physical aspects of teaching were strong themes in Tammy's comments; however, there were times when the semiotic was not engaged and the symbolic perpetuated itself in her thoughts, for example, when she assumed the "teacher role" of policing for cheaters. The embodied aspects of teaching—the physical, the

environment, and maternal drives—influence Jennifer's interaction with her cooperating teachers as she examines their rooms and questions them about participants beyond traditional pedagogical ones. The role of multiple perspectives as teacher, mother, and student also plays a strong part in Jennifer's identity construction. In the final chapter, I will summarize this study, suggest some contributions to theory, research, and the practice of pre-service teacher education, and propose directions for future research.

CHAPTER SIX

CONCLUSION

Introduction

In the introduction, I compared these pre-service teachers who are venturing out in the field for the first time during the field experiences course with the subject in Paul Klee's painting *The Head of a Man, Going Senile*. I still regard the many splits in this portrait as representative of my participants' complex and ongoing identity construction. And these splits reveal themselves as some of my students negotiate the symbolic in the teacher-making process when they are unable to identify any *unity* or *one way* within the system. In one of her log entries, Melissa, a secondary science education major, recounts an event that captures the peculiar position of a field experience student observing in another teacher's classroom:

> When I was walking to my seat at the beginning of class a girl asked if I was going to teach them today. I just said, "no, not today." The teacher then said, "okay we're going to review today" a student then replied "we want her to teach us" while looking at me. Then the class joined in agreement. There was a comment "we'll be good." Their teacher said, "sorry but I just don't trust you all". She then told them that I was going to teach 7th hour and they started asking why. The teacher then redirected them to reviewing. . .

This excerpt summarizes the complicated position in which many of these pre-service teachers found themselves during the spring 2006 early field experience course. Melissa speaks of herself as a part of this classroom (she uses the term "*my* seat" rather than "*a* seat") yet seems uneasy to participate fully in the conversation (She limits her response to "no, not today" without further explanation). Melissa responds to the student's question, but keeps herself from revealing to the students why she isn't teaching them. The use of "not today" further implies that she may in the future; perhaps it depends on the teacher's decision. Like Jennifer, who is unsure of what to call herself, pre-service teachers in an early field experience course find themselves being asked to take part in their cooperating teachers' classrooms but in multiple and overlapping roles, sometimes as a teacher, sometimes as a student, and sometimes, as in Melissa's case, as a combination of these.

In order to address the question "How are pre-service teachers who are enrolled in an early field experience course constructing themselves and are being institutionally constructed as teacher subjects?" I examined the course writings of 18 students enrolled in CIED 3712 Field Experiences in the Secondary Schools, spring 2006 and interviewed four of them about their experiences in their cooperating teachers' classrooms. My analysis included close readings of their essays and interview transcripts paying particular attention to moments of contradiction, repetition, and reappropriation of educational terms. These categories emerge from the connections between Julia Kristeva's theories and my multiple readings of my participants' works, first as instructor and then as a researcher. These terms, which are also inherent in Kristeva's work, serve as a way to categorize those instances in their writings which seemed to disrupt otherwise

usual smooth, coherent prose. Furthermore, my in-depth analysis of four participants further complicates the picture of pre-service teachers' identity making.

How can Julia Kristeva's notion of the subject-in-process/ on trial inform a new way of reading the early field experience student? First, her theory along with other post-structuralists' theories suggest that participants' identities are never fixed. This notion challenges the terms often used to describe teachers' identities or philosophies which educational researchers seek to undo or "unwash" or "unlearn." Perhaps "strong" or "fixed" or "developed" identities do not determine whether or not teachers become "agents of change." Identifying those moments when their semiotic flow clashes with the symbolic boundary, however fleeting or transitory as they might be, is a good way to understand pre-service teacher's potential for creating new subjectivity and subsequently transforming the educational system. Furthermore, examining students as subjects-in-process/on trial changes the concept of positive versus negative. Negative has just as much productive power as positive in educational practice. Participating as subject-in-process/on trial enables pre-service teachers to change and revise and question what they do without judgments being passed on them yet playing with the boundaries which govern the system.

Examining participants' writing for disruptive, repetitive, and contradictory moments highlights the tension between the semiotic and the symbolic in their identity construction. During these moments, participants negotiate ways in which to employ the terminology and concepts of the teacher-making process with their own perceptions, memories, and experiences with education. As I tried to demonstrate by focusing on four of my student in particular, participants who face the intersection of the semiotic and the

symbolic discover, consciously or unconsciously, a moment when their identities become more complicated than they might have previously thought. Those involved in teacher education should try to understand how pre-service teachers regard these moments in their writing and whether or not they sense this unraveling of their identities in the reflective writings they produce for their courses.

Although this negotiation might not have a place in many of today's teacher education programs, teacher educators, I would argue, have a duty to encourage pre-service teachers in this conversation. My study suggests that returning to students' writings with them is a good place to start. When students consistently "misuse" a term, repeat a story, or contradict themselves, there may be a reason behind that other than carelessness or immaturity. Teacher educators who undergo a rereading of their students' writings and discussions who look for these moments, as I did, might find the importance of these examples in the forming/formation of their students' identities. That charge would mean that teacher educators must become subjects-in-process/on trial in regards to their own practices.

Teacher educators as subjects-in-process

Kristevian ethics "involves the rupture in the symbolic order brought by the semiotic in poetic language" not a "set of parameters which govern individual behavior" (Letche & Margaroni, 2004, p. 107). Understanding ethical practice as a means for the semiotic to "rupture" the symbolic enables subversion of "convention and conformity" (p. 108). Teacher educators must not only be mindful of their judgments of pre-service teachers as naïve and inexperienced but also cognizant of their initial interpretations of the writings of their students. As in the case of Peter, his recounting of an embarrassing

moment during his experience relates back to his own embarrassment as a student and has a profound effect on his personal philosophy of teaching. Teacher educators and colleges of education, for that matter, must be able to make room for the semiotic amidst all of the standards set in place by accreditation institutions and other governing bodies. However, even if we do not, *some* of our pre-service teachers will still engage in the work which can "rupture" and subvert the symbolic of the teacher-making process.

The presentation of a subject-in-process/on trial is also implicated in my own research and writing for this dissertation where I interrupted the symbolic structure with my own semiotic flow. Intending to follow the standard format of a dissertation, I found that as I prepared the data analysis that I had information that I wanted to express about my study that was not part of my initial research questions. However, I wanted to provide a more complicated depiction of this study which added me as a participant and author. Including interludes between the analysis chapters was my way of attempting to transform the traditional template for a dissertation and find a way for my own role as participant in this study to emerge.

Educators, I would argue, need to negotiate with their own semiotic potential in order to encourage their students to become subjects in process and this tension remains as a further line of research I would like to pursue. I also tried to examine this tension in my study. This tension is not just limited to what teachers do, but how they represent the symbolic to their students. As depicted in the first interlude and in chapters four and five, many of my students' thesis statements clearly resemble the suggestions I made during class. Because Kristeva's subject-in-process/on trial and revolution in poetic language theories transcend the written word, it is possible to explore the other ways in which the

semiotic and symbolic cross over into one another which might lead to new ways of reading teacher education. In this manner, teacher educators can also become subjects-in-process/on trial when they engage in Kristevian revolt: “I [use] the word ‘revolt’ in the etymological sense of the drive and vice versa, in order to reveal memory and to restart the subject” (Kristeva, 1997/2002, p. 137; J. M. Lechte, M., 2004). For Kristeva, the subject “restarts” in order to “question value systems,” “make judgments” and “question[s] things from the place of another subject. “ (p. 137). In a sense, I “restarted” when I realized that for my students, I represented the symbolic as an authority figure in the classroom. Even if I engaged in a conversation about the boundaries of the teacher-making process, my students still engaged with my words and my actions as symbolic by adopting my interpretation of the teaching philosophy and goals statements into their essays. (After all, they knew I would be grading their essays as well.) When students subverted the framework they were given, I began to question why it was so important for me to present these guidelines in the way I had been doing. If I were to teach this course again, I would not try to separate myself from the process, which is impossible, but shift the focus from the guidelines and my expectations, to my students’ ideas of approaching these parameters.

