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Abstract

Students’ capacity to self-regulate in learning situations is linked to their development of three underlying processes: metacognition, motivation, and strategic action. These processes support students’ development of: creative, critical, and problem solving thinking skills; strategies to apply knowledge in a flexible and adaptive manner; motivation to engage in continuous (life-long) learning; and skills to participate in independent and collaborative learning settings.

Research indicates that supporting students’ development of self-regulated learning (SRL) leads to positive academic, social, and emotional outcomes for learners across learning contexts. However, teaching towards SRL presents challenges for many educators. In many cases, teachers and teacher candidates have not been provided with models of how SRL can be supported in their own educational experiences. Therefore, their development of teaching skills aligned with SRL requires an openness on their part to consider new ways of learning, as well as sustained effort while they learn, implement, and refine novel teaching practices.

This study examined the experiences of four teacher candidates (TCs) enrolled in a teacher education program (TEP) in western Canada over the course of eleven months. TCs’ personal characteristics (i.e., beliefs about learning and teaching, motivational orientations, and histories) along with features of their TEP (i.e., motivational supports and structural supports) were examined in relation to TCs’ development and implementation of SRL promoting practices (SRLPPs). SRL theory, self-determination theory (SDT), and research about teacher beliefs were used to inform this purpose. Data analyzed included: a questionnaire, interviews, documents, and in-class observations.
Results indicated that TCs’ sense of self-determined motivation appeared to impact their beliefs about and development and implementation of SRLPPs. TCs’ perceived fulfillment of their needs for autonomy, competence and relatedness impacted their beliefs and development of SRLPPs. Supports that TCs’ identified and I interpreted for their development of SRLPPs included: the presence or absence of supportive relationships; alignments between TCs’ on-campus learning experiences and practicum experiences; TCs’ development of relationships with students; sufficient time, freedom, and support to develop SRLPPs; and management practices within TCs’ practicum settings. These themes suggest rich areas for research to prepare teachers to embed opportunities for SRL in their classroom practices.
Self-regulated learning (or SRL) refers to how people direct and use their resources (cognitive, motivational, environmental) to engage in learning tasks. Many teaching practices help students develop skills to regulate their learning. These practices include tasks that require learners to think about their learning, make choices, develop strategies to engage in tasks, access support, and maintain their motivation.

Over 11 months, I examined the experiences of four TCs (pre-service teachers), in an SRL-focused teacher education cohort in Canada. TCs participated in a motivational questionnaire, interviews and teaching observations. Results identified common affordances and constraints for TCs’ development of practices that support self-regulated learning. These included: the presence or absence of secure relationships with their advisors, alignment between their university and practicum experiences, well-established routines within TCs’ practicum classrooms and sufficient time for TCs to immerse themselves in their practicum setting.
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Chapter One: Introduction

Most developed nations have recognized that systemic educational change is required to equip all students with the competencies they will need to be engaged, contributing citizens within contemporary global societies. In response to this need, educational systems are shifting instructional foci away from delivering content and toward developing competencies for learning. These competencies include students’ development of creative and critical thinking skills, as well as problem-solving skills; competencies that students can apply in flexible and adaptive ways across a wide range of settings and situations to learn independently and cooperatively (Ananiadou & Claro, 2009; Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority, 2009; British Columbia Ministry of Education, 2012).

The movement away from traditional instructional practices (i.e., practices focused on the delivery of content) has presented challenges for teacher education programs (TEPs). It requires complex forms of teaching and learning that may not be easy for novice teachers to plan and support (Brown & Campione, 1994; Perry, Phillips, & Hutchinson, 2006; Whitaker, 2000). For some teacher candidates (TCs) this approach to learning and teaching may be quite different from their own educational experiences. Therefore, their beliefs about and motivations for teaching and learning, upon entering TEPs, may conflict with the new mandates and objectives of TEPs. In this context, teacher educators need to attend not only to TCs’ development of skills associated with complex teaching strategies but also to their beliefs and motivations concerning those strategies.

My dissertation is a case study investigation of the development of four TCs enrolled in one TEP and within a cohort that has a focus on self-regulated learning (SRL)—an approach to learning that aligns well with goals and objectives for 21st-century classrooms (Wolters, 2010)
and the shifts in education I have described above. SRL refers to ways learners control thoughts and actions to achieve goals (both their own and those set by others) and respond to environmental demands (Zimmerman, 2008). Self-regulated learners are described as productive, focused, persistent, and flexible learners (Perry, Mazabel, Dantzer, & Winne, 2018).