It therefore may be important for teacher educators, as well as pre-service teachers to understand how our identities are influenced by all of the parties involved in the teacher-making process and that “eternally contradicting,” forever reconciling, and “testing the very possibility of unitary meaning” (Kristeva, 1997/2002, p. 10) is a way of rereading comments such as Kagan’s (1992) on beginning teachers’ identities determining success in the classroom:

> The necessary and proper focus of a novice's attention and reflection may be inward; on the novice's own behaviors, beliefs, and image of self as teacher. Novices who do not possess strong images of self as teacher when they first enter the classroom may be doomed to flounder. . . preservice programs might include structured activities that forces novices to acknowledge where their personal images may be inappropriate modify, and reconstruct the images. The image of self as teacher must also be adapted for the realities of teaching (p. 163).

I do not believe that these two directions are contradictory. The subject-in-process/on trial is central to Kristeva's culture of revolt, and the notion of "restarting" is a productive one to consider in pre-service teacher education. When new teachers move to the status quo, perhaps engaging in tasks that "restart" them will recharge their teaching. In accordance with Geijsel and Meijer's (2005) definition of identity as "the ever-changing configuration of interpretations that individuals attach to themselves, as related to the activities that they participate in" (p. 423), attempts to prevent teachers from changing their teaching philosophies are probably futile. Instead, these changes are inevitable and if teachers can recognize their changes in philosophy and engage in memory work then revolt becomes possible and productive.

Others, like Stone (2004) have argued that current educational practices in the United States measure and publicize just one facet of our students—their test scores. While teacher education programs appear to be critical of this practice, how are we "measuring" our pre-service teachers? What are our "expectations" as demonstrated by our assignments, portfolios, and rubrics? From the initial field logs students write to the instruments we use to evaluate their student teaching, how much leverage does their

attention to their awareness of how their identities are formed play in their assessment? How should we treat a pre-service teacher who reappropriates a term or contradicts himself or herself during an interview? Furthermore, I think that noticing how memories about a feeling or emotion associated with the classroom hold tremendous possibilities for teacher education. Teacher educators and pre-service teachers often reminisce about their favorite teachers, and some of those reminisces include very powerful experiences with the semiotic. Exploring how those experiences affect teaching philosophies, rather than just analyzing the successful strategies these teachers used, would lead to a deeper understanding of the dispositions pre-service teachers believe are important or unimportant.

Limitations and directions for further research

As stated in the introduction, this study included a small number of participants, who were the researcher's students. While it is impossible to be objective in any study, instead of trying to distance myself from my participants, I have tried to be open about my research methods, my relationship to my participants, and my dual role as their teacher and researcher. In addition to my participants also being my students, all but one of them were female, mainly Caucasian, middle class (as am I), and came from the state's public school system. While we do reflect the majority of teachers, we do represent a narrow segment of the population. In this way, these conclusions may not be generalizable to the population at large and finding a more diverse set of participants would be a valuable way to start further research of pre-service teacher and identity construction.

Another limitation concerns my dual role as researcher and teacher. One way of analyzing the two interludes reveals a reluctance on my part to share the progress of my research with my participants. While I claimed it was because it would consume class time, it might have also been the result of uneasiness on my part to criticize or judge my students, some of whom, like Jennifer, I regarded as friends. I could have included as part of this study the comments that I made to each of my students when they used a term "incorrectly" or made a statement that I felt they needed to clarify or rethink. Certainly, my experience as a teacher influenced how I view Tammy's goals on needing to learn how to wake up earlier. My first impression was to consider them unimportant in regards to the other goals Tammy could have set for herself. With Kristeva and by reexamining Tammy's experiences, I have come to see the importance she places on the physical aspects of teaching. I was uneasy at first when deciding how to respond to Tammy's comments because she tied them into her experiences and *personal* goal setting; however, now I see the relevance of the semiotic and how I have overlooked its use by my students.

Incorporating Kristeva into educational research charges scholars to rethink the idea of measurement of student progress, especially from an ethical viewpoint. Negative does not always mean "bad" and what might seem to be a naïve observation about a classroom episode might not be. Examining not just the writings of one student or one writing assignment can lead to a richer understanding of a participant. Along those lines, conversations about their emotional responses to teaching and how those influence their personal philosophies could serve as another way of discussing identity construction with pre-service teachers. These emotions tie directly into their future classroom practice as do

the imaginations they create of their future students. Kristeva's theory and these research methods lead to a questioning of assessment and evaluation, which affect not only k-12 teachers but those at higher institutions as well. I'd like to return to the notion of how the semiotic can "restart" the process of subjectivity formation and the ways this is not only happening but can happen in teacher education. Furthermore, I think that as a data source, field logs are often overlooked by researchers or used as a record to gauge depth of reflection on how pre-service teachers record their experiences. How are these logs used in the classroom? What role do they play in teacher education programs? Because of their widespread use, I think that it is important to challenge what the teacher-making process expects from them. "Restarting" the subject through the use of field logs, rethinking how pre-service teachers' identities are evaluated, and how teacher educators can be subjects-in-process/on trial are just three directions I could begin after this study.

Epilogue

After writing a draft of Chapter 5, I sent each of the four participants a copy of their section and the message that they could "add, omit, revise, or complain" any part of it and that "I would honor [their] requests." Jennifer, Tammy, and Susan all briefly responded. I would like to end this dissertation with their words, since the responses further demonstrates how they are still in process.

Jennifer, who still plans to student teach in the spring 2007 semester, thanked me for including her in my study and indicated an interest in reading the "finished product." She ends her email: "Are you still going to be on campus this fall? I'll stop by and say hi if you will be around."

Tammy, who also plans to student teach in the spring 2007 semester, begins her email, “Wow that was really interesting,” but does not elaborate on what exactly she found interesting. She “did get married” during the summer and has a new last name. She ends by telling me to let her know if I “need anything else.”

Susan will not be student teaching in the spring 2007 semester. She responds:

> Hi, Jackie,
>
> Thanks for passing that along. I hope the interview was helpful. All sounds great! Though I can't believe how incoherent I sound when I talk! =) Wow! . . . Unfortunately, I will not be heading back to school for awhile. My husband and I kind of got a wonderful surprise. We are expecting our first child a little sooner than planned! Now I know why my mom always told me it only takes one time! She was right! =)I'm due in February which is right when I should be student teaching, so things are postponed for now.

I included most of Susan’s email for several reasons. First, here I think her use of emoticons, using symbols instead of words to express or highlight emotions, is indicative of the semiotic once again emerging in her writing. These symbols are yet another way of the semiotic or the inexpressible negotiates with the symbolic. Susan, and many others who use emoticons, have reappropriated the meanings of these symbols to express emotions that are not reproducible in words. But that digression is best left to another time. . . Susan also repeats that she is merely delaying her education twice in her message “awhile” and “postponed.” Is this repetition her way of reassuring herself that she will continue her journey to becoming a teacher?