To guide this pursuit, I used three sensitizing lenses: SRL theory, theory about teachers’/TCs’ beliefs, and self-determination theory (SDT). First, SRL theory helped me to understand a central task for the TCs in my study: developing practices to support their students’ SRL. Second, theories about how teachers’ (in this case TCs’) beliefs and motivations impact their practices helped me consider how beliefs about and motivations toward SRL might support (or thwart) TCs’ development of practices known to support SRL. Finally, SDT illuminated how TCs’ personal characteristics (e.g., beliefs, motivations, histories, and perceived knowledge of SRLPPs) and features of the SRL cohort and TEP contexts might impact TCs’ development and implementation of SRL promoting practices (SRLPPs). These theoretical perspectives are described in greater detail below.

**Finding Direction Through Theoretical and Research Perspectives**

**Self-regulated learning theory.** Self-regulated learning theory provides a means for teacher educators and TCs/teachers to conceptualize teaching practices associated with students’ development of key competencies and processes for learning. Self-regulated learning theory attends to the development of three learning processes: metacognition, motivation, and strategic action (Winne & Perry 2000; Zimmerman 1990; 2008). **Metacognitive learners** are aware of their personal learning strengths and challenges. They have knowledge of learning strategies and are attuned to others’ needs and interests. **Motivated learners** are willing to attempt challenging tasks. They are persistent and believe that, with effort, they will succeed within learning tasks.
Finally, strategic learners have repertoires of learning strategies and continue to learn and personalize strategies to meet task demands and their needs as learners. They are adaptive and flexible not only in their use of strategies, but also their adjustment of strategies to meet the needs of various tasks.

Most models of SRL describe cyclical processes learners use to guide their thoughts and actions before, during, and after engaging in learning tasks (See: Butler & Cartier, 2005; Winne & Hadwin, 1998; Zimmerman, 2002). For example, Zimmerman’s SRL model identifies three phases of SRL. The first phase is referred to as the forethought phase, during which learners set goals for themselves, assess their motivation and abilities to complete the tasks, and make plans for engaging in the task. The second phase, the performance phase, takes place when learners focus their attention, engage in tasks, develop and apply strategies, and monitor their progress. Lastly, during the self-reflection phase, learners reflect upon the task and their performance through self-evaluation. Butler and Cartier (2018) describe cycles of strategic action in which learners interpret tasks, make plans, enact strategies, monitor progress, and make adjustments as they complete new and/or challenging tasks. Butler and Cartier’s model expands upon early models of SRL theory by including a sociocultural lens that links historical, cultural, social, and community contexts to it. However, all SRL models emphasize the importance of iterative cycles of planning (forethought), enacting, reflecting, and adjusting thoughts and actions to achieve goals and succeed at tasks.

Why is supporting SRL important? SRL pairs well with current educational initiatives and innovations (21st-century learning goals, inquiry learning, inclusion, assessment for learning). SRL is linked to students becoming adaptive, lifelong learners who are critical and creative thinkers, problem solvers, and able to work and learn both independently and
Students’ development of SRL has been found to be a significant source of achievement differences among students (Zimmerman & Schunk, 2011). Furthermore, it is an asset that cuts across socio-demographic boundaries (McClelland & Wanless, 2012; Perry et al., 2017). Self-regulation is developmental: all learners can improve capacities for self-regulating, including those with exceptional learning needs, and use these capacities to support their learning (Bishara, 2016; Stoeger, Fleischman, & Obergriesser, 2015; Wong, Harris, Graham, and Butler, 2003).

What are SRLPPs? Aligned with Vygotskian theory (1978), self-regulation encompasses both personal and social forms of learning. The cognitive and metacognitive processes of self-regulation are modeled and internalized through social interactions; this co-regulation with others fosters SRL in the individual learner (McCaslin, 2009). Socially shared regulation expands upon the notion of co-regulation. Encompassing co-regulation, socially shared regulation refers to the regulation of common learning objectives shared within groups to achieve agreed upon goals (Hadwin, Jarvela, & Miller, 2018). Importantly, socially responsible self-regulation is defined as a form of self-regulation that is characterized by learners’ “awareness of self and others (metacognition), a desire to support others’ success (motivation) and the application of strategies that instrumentally support self and others’ learning in socially responsible ways” (Hutchinson, 2013, p. 5).