I have not heard from Peter yet. I hope that he would approve of my representation of his experiences and our conversation.

I’m not sure what I hoped for from my participants and former students—anger, indignation, additional comments—but this is my study and my interests. What I did receive, to me, is more valuable. I look forward to hearing more about my participants’ lives not only as future teachers but as people with identities that extend beyond and yet within the profession.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, N., Shea, C., Liston, D., & Deever, B. (1996). *Learning to teach: A critical approach to field experiences*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Alsup, J. (2006). *Teacher identity discourses: Negotiating personal and professional spaces*. Mahwah, NJ: NCTE-LEA.

Anderson, N. A., Barksdale, M. A., & Hite, C. (2005). Preservice teachers' observations of cooperating teachers and peers while participating in an early field experience. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 32*(4).

Atwell-Vasey, W. (1998). *Nourishing words: bridging private reading and public teaching*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Bickmore, S., Smagorinsky, P., & O'Donnell-Allen, C. (2005). Tensions between traditions: The role of contexts in learning to teach. *English Education, 38*(1), 23-52.

Bove, C. M. (2006). *Language and politics in Julia Kristeva: Literature, art, therapy*. Albany, NY: State University of New York

Britner, S., & Finson, K. (2005). Preservice teachers' reflections on their growth in an inquiry-oriented science pedagogy course. *Journal of Elementary Science Education, 17*(1), 39-55.

Cochran-Smith, M. (1991). Learning to teach against the grain. *Harvard Educational Review, 62*(3), 279-310.

Cochran-Smith, M. (2003). Learning and unlearning: The education of teacher educators. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 19*, 5-28.

Crotty, M. (1998). *The foundations of social research: Meaning and perspective in the research process*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Fajet, W., Bello, M., Leftwich, S., Mesler, J., & Shaver, A. (2005). Pre-service teachers' perceptions in beginning education classes. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 21*, 717-727.

Folden, R., & Klinzing, H. (1990). What can research on teacher thinking contribute to teacher education? A second opinion. *Educational Researcher, 19*(5), 15-20.

Fullan, M. (1993). Why teachers must become change agents. *Educational Leadership, 50*(6), 1-13.

Geijsel, F., & Meijers, F. (2005). Identity learning and educational change. *Educational Studies, 31*(4), 419-430.

Goldstein, L. S., & Freedman, D. (2003). Challenges enacting caring teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 54*(5).

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. (1989). *Fourth generation evaluation*. Newsbury Park, CA: Sage.

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

Klee, P. (Artist). (1922). *Head of a Man, Going Senile* [Painting].

Kristeva, J. (1974/1984). *Revolution in poetic language* (M. Waller, Trans.). New York: Columbia University Press.

Kristeva, J. (1977/1980). *Desire in language: A semiotic approach to literature and art* (T. Gora, A. Jardine & L. S. Roudiez, Trans.). New York: Columbia University Press.

Kristeva, J. (1997/2002). *Intimate revolt: The powers and limits of psychoanalysis* (J. Herman, Trans. Vol. 2). New York: Columbia University Press.

Larson, A. (2005). Preservice teachers' field experience surprises: Some thing never change. *Physical Educator, 62*(3), 154-163.

Lechte, J., & Zournazi, M. (2004). *The Kristeva critical reader*. Edinburgh Edinburgh University Press.

Lechte, J. M., M. (Ed.). (2004). *Julia Kristeva: Live theory*. London: Continuum.

Lee, H.-J. (2005). Understanding and assessing preservice teachers' reflective thinking. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 21*, 699-715.

Lewis, P. (1974). Revolutionary semiotics. *Diacritics, 4*(2), 28-32.

Lipkowitz, I., & Loselle, A. (1996). A conversation with Julia Kristeva. In R. M. Guberman (Ed.), *Julia Kristeva interviews*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Liston, D., & Zeichner, K. (1987). Critical pedagogy and teacher education. *Journal of Education, 169*(3), 117-137.

Lloyd, S. (2005). *Examining a framework of dialogue emails and inquiry into practice to scaffold reflective practice in preservice teachers during their early field experiences.* Unpublished Unpublished Dissertation, University of South Florida.

Lortie, D. (1975). *Schoolteacher* (Second ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Mathison, S. (1988). Why Triangulate? *Educational Researcher, 17*(2), 13-17.

Moore, R. (2003). Reexaming the field experiences of preservice teachers. *Journal of Teacher Education, 54*(1), 31-42.

Oliver, K. (1993). *Reading Kristeva: Unraveling the double-bind*. Bloomington, ID: Indiana University Press.

Oliver, K. (Ed.). (2002). *The Portable Kristeva: Updated edition*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Payne, M. (1993). *Reading theory: An introduction to Lacan, Derrida, and Kristeva*. Cambridge, M.A.: Blackwell Publishers.

Posner, G. (1996). *Field experience: A guide to reflective teaching*. White Plain, N.Y.: Longman Publishers.

Prasad, P. (2005). *Crafting qualitative research: Working in the postpositivist traditions*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, Inc. .

Price, J. N., & Valli, L. (2005). Preservice teachers becoming agents of change: Pedagogical implications for action research. *Journal of Teacher Education, 56*(1), 57-72.

Pryor, C. (2005). European and American influences on democratic practice at the professional development school: Postbaccalaureate students in early field experiences. In A. Pearl & C. Pyror (Eds.), *Democratic Practices in Education*. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Education.

Reynolds, W. M. (2003). *Curriculum: A river runs through it* (Vol. 108). New York: Peter Lang.

Sipe, L., & Constable, S. (1996). A Chart of Four Contemporary Research Paradigms: Metaphors for the Modes of Inquiry. *Taboo: The Journal of Culture and Educational Leadership, 1*, 153-163.

Smith, A.-M. (1998). *Julia Kristeva : Speaking the unspeakable* London: Pluto Press.

Smith, D. (1991). Hermeneutic inquiry: The hermeneutic imagination and the pedagogic text. In E. C. Short (Ed.), *Forms of Curriculum Inquiry*. Albany, N Y: State University of New York Press.

Stanton, J. (1987). Dialogue journals (Publication no. ED284276). Retrieved November 19, 2005, from Eric. Language Arts:

Stone, L. (2004). Crisis of the educated subject: Insight from Kristeva for American Education. *Studies in Philosophy and Education, 23*, 103-116.

Wang, H. (2004). The call from the stranger on a journey home: Curriculum in a third space. New York: Peter Lang.

Woll, S. (2002). *Everyday thinking: memory, reasoning, and judgement in the real world*. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Zeichner, K. (1993). Connecting genuine teacher development to the struggle for social justice. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 19*(1), 5-21.

Ziarek, E. (2003). Evil and testimony: Ethics "after" postmodernism. *Hypatia, 18*(2), 197-204.

APPENDIX A

CIED 3712 COURSE SYLLABUS AND ASSIGNMENTS

Oklahoma State University
College of Education
School of Curriculum and Educational Leadership

CIED 3712
Field Experiences in the Secondary School
Spring 2006

Course text—You must purchase a LiveText (United Streaming version) License that will be used to create your portfolio submissions

I. Course Description

This course is a seminar accompanying your field experience in a secondary school environment. Much of the content of the course will serve as reinforcement and enhancement of concepts already learned in other education courses or as advance organizers for future education courses. This course seeks to assist you in developing experience in meeting the cognitive, social, physical, and cultural differences among children. During this semester, you will continue to work towards attaining the Professional Education Council Core Concepts and Goals (statement attached) which emphasize integration, diversity, professionalism, and life-long learning.

II. Program Goals

Oklahoma State University Professional Education Council Mission and Conceptual Framework

The Professional Education Unit (PEU) prepares and develops professional educators who facilitate life long learning and enrich quality of life for people in public schools and other educational settings. OSU's Professional Education programs are based upon the L.E.A.D.S. conceptual framework: **L**eadership; **E**thics and Professionalism; **A**cademics and Professional Roles, including Content Knowledge, Integration, Human Growth and Development, Learning Environment, Technology, Teaching/Professional Practice and Assessment; **D**iversity; and **S**ervice Orientation/Community Outreach. These core values are an expansion of the earlier conceptual framework based upon Professionalism, Integration and Diversity.

III. Prerequisites

Consent of instructor, GPA greater or equal to a 2.5, Passing score on the OGET, Application for Professional Education submitted to Willard 325

IV. Style of Instruction

The instructional strategies used in this course, include, but are not limited to, lecture, small group and seminar discussions, presentations, guest speakers, and inquiry-based learning. Instruction will concentrate on field observations and assignments.

V. Knowledge Base

Each of your disciplines encourages field-based preservice education courses which provide prospective teachers with opportunities prior to student teaching to observe and participate in classrooms with qualified teachers. Experiences including observing, tutoring, teaching, and planning lessons and specific students' tasks related to the teaching and learning of your discipline are integral components of this course.

VI. Rationale for the Course

This course serves as the introduction to teaching and learning in the middle and high school. Preservice teacher candidates are provided opportunities to observe teaching and learning firsthand in a classroom setting. Students begin the journey toward becoming a professional educator by interacting with students, teachers, administrators, and the community in order to establish personal goals, a commitment to the profession, and insights into the "business" of educating students to become active participants in society. One semester (2 credits) of observation/ participation is required of all secondary education majors for certification.

There are two course components

1. **A public school experience of consisting of 45 hours** of observation and participation under the supervision of a certified teacher.
2. **Weekly seminars** designed to acquaint you with the issues of contemporary education, to develop your skill in observation, and to introduce you to effective methods/strategies of teaching in the secondary school.

VII. Attendance Policy

Attendance and participation are essential for success in this class and to your continued pre-professional development. Students should approach class meetings and field experiences with the conscientiousness development. Students are expected to be on time to all class sessions and to come prepared to participate in class discussions. Students are responsible for all ideas and information presented or discussed during class even if they are absent. <u>A student with more than two absences will not be eligible to receive a passing grade in this course.</u>

VIII. Course Objectives

Upon completion of this course, each teacher candidate should be able to

Employ the observational process (including classroom observations, field notes, and oral and written reflections, and participation in school activities) to enhance the skills necessary to become a reflective practitioner:

Consider personal strengths and weaknesses, concerns, and interests in making a commitment to teaching and other professional career decisions;

1. Discuss the following topics in an informed, reflective manner:
    a. the influence of personal beliefs and past experiences;
    b. characteristics of students (individuals and groups) at various levels;

c. organization of a secondary school
d. teacher relationships with principals, peers, other staff, parents, and students;
e. responsibilities of the teacher beyond classroom teaching;
f. school rules and regulations for teachers and students;
g. curriculum;
h. classroom organization and management;
i. teaching and instructional strategies;
j. resources and materials;
k. the school and community
l. multicultural issues;
m. current issues in secondary education;
n. use of technology

IX. Course Requirements

A. Attendance and participation at each seminar session
The class meets in seminar session once a week and your presence, on time, is mandatory. Professional behavior is expected. You should be prepared to discuss and listen to others. Assignments, on dates indicated, are due at the beginning of the class hour.

B. Written reflections on Field Experiences
Reflective writing requires you to think about what you observe and what you bring to the field experience. Your writing assignments will be critical to class discussions. [Note: Do NOT use real names of people in your reflections or other assignments.] Each assignment will be assigned a score of 0 (unacceptable), 1 (needs improvement), 2 (meets expectations), or 3 (exceeds expectations) based upon a scoring rubric. Students must complete all six in order to pass the course. None of the 6 assignments can have a score of 0, and the cumulative average score of all assignments must be 2.0 or higher. For additional information about these assignments, see the "Course Calendar."

C. Field Experience Log and Dialogue journals (See attached forms)
Students must complete a minimum of 45 observation hours in the schools to pass this course. The student's cooperating teacher must verify a record of these hours. When in the schools, students must be punctual, pleasant, cooperative, enthusiastic, and professionally attired. Check in with the main office on the first visit to the school, and, if required, each time thereafter. In addition to observing, students are expected to show initiative and become involved in the "life" of the classroom. This includes introducing oneself to the classes, working with small groups of students, and teaching at least one lesson.
Students will complete a field log entry after each classroom observation or other field experience. Field logs will be taken up around the middle of the semester (March 9) and again at the end of the semester (May 4).

D. Narrative presentation (your final exam)
In place of a traditional final exam, each student will create a presentation that thoughtfully reflects on the semester's experiences. Students will present their conclusions in an interesting and informative multimedia presentation to the class during the time scheduled for the final exam (Monday, May 1, 2:00 p.m.)

E. Interview for Full Admission to Teacher Education
Interviews for Admission to Teacher Education will be held during the semester. (This experience is also good practice for job interviewing.) The interviewing panels will include public school teachers. **In order to receive a passing grade in CIED 3712, you must be recommended for Full Admission by the interview panelists.** The interview evaluation sheet must be included in your professional portfolio.

F. Professional Education Portfolio
The Professional Education Portfolio, mandated by the Oklahoma Commission for Teacher Preparation, is an integral part of the teacher preparation programs at all universities and colleges in Oklahoma. You will prepare for Submission I of the Portfolio during this class. Be sure that you have a hard copy of the Portfolio Handbook—Submission I, and bring it to class with you. (ALWAYS) **In order to receive a passing grade in CIED 3712, you must successfully complete the first phase of the Portfolio**.

X. Grading

This course is pass/fail. In order to pass, a student must

- Complete and verify a minimum of 45 hours of observation (required by the state for licensure).
- Receive favorable evaluations from the cooperating teacher.
- Receive passing grades on eight reflective assignments
- Have a cumulative average score of 2.0 or higher on all reflection assignments.
- Submit a field log containing entries for each classroom visit.
- Receive a passing grade on a final refection presented orally and in writing.
- Be recommended for full admission to the Professional Education Program by successfully completing Portfolio Submission I and the admission interview

XI. Students with Disabilities Policy

If any student in this class has a disability that requires special accommodations, please discuss the disability and the desired accommodations with the instructor during the first week of the semester. Additional information on this topic may be found under "Special Accommodations for Students" on the "Syllabus Attachment."

XII. Academic Dishonesty/ Misconduct

As stated in the University Catalog, "Academic dishonesty or misconduct is neither condoned nor tolerated at Oklahoma State University." Disciplinary actions imposed on students guilty of these offenses may be as severe as a grade of "F" for the course or expulsion from the university. For more information, see OSU Policy and Procedures Letter 2-0822 (at http://home.okstate.edu/Policy.nsf/).

XIII. Dropping a Course

See "Dropping a Course and Withdrawing from the University" on the "Syllabus Attachment."