Within groups (e.g., classroom settings), individuals engage in self-, co-, shared, and socially responsible forms of regulation. Individuals plan, monitor, and evaluate their contributions to the group (i.e., self-regulation), while members within the group provide modelling of cognitive and metacognitive strategies, as well as motivational support (i.e., co-regulation). Together the group might plan, implement, and evaluate their collective actions (i.e.,
socially-shared regulation). It is within this collaboration that socially responsible self-regulation is fostered.

**What does SRL look like in classrooms?** Perry and colleagues (Perry, 1998, 2013; Perry et al., 2018) have identified a set of practices that create opportunities for students to engage in SRL. These practices (shown in Table 1.1) support students’ metacognition, motivation, and cycles of strategic action, often in the context of complex tasks that require creative and/or critical thinking and problem solving.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practices</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Choice</td>
<td>Students are involved in choices that involve higher level decision making (e.g., topics to research, what resources to use; how to organize information; roles for collaborative group members; time management; working conditions, partners)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Over</td>
<td>Students are given opportunities to negotiate with their teacher or independently make modifications/adaptations to learning tasks based on their learning needs and interests (e.g., students work at their own pace; decide on the length of writing assignments; determine presentation formats)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Assessment</td>
<td>Students self-evaluate their work. They are aware of criteria for tasks and have opportunities to assess their on-going progress (e.g., to consider their work in relation to task criteria and their own learning goals).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Support</td>
<td>Teachers provide students with support that is instrumental to their self-regulated learning. They guide students toward independence by supporting their development of skills to solve problems for themselves (e.g., rather than telling a student how to complete a task, the teacher promotes metacognitive thought through questioning [e.g., “Can you think … ”; “What strategies could you use…”]). Teachers support student motivation by using motivational language that emphasizes the role of effort, effective strategy use, and personal growth over external indicators of performance (e.g., grades)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support from Peers</td>
<td>Similar to teacher support, peers provide instrumental versus procedural support. They offer growth oriented motivational messages (as described above). Additionally, discussions with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embedded</td>
<td>Teachers provide students with feedback (verbal, visual or written). Teachers keep records regarding student progress and continually reflect on how students are responding to tasks and teaching strategies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complex Tasks</td>
<td>Teachers engage students in complex tasks. Often, these tasks address multiple goals. They incorporate content goals; goals for the development of cognitive and metacognitive processes (e.g., students are asked to select and evaluate strategies). Complex tasks scaffold student learning (e.g., they teach skills and concepts in a manner that builds upon students current skills and processes). These tasks are meaningful to students and integrate content and skills from across the curriculum. Complex tasks also allow for multiple representations of learning. Students may represent learning in an oral presentation, through a written report, a multi-dimensional model or other visual display).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation for Individual Differences</td>
<td>Tasks, activities, models of assessment are open and flexible. They accommodate differences in abilities and allow for the participation of all students. To this end, adaption in criteria for assessment are made, or can be made, to accommodate individual differences. Additionally, tasks universally designed to enable meaningful participation of all students. Tasks that address multiple learning goals fit learners’ needs and support all areas of SRL.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Perry 1998; Perry, 2013
There are multiple strategies teachers can use to support metacognition, motivation, and strategic action (many of which support several of these processes at the same time). For example, teachers can support students’ metacognition when they make learning visible and provide opportunities for students to gather knowledge about themselves as learners through self-assessment and reflection. Furthermore, students’ metacognition is supported when they have opportunities to increase their understanding of tasks by engaging in familiar routines, have access to visual prompts, and are encouraged to interpret tasks through metacognitive questioning (e.g., What strategy could help solve this?). Additionally, through discourse with peers and teachers, students have the opportunity to gather information about themselves as learners and consider which strategies are task appropriate. In turn, students’ motivation is supported when students are offered choices (e.g., in learning goals and working conditions), provided opportunities for social interactions, and adequately supported to engage in tasks that they find meaningful and optimally challenging. Strategic action develops as students have opportunities to engage in iterative cycles of planning, enacting, monitoring, and adjusting (Butler & Cartier 2004; 2018). Throughout this process, they consider the utility of multiple strategies to support their productive engagement in learning tasks. Strategic action can be fostered before, during, and after students’ engagement in tasks. For example, prior to tasks, teachers and/or peers can provide support for learning through instruction, resources, and information. These forms of instrumental support help students to develop, apply, and revise strategies to meet their learning needs throughout their engagement in tasks. Strategy development occurs when students reflect on the effectiveness of strategies in relation to the task upon its completion.
While research indicates SRLPPs are effective, it also suggests the development of these instructional practices is difficult. According to Brown and Campione (1994), supporting SRL requires both sophisticated awareness of and responsiveness to students’ needs, as well as knowledge and use of complex teaching strategies. Ideally, teachers target students’ “zones of proximal development” (Vygotsky, 1978), providing “just enough” and “just in time” support, thereby allowing students to solve problems independently as much as possible (Perry & Rahim, 2011). Scaffolding learning through metacognitive questioning or modeling, and crafting formative feedback may be difficult for novice teachers (i.e., TCs) who are focused on the procedural and curricular demands of teaching and their own “survival needs” (Fuller & Bown, 1975; Perry et al., 2006; Whitaker, 2000). However, research indicates that TCs can successfully manage the task of supporting SRL if they are given explicit instruction and intensive scaffolding for doing so (Perry et al., 2006).