CIED 3712- Field Experiences in the Secondary School
Spring 2006 Course Calendar

Week	Date	Topic	Assignment Due
1	9 Jan.	Introduction to Field Experiences in the Secondary School	
2	16 Jan.	Why Teach Secondary School?	The Purpose of Secondary Education
3	23 Jan.	Teaching as a Profession	
4	30 Jan.	The Public View of Education	Professional Goals Essay **Blackboard Chat Room**
5	6 Feb.	The School in the Community	
6	13 Feb.	The Organization of the School	Teaching Philosophy
	15 Feb.	**Submission 1 Help Session; NRC 106; 4 pm**	
7	20 Feb.	The Students	Dialogue journals due (3 entries)
8	27 Feb.	A Professional View of Teaching	Cooperating Teacher Interview
9	6 Mar.	Effective Instructional Practice	Field logs due Classroom Management
	8 March	**Teaching Portfolio** **Submission 1 due; Use** **Live Text**	
10	13 Mar.	**Spring Break**	
11	20 Mar.	Effective Classroom Management	**Blackboard Chat Room**
12	27 Mar.	Materials, Resources, Technology, and Planning	Discipline
	31 March	**Plans of Improvement due (If applicable)**	
13	3 Apr.	Assessment and Evaluation	Dialogue journals due (3 entries)
14	10 Apr.	Teaching and Reflection on Practice	Assessment and Evaluation
	April 17, 18	**Interviews for admission into Professional Education Program**	
15	17 Apr.	Developing a Rationale for	Teaching a Lesson

		Teaching Secondary School	**Blackboard Chat Room**
16	24 Apr.	Progress Toward Professionalism	Field Log (entire collection) Time sheets, evaluations, and checklists
	1 May		Final presentations

Please keep a copy of all assignments for possible use in your portfolios. If you have any questions, ask me.

THIS SCHEDULE IS SUBJECT TO CHANGE ACCORDING TO THE NEEDS OF THE CLASS.

CIED 3712 – FIELD EXPERIENCES IN THE SECONDARY SCHOOL

Evaluation Rubric for Assignments

Ratings: 3 = Exceeds Expectations 2 = Meets Expectations 1 = Needs Improvement

Exceeds Expectations (3)	Meets Expectations (2)	Needs Improvement (1)	Unacceptable (0)
Paper is exceptionally well written (focused, logically organized, and free of mechanical errors). Fully addresses all aspects of the assignment. Uses detailed observations as the basis for thoughtful reflection and insightful analysis. Shows clear evidence of personal and professional growth.	Paper is well written (focused, organized, with few mechanical errors). Addresses central aspects of the assignment. Uses detailed observations as the basis for reflection and analysis. Shows evidence of personal and professional growth.	Paper is adequately written (unfocused, disorganized, or contains several mechanical errors). Addresses some aspects of the assignment. Contains observations, but they are not the basis for reflection and analysis. Shows some evidence of personal or professional growth.	Paper is poorly written (not typed, unfocused, disorganized, and contains many mechanical errors. Does not address significant aspects of the assignment. Observations, if present, lack detail. Little or no reflection or analysis. Shows little or no evidence of personal or professional growth.

Criteria for Evaluating 3712 Field Experience Logs

Are all four parts there?

1. Heading
2. Sequence of events
3. Elaboration of events
4. Analysis of events

Elaboration of event(s) description

1. Are all aspects of the event(s) mentioned?
    a. Learners (what they said and did)
    b. Cooperating teacher (when appropriate)
    c. Subject matter (content of lesson/ discussion)
    d. Context (surroundings)
2. Is it detailed? Use of quotes, rich description, etc.
3. Does it stick to description, rather than confounding description with analysis? Look especially for instances where the writer attributes to the learners a) particular motivations (for example, "trying to please), b) traits (for example, "lazy"), c) capabilities (for example, "a good reader"), or d) emotional states (for example, "angry").

Analysis of episode(s)

1. Does the analysis focus on the episode described earlier (rather than additional episode descriptions)?
2. Does the analysis go beyond simply describing how the writer felt about the experience to include why he or she felt that way?
3. Does the analysis include any conclusions from the experience? Conclusions may be in the form of questions that the writer is left with, or dilemmas that the writer realizes, rather than just hare-and-fast principles.
4. Does the analysis draw on past experiences, reading, or exercises from teacher education coursework?
5. Does the analysis lead to any plans? Will the writer do something as a consequence of this experience the next time he or she teaches?

*Adapted from Posner, George J. (1996). Field Experience: A Guide to Reflective Teaching, 4th Edition. Longman: White Plains, NY.

Field observation logs

You will keep a notebook/ journal in which you record at least **10** records of visits to your school site. Each entry should be structured as follows:

1. Heading—Teacher, class, date, times
2. Sequence of events—a numbered list of what occurred during the lesson
3. Elaboration of one or two of episodes
4. Analysis/ and or reflection on those episodes.

The Dialogue Journals

In addition to your field experience logs, you will be responsible for keeping a dialogue journal. You and your partner will swap these notebooks each week and follow the guidelines below. Partners will be responsible for their own notebooks and will transport these notebooks back and forth from the weekly class meetings. Students must record twenty entries in their field experience logs and write to their partner at least **six** times throughout the semester.

Each entry must follow these guidelines and formatting:

1. A heading containing the date of each entry
2. Two or three questions addressed to his or her partner based on what was recorded in her or his field experience log.

The partner should follow these guidelines when responding

1. Respond to each of the questions posed by his or her partner
2. Comment on an aspect of their partner's entry
3. Ask one of their own questions

Responses must be at least one page long.

CIED 3712 - FIELD EXPERIENCE IN THE SECONDARY SCHOOL
(* Denotes Required Assignments: 4)

Each student will complete the 4 required assignments (starred, including Goals Statement and Philosophy required for Portfolio Submission I) and 2 other assignments you select from the 14 options. You will turn in field logs two times this semester, each time counts as an assignment. Thus, you will have a total of 8 assignments, not counting your final.

Assignment 1 – The Purpose of Secondary Education*

For this assignment, write an essay addressing the questions posed below. This essay should provide a snapshot of your current thinking. As such, it may serve as a useful benchmark or point of reference as you continue to develop as a pre-professional educator over the next two years. Your essay should provide evidence that you gave these questions considerable thought. In addition, it should be typed, well organized, and free from mechanical errors (e.g., misspellings, grammatical mistakes, etc.).

Exercise 1.1 The Purpose of Secondary Education

The state of Oklahoma has identified *Priority Academic Student Skills* in science, mathematics, language arts, and social studies for kindergarten through 12th grade (available for viewing or downloading at the State Department of Education's website, http://www.sde.state.ok.us/). In addition, Oklahoma state colleges and universities require applicants to have completed 2-4 courses in each of these core areas in order to be eligible for admission. Recently, some state leaders have proposed that four years of study in each core subject be required for high school graduation. It appears there is widespread agreement that these core subjects are valuable components of a K-12 education

Why is learning the subject in which you are specializing considered to be so important for students? What do students gain from courses in your discipline that will be of value to them? Is the value limited to preparing them for future courses, or is knowledge in your discipline useful in a broader context? If so, how?

Exercise 1.2 A Personal Sense of Purpose

Most people choose careers they hope will give them a sense of satisfaction and accomplishment. A sense of satisfaction comes from doing something they believe is important, and a feeling of accomplishment comes from achieving their goals. When you become a teacher, you will join the "conspiracy" to make every student learn core subjects. Why do you want to be a part of this? Is helping students learn your discipline important enough to you to make it a satisfying career? What do you hope to accomplish, professionally and personally, in your career as a secondary school teacher? In short, what beliefs and values do you hold that will provide a sense of purpose to your life as a teacher? Take some time to reflect as you identify and examine the values you hold and the personal and professional goals you hope to meet as a future teacher.