**Beliefs about teaching and learning.** Along with the complexity of SRLPPs, other constraints likely exist for TCs’ uptake and implementation of SRLPPs. Therefore, in addition to studying contextual supports within the SRL cohort and TEP, my study examined the role of TCs’ beliefs about and motivations toward SRL for supporting (or thwarting) their development of SRLPPs.

**What are beliefs and how are they Connected to TCs’ Learning?** Upon entering TEPs, it is expected that some TCs will have had limited experiences with SRL as an educational focus in their own learning experiences. For these TCs, SRL will be a new construct. Due to their limited understandings and experiences with SRL, some TCs may struggle with questions related to the implementation of SRL and its suitability for diverse learners. These struggles may cause them to question the value and utility of SRL and in turn, their motivation to learn about SRL and
implement SRLPPs. Therefore, when examining potential supports and constraints for TCs’ development and implementation of SRLPPs, a need arises to surface and examine TCs’ beliefs about learning and teaching, particularly as these may relate to SRL.

Beliefs are people’s assumptions and understandings about what is true (Schwitzgebel, 2006). They act as filters, shaping and guiding thoughts, judgments, and behaviours (Brownlee, 2003; Kane, Sandretto, & Heath, 2002; Karavas-Doukas, 1996; Pajares, 1992). In this way, beliefs underlie people’s motivations and actions in all realms of life. Shaped within past learning and teaching experiences, the beliefs TCs bring with them to TEPs have been identified as a leading factor in TCs’ motivation to develop and implement specific practices, including SRL in their classrooms (Farrel & Ives, 2014; Korthagen & Evelein, 2016; Lombaerts, deBacker, Engels, van Braak, & Athanasou, 2009; Pajares). Once formed, TCs’ beliefs about teaching practices are difficult to change, particularly if those beliefs are reinforced in practice and practicum settings (Irez, 2007; Vartuli & Rohs, 2009).

Although relatively stable over time and contexts, Cabaroglu and Roberts (2000) found teaching beliefs (e.g., beliefs about the value and utility of educational practices) are malleable, particularly if they are addressed early within teachers’ careers. TEPs have been identified as a particularly formative time for TCs’ development of beliefs about the value of instructional methods (Di Santo, Timmons, & Lenis, 2017; Simmons et al., 1999 in Vartuli & Rohs, 2009). Research has indicated that beginning teachers’ (including TCs’) beliefs can and do change if they: (a) have opportunities to surface, examine, and understand how their beliefs act to shape their practice; (b) are presented with experiences that demonstrate the need for change; (c) witness the effectiveness of the new practices; and (d) receive scaffolding to develop and implement the new practices (Cabaroglu & Roberts; Dignath, 2017). These affordances provide
TCs with opportunities to see new practices modeled and to partake in cycles of planning (forethought), enacting, and reflection, along the same lines as the cycles of strategic action associated with SRL.