Assignment 2 – Professional Goals Essay*

For writing your Professional Goals Essay, Submission I, follow the directions on the COE website and/or the link to/posting on the class Blackboard site. Pay close

attention to the guidelines, the step-by-step instructions, and the scoring rubric. Your essay should be well thought out and clearly written. In addition, it should be typed, double-spaced, and free from mechanical errors. Keep your writing "tight" by cutting wordiness and revising clumsy, cumbersome sentence constructions. Use sentence variety. Make sure you write clear transitions between paragraphs and as you move from point to point, idea to idea. You should submit a sophisticated piece of writing, direct (use active voice) and to the point.

Assignment 3– Teaching Philosophy*

For writing your Teaching Philosophy, Submission I, follow the directions on the COE website and linked to or provided on Blackboard. Pay particular attention to both the guidelines and the scoring rubric. Your philosophy should be well thought out and clearly written. In addition, it should be typed, double-spaced, and free from mechanical errors. Keep your writing "tight" by cutting wordiness and revising clumsy, cumbersome sentence constructions. Use sentence variety. Make sure you write clear transitions between paragraphs and as you move from point to point, idea to idea. You should submit a sophisticated piece of writing, direct (use active voice) and to the point.

Assignment 4 – Personal Influences and Successful Teachers

For this assignment, write an essay addressing the questions posed below. Your essay should provide evidence that you gave these questions considerable thought. In addition, it should be typed, well organized, and free from mechanical errors (e.g., misspellings, grammatical mistakes, etc.).

You have had a great deal of experience in schools as a student and have been exposed to many different teachers. Some teachers are popular with students because of their personality or because their classes are an "easy A." Others are unpopular because they are demanding or just plain mean. But being popular or unpopular with students is not necessarily related to being an effective teacher. The primary characteristic of an effective teacher is the ability consistently to attain high levels of student achievement. In other words, effective teachers are those who promote student learning.

To complete this assignment, think about teachers you have had in the past, both effective and ineffective. <u>Draw on actual experiences you recall from your schooling</u>. If you have positive examples of effective teachers from your past, you may refer to them by name. If you have negative examples from your past, you may use them as a contrast but <u>do not identify them by name</u>. As you recall effective and ineffective teachers from your past, answer the following questions:

Describe the kinds of lessons presented in class by an effective teacher. How does the teacher interact with students? What do the students do? What do the students learn? What kinds of out-of-class assignments are used?

What is the effective teacher's attitude toward the students? What are the students' attitudes toward the teacher? How can you tell?

How is the effective teacher's classroom arranged and decorated?

What characteristics or behaviors did effective teachers have in common that ineffective teachers lacked? In other words, what makes a teacher effective (or ineffective)?

Assignment 5 – The School in the Community

For this assignment, follow the directions below and write an essay addressing the questions posed. Your essay should provide evidence that you gave these questions considerable thought. In addition, it should be typed, well organized, and free from mechanical errors (e.g., misspellings, grammatical mistakes, etc.).

Exercise 5.1 Local Newspaper Coverage

Read a local newspaper from the school district where you are spending your field experience. Look for articles, editorials, and any other items concerning the schools. Does one activity or grade level receive more attention than others? Is the community proud of its schools? Of what do they seem most proud? What do you expect to find at your school based on these impressions?

Exercise 5.2 The School Surroundings

Now walk or drive around the neighborhood of the school. Look at the houses, businesses, people, landscape, and other elements of the school surroundings. Spend some time somewhere near the school (like a convenience store) and see if people have anything to say about the school. Report your findings. How does this match the impressions you got from the newspaper? Have your expectations changed based on this exercise? If so, how? If not, why not?

Assignment 6 – The Organization of the School

For this assignment, follow the directions below and write a report addressing the questions posed. Your report should provide evidence that you made careful, thorough observations. In addition, it should be typed, well organized, and free from mechanical errors (e.g., misspellings, grammatical mistakes, etc.).

With the administration's permission, take a walk through the school building. Describe the school itself. A sketch of the layout of the campus might be helpful. Use the following questions to guide your observations:

> How are the classrooms arranged? Are they grouped by subject? By grade level? What do they look and sound like?
>
> Where are the student lockers? How do they look?
>
> What are the halls like? Who is there and when? Are there decorations on the walls or examples of student work? Is it clean and inviting?

Check out the gym, library, auditorium, cafeteria, and administrative offices.

> Describe the library. Who is in charge of it? What resources are available and when? Do the students seem to like it?
>
> What are the gym and auditorium like? What are they used for?
>
> Is the cafeteria large enough for the entire student body? How is it arranged and used? How does it smell?
>
> What do you notice about life in the main office?

Describe your impressions of what kind of school this may be. Does this match your impressions from the newspaper and the neighborhood? (See Assignment 5.) If you can, look at a copy of the school newspaper and yearbook.

Describe the hierarchy of the school. Ask a member of the administration or your cooperating teacher how the school is organized. Who is in charge of what? Who makes the decisions in this school? Do students have input? Are there subject matter department heads or teams? Are different ethnic and socioeconomic groups represented among students and faculty?

Assignment 7 – The Students

For this assignment, follow the directions below and write a report addressing the questions posed. Your report should provide evidence that you made careful, thorough observations. In addition, it should be typed, well organized, and free from mechanical errors (e.g., misspellings, grammatical mistakes, etc.).

Before or after school, at lunch, or at an extracurricular activity, talk with at least one student. Tell the student you are doing your homework and want to get to know the students at this school. Try to find out something about the student's background, goals, likes and dislikes, ideal teacher, friends and "significant others," parents, and attitudes towards people who seem "different." You might ask about the student's plans after graduation. What does the student like and not like about the school? Where and to what extent are parents involved? How important are extracurricular activities? Try to create a full portrait of one particular student and do NOT use that student's real name in your report.

Then, observe students in groups. Note dress, language (outside class), interests, groups, conflicts, who seems to dominate, and other characteristics of social groups. Is the student population diverse (multicultural)? Is there any indication of multicultural education in this school? Try to describe what you think it is like to "live" in this school.

Assignment 8 – Cooperating Teacher Interview

For this assignment, follow the directions below and write a report of your findings. Your paper should include the questions you asked, the teacher's responses (reported verbatim or accurately paraphrased or summarized), and a final paragraph in which you reflect on your findings. In addition, it should be typed, well organized, and free from mechanical errors (e.g., misspellings, grammatical mistakes, etc.).

Arrange a time to interview your cooperating teacher. Try to find out the teacher's perspectives on and beliefs about teaching. You may use some or all of the following questions, but feel free to omit some and add others of your own.

Why do you arrange the room the way it is?
What do you think of the textbooks you use? How and when were they selected?
Where do you get other instructional materials? Do you spend your own money on your class?
Is there a curriculum guide you must follow? Who created it? What do you think of it?
How involved are the parents in this school? How can parents best help you and your students? How do you involve parents?
What sorts of students do you teach? Do you treat different students differently?
How friendly are you with students? Do you share your personal life with them? Why or why not?
What kinds of school duties and activities are you involved with outside your class?
What makes a good day of teaching for you?
What makes this a good school in which to teach?
Why did you decide to become a teacher? How long have you been a teacher? Have you worked at other jobs?

Assignment 9 – Lesson Profile

For this assignment, follow the directions below and write a report addressing the questions posed. Your report should provide evidence that you made careful, thorough observations. In

addition, it should be typed, well organized, and free from mechanical errors (e.g., misspellings, grammatical mistakes, etc.).

Exercise 9.1 Analyzing the Lesson

Create a lesson profile of a complete lesson (one class period) that you observe. Think of a lesson as a sequence of events; there is a beginning, a middle, and an end. The beginning might consist of a settling-down period, a preface and/or introduction, or the presentation of instructions for the main activity. The middle might entail a demonstration, lecture, lab, video, discussion, presentation of work by groups, seatwork, or any combination of these and other activities. The end might be used as a period for summary, conclusions, cleaning up, homework assignments, test taking, among other things. List the sequence of events that took place during the lesson, indicating the approximate length of time each event required, and describing what seem to you to be important aspects of each. You might want to include information about some of the following for each event:

Activity of teacher (what is the teacher doing?)
Activity of learners (what are the students doing?)
Resources (what resources are used?)
Noise level (high, moderate, low)
Use of space (what areas of the classroom are used?)
Engagement level of students (high, moderate, low)
Movement of learners
Movement of teacher
Number of learners involved
Lines of communication (teacher-to-student, student-to-teacher, student-to-student)

There are, of course, other aspects you might want to describe. Feel free to improvise.

Exercise 9.2 Reflecting on the Lesson

Now answer these questions based upon your observations:

What seems to be the point/objective of the lesson? For example, is it to memorize information for a test, practice some skill, or clarify ideas? What is the teacher's goal?
How responsive does the teacher appear to be to the reactions, feelings of the students?
Does the teacher treat different students in different ways?
How much of the lesson is done by learners individually and how much in groups?
How is the pace? What seems to be the difficulty level?
How would you classify this lesson? Teacher-centered? Student-centered? Both?

Assignment 10—Classroom Management

For this assignment, follow the directions below and write a report addressing the questions posed. Your report should provide evidence that you made careful, thorough observations. In addition, it should be typed, well organized, and free from mechanical errors (e.g., misspellings, grammatical mistakes, etc.).

What are your cooperating teacher's procedures for starting the class? What are your cooperating teacher's procedures for ending the class? What types of class starters or "bell ringers" does your cooperating teacher use?

Does your cooperating teacher arrange the desks in different ways to help him/her manage the class; that is, does the desk arrangement signal the type of activity they are going to do? For example, a semi-circle might signal that they are taking notes today and need their notebooks. Group arrangement of desks might signal that they sit in a

particular place with certain individuals or that they go to the bulletin board to find out who is in their group, where they sit, group name, etc. Circle might signal whole class discussion.

One excellent way to manage the class is through curriculum, specifically, engaging curriculum. If students are interested, moving, "engaged," they are less likely to act up or act out. Does your cooperating teacher keep the engaged and therefore well managed?

Does your cooperating teacher have procedures for getting and putting away books, dictionaries, magazines? Procedures for passing in papers? Procedures for those who have been absent? Procedures for group work?

Would you say the teacher has clearly established his/her expectations and therefore has a well organized—well-managed—classroom? Give examples.

Assignment 11 – Discipline

For this assignment, follow the directions below and write a report addressing the questions posed. Your report should provide evidence that you made careful, thorough observations. In addition, it should be typed, well organized, and free from mechanical errors (e.g., misspellings, grammatical mistakes, etc.).

> How does your cooperating teacher maintain control of his/her classroom? Who sets the rules? What resources are available to the teacher to enforce the rules (e.g., detention, out-of-school or in-school suspension, corporal punishment)? What are the biggest problems/frustrations the teacher encounters in his/her classroom and how are they handled? Where are students referred for further disciplinary action?
>
> Obtain a copy of the school discipline plan or school rules. What are the school's and district's rules regarding discipline? How are they communicated to students and parents?
>
> Have you seen any disciplinary problems in your observations? Describe what happened and how it was resolved.

If you can, interview the person who handles the school's disciplinary situations (e.g., principal, vice-principal)

> What are some of the problems encountered at this school? How are they usually resolved? How involved are parents in these situations? How typical are these problems in other schools in the area? What long-term solutions does he/she envision for these problems?

Assignment 12 – Education as Portrayed in the Media

For this assignment, write an essay addressing the questions posed below. Your essay should provide evidence that you gave these questions considerable thought. In addition, it should be typed, well organized, and free from mechanical errors (e.g., misspellings, grammatical mistakes, etc.).

Watch a movie or television program (even a documentary) about a teacher(s) or school(s). After viewing, describe how the program portrayed education by answering the following questions:

> What was the purpose or theme of the program? Give a brief synopsis of the program.
>
> What was the program saying, directly or indirectly, about the state of education? Did it put education in a positive or negative light? How?
>
> How were the students portrayed? The teacher? The administration? Parents?

What did the school look like? Where was it located? Was it typical or realistic?
In conclusion, how do the media affect schools?

Your response should also include your insights as a student and, more importantly, as a future educator.

Assignment 13 – Assessment and Evaluation

For this assignment, follow the directions below and write a report addressing the questions posed. Your report should provide evidence that you made careful, thorough observations. In addition, it should be typed, well organized, and free from mechanical errors (e.g., misspellings, grammatical mistakes, etc.).

Does your cooperating teacher asses students learning dialing? What kinds of assessment have you seen the teacher use? Do you see your cooperating teacher modifying instruction based on daily assessments? How?

Are the cooperating teacher's daily assessments "authentic." Give examples from the classes you've visited. Give examples of "inauthentic" assessments you have witnessed.

Ask your cooperating teacher to talk to you about how he/she modifies instruction based on daily assessment.

Volunteer to help your cooperating teacher evaluate student work (e.g., grade papers, score tests or quizzes, evaluate student projects). Discuss student evaluation with your cooperating teacher. Then answer the following questions:

What does your cooperating teacher evaluate? Does your teacher have a list of pre-determined objectives for the students to meet? Are there district objectives? What role do the state *Priority Academic Student Skills* (PASS) play in evaluation?

How are students evaluated? Tests? Presentations? Portfolios? Projects? Are standardized or commercially published (textbook-based) tests used or are teacher-made tests used? How are tests selected or made?

How are students with special needs evaluated? Are they evaluated the same way as everyone else? Why or why not?

What information is recorded in the teacher's grade book? How is this information organized? How are students' grades determined? What kind of grading scale is used?

How much time does the teacher spend outside school grading, writing tests, and performing other duties related to evaluation of students?

Assignment 14 – Teaching a Lesson*

With the assistance of your cooperating teacher, you will plan, prepare, and teach a short lesson to a class of students. (Ideally, your lesson should fit into the curriculum so that it matches the goals of the course and moves the students toward achieving the cooperating teacher's objectives.) After you teach your lesson, you will analyze your lesson and write a report addressing the questions posed below. Your report should provide evidence of reflective thought about your lesson plan and your teaching of the lesson. It should be typed, well organized, and free from mechanical errors (e.g., misspellings, grammatical mistakes, etc.). You will turn in both your report and your original lesson plan. More TBA.

APPENDIX B

PORTFOLIO EVALUATION RUBRIC

Evaluation Rubric and Score Report for Submission I: Admission to Professional Education

Candidate's Name (please print)______________________________________

ID Number________________________________

Ratings: 3=Exceeds Standard 2=Meets Standard 1=Approaches Standard 0=Unacceptable

Item	Exceeds Standard (3)	Meets Standard (2)	Approaches Standard (1)	Unacceptable (0)	Score
Overall presentation	Exceptionally professional presentation with attention to detail. **All** forms and essays are completed and arranged according to handbook guidelines.	Neat presentation with some attention to detail. **Most** forms and essays are completed and arranged according to handbook guidelines.	Disorganized presentation with little attention to details. **Some** forms and essays not completed or arranged according to handbook guidelines.	Sloppy presentation with **no** attention to details. Forms and essays are not completed or arranged according to handbook guidelines.	
First Teaching Philosophy	Exceptionally well written and logically organized. Essay is very focused and uses **many** examples based on experience or observation. Content follows handbook guidelines. **Excellent control** of written expression.	Clearly written and organized. Essay is focused and uses **some** examples based on experience or observation. Content follows handbook guidelines. **Good control** of written expression.	Somewhat disorganized explanation. Essay is unfocused, makes **few connections** to experience or observation. Content follows handbook guidelines. **Weak control** of written expression.	Lacks basic organization. Essay makes **no connections** to experience or observation. Content does not follow handbook guidelines. **No control** of written expression.	
Professional Goals Essay	Exceptionally well written and logically organized essay	Clear, organized essay that **develops a**	Somewhat disorganized essay with **few details of plan**	Poorly organized essay. **No specific plan** to accomplish	

that develops a **detailed plan** to accomplish professional goals based on OSU Core Values and essential skills and attitudes needed as an educator. Content follows handbook guidelines. **Excellent control** of written expression.	**plan** to accomplish professional goals. Some awareness of OSU Core Values and essential skills and attitudes needed as an educator. Content follows handbook guidelines. **Good control** of written expression.	to accomplish professional goals. Little awareness of OSU Core Values or essential skills and attitudes needed as an educator. Content follows handbook guidelines. **Weak contro**l of written expression.	professional goals. No awareness of OSU Core Values or essential skills and attitudes needed as an educator. Content does not follow handbook guidelines. **No control** of written expression.

Reader's Signature Date______________________________________
Comments:

APPENDIX C

INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

Interview protocol/ script for the interview[16]

Thank you for agreeing to interview with me as part of your experience in this course. Remember by agreeing to participate in a midterm and final interview about your experiences this semester, you may drop one of your non-required assignments. On the consent form, I indicated that any personal information you may reveal about yourself, your cooperating teacher, or the students you observe will be kept confidential. Together the two interviews should take about 45 minutes of your time. This interview will be tape-recorded.

1. You've been observing in your school now for about __________ weeks. What has the experience been like so far?
2. Think about and then describe one of the observations you've written about in your journal this semester.
3. Talk about this episode. What makes it memorable?
    a. How did the cooperating teacher act during this episode?
    b. How did the students act during this episode?
    c. How did you respond to this episode?
    d. How do you feel about it?
    e. Why did you choose to write about this episode?
4. Describe one or two things you have learned so far in this course?
5. What assignments contributed to most of your learning in this class?
6. What are the steps you still have to take to become a teacher?
7. How do you feel about these steps?
8. Describe the type(s) of writing you did for this class. How did you approach the writing for this class?
9. What did you learn from
    a. The students you observed?
    b. The partner with whom you dialogued?
    c. Your cooperating teacher?
    d. The assignments?
    e. The weekly class meetings?
10. Thank you for agreeing to participate in this study. Is there anything else you'd like to add?

[16] As qualitative studies rely on emergent strategies, the wording of these questions may change during the course of the study and probing will necessitate the asking of questions based on individual answers. In this study, I was careful to follow the order of these questions, although sometimes a participant would answer a question before I asked it.

APPENDIX D

IRB APPROVAL LETTER

Oklahoma State University Institutional Review Board

Date:	Wednesday, March 22, 2006
IRB Application No	ED06102
Proposal Title:	The Construction of Teacher Subjects in Early Field Experiences

Reviewed and Processed as: Expedited

Status Recommended by Reviewer(s): Approved Protocol Expires: 3/21/2007

Principal Investigator(s

Jacqueline Bach
221 Willard
Stillwater, OK 74078

Hongyu Wang
239 Willard
Stillwater, OK 74078

The IRB application referenced above has been approved. It is the judgment of the reviewers that the rights and welfare of individuals who may be asked to participate in this study will be respected, and that the research will be conducted in a manner consistent with the IRB requirements as outlined in section 45 CFR 46.

☒ The final versions of any printed recruitment, consent and assent documents bearing the IRB approval stamp are attached to this letter. These are the versions that must be used during the study.

As Principal Investigator, it is your responsibility to do the following:

1. Conduct this study exactly as it has been approved. Any modifications to the research protocol must be submitted with the appropriate signatures for IRB approval.
2. Submit a request for continuation if the study extends beyond the approval period of one calendar year. This continuation must receive IRB review and approval before the research can continue.
3. Report any adverse events to the IRB Chair promptly. Adverse events are those which are unanticipated and impact the subjects during the course of this research; and
4. Notify the IRB office in writing when your research project is complete.

Please note that approved protocols are subject to monitoring by the IRB and that the IRB office has the authority to inspect research records associated with this protocol at any time. If you have questions about the IRB procedures or need any assistance from the Board, please contact Beth McTernan in 415 Whitehurst (phone: 405-744-5700, beth.mcternan@okstate.edu).

Sincerely,

Sue C. Jacobs, Chair
Institutional Review Board

VITA

Jacqueline Bach

Candidate for the Degree of

Philosophy of Education

Dissertation: THE TEACHER THAT JACK BUILT: THE CONSTRUCTION OF TEACHER SUBJECTS IN AN EARLY FIELD EXPERIENCE COURSE

Major Field: Education

Biographical:

Education:

Masters of Arts, English
University of West Florida, Pensacola, Florida
Thesis "The Modern Catholic Novel: David Lodge and Mary Gordon Respond to Vatican II" in April, 2000.

Bachelors of Arts, English/ Secondary English Education
Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida in April, 2005.

Completed the Requirements for the DOCTORATE OF PHILOSOPHY degree in Education at Oklahoma State University in December, 2006.

Experience: Taught high school English; employed as a graduate assistant at Oklahoma State University.

Professional memberships: National Council of Teachers of English, American Educational Research Association, American Association for Teaching and Curriculum

Name: Jacqueline Marie Bach Date of Degree: December, 2006

Institution: Oklahoma State University Location: Stillwater, Oklahoma

Title of Study: THE TEACHER THAT JACK BUILT: THE CONSTRUCTION OF TEACHER SUBJECTS IN AN EARLY FIELD EXPERIENCE COURSE

Pages in Study: 168 Candidate for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Major Field: Education

Scope and Method of Study: Increased standardization of teacher education programs urges a reconsideration of how pre-service teacher identities are constructed/ being constructed. The purpose of my study was to examine the writings of pre-service teachers enrolled in an early field experiences course in order to identify moments in which they interacted with, negotiated, and subverted the teacher-making process, which they officially enter during the semester they take this course.

Findings and Conclusions: An analysis of pre-service teachers enrolled in an early field experience course using Julia Kristeva's theory of the subject-in-process/on trial illustrates how their language disrupts, contradicts, and reappropriates the standardized language of teacher candidate programs. Examining the writings of pre-service teachers through this theoretical framework illustrates how some of them are not only subjects-in-the-making but they are also remaking the system they are entering.

ADVISER'S APPROVAL: Hongyu Wang