TEPs can be an ideal context to surface and attend to TCs’ beliefs about instructional practices. Researchers (e.g., Butler & Schnellert, 2008, 2012; Perry & Hutchinson, 2006) have proposed particular approaches to teacher development and professional learning that attend to teachers’ and TCs’ beliefs. Aligned with SRL theory and teacher belief theory, these models for professional learning include opportunities for teachers to examine their beliefs about teaching, learning, and learners. They engage in collaborative inquiry, planning and enacting innovations to their teaching with support from colleagues and researchers, or teacher educators. Throughout this process, there are multiple opportunities for teachers to reflect on their changing practice, set goals for themselves based on their teaching interests, and adjust practices as needed (Butler & Schnellert; 2008, 2012). Perry et al. (2006) and Michalsky (2014) found that models of teacher development based within SRL promoted belief change within teachers. These foci provide TCs and teachers with new insight into their learning experiences to surface their pre-existing beliefs and design instruction that addresses the unique needs of their teaching and learning contexts.

**Self-determination theory.** SDT provides a broad framework for the examination of contextual features and personal characteristics that impact TCs’ learning experiences. SDT is a motivational theory of human development. It posits that humans have a natural tendency to approach, engage in, and master socially valued practices and challenges in their environments to meet their innate need for learning and growth (Deci & Ryan, 2000; Jang, 2009; Ryan & Deci, 2017). In SDT, optimal human performance is facilitated through the fulfillment of three innate psychological needs: autonomy, competence, and relatedness (Deci & Ryan; Ryan & Deci).
Autonomy refers to both a sense of volition to act and an openness to the influence of others, while still maintaining a sense of choice and freedom about one’s thoughts and actions (Deci & Ryan; Sheldon & Ryan, 2011). TCs and teachers perceive autonomy when they are able to choose instructional practices that are aligned with their goals and values. Competence is the perceived experience of being able to influence and master tasks in one’s environment (Evelein, Korthagen, & Brekelmans, 2008; Ryan & Deci; White, 1959). TCs acquire a sense of competence to the extent that they have access to resources that support their learning and perceive that they can be successful implementing new practices (Ryan and Deci). Relatedness is marked by one’s ability to connect with others and maintain trusting, respectful relationships (Reeve & Assor, 2011; Ryan & Deci, 2002). It is commonly known that teachers’ sense of relatedness is fulfilled when they develop positive relationships with others, particularly with students (Klassen, Perry, & Frenzel, 2012a). However, it remains unknown whether TCs’ sense of relatedness is fulfilled in the same manner.

A person’s need for competence, autonomy, and relatedness are collectively referred to as self-determination needs (SD needs). It is through the fulfilment of these needs within nurturing environments that people become increasingly internally motivated, therefore more likely to invest energy in self-regulating their engagement in learning and professional settings (Deci & Ryan, 1985; Ryan & Deci, 2017). Akin to sociocultural theory, SDT posits contextual features work in tandem with people’s motivational orientations. Deci and Ryan conceptualize motivational orientations as tendencies people have to seek external or internal motivators for behaviour. They identify three motivational orientations: autonomous, controlled, and impersonal. To some degree all learners hold all three motivations; however, one is usually dominant. Learners who hold a mainly autonomous orientation are more likely to be internally
motivated. They perceive that they can determine outcomes through their actions, so they take responsibility for their learning and actively seek supports within their environment (e.g., they ask for feedback and take advantage of supports provided). In contrast, individuals with a mainly controlled orientation are more prone to seek external supports for their motivation. They seek highly structured learning opportunities with very clear outcomes. Externally oriented individuals focus more on rewards and social comparisons than their autonomous peers. They may look for assurances of success and avoid challenge for fear of failure and personal or public penalties/humiliation that might accrue from it. Individuals with an impersonal orientation demonstrate behaviours associated with learned helplessness. They believe that outcomes are not within their control but are associated with luck and fate—they lack a sense of autonomy. As a result, they tend to be anxious, disengaged from learning situations, and avoid challenge or change.

Motivational orientations shape people’s perceptions of, and reactions to, contextual supports and constraints for their autonomy, competence, and relatedness. Motivational orientations impact the extent to which people seek support for their development of new practices and skills. Based on this theory, an autonomous orientation and support for autonomy should align well with SRL theory and practice. Therefore, TCs with an autonomous orientation may find the ideas and values presented in the SRL theory resonate more fully with them than TCs with controlled or impersonal orientations, who may be challenged by these ideas and values.

In 1985, Deci and Ryan described motivational orientations as “relatively stable” across contexts. However, Reeve, Bolt, and Cia (1999) challenged this framing in an educational context. They sought to explore the impact of contextual conditions on TCs’ motivational
orientations. Reeve et al. found that contextual features that support or hinder the fulfillment of TCs’ SD needs appeared to influence their motivational orientations and, in turn, their teaching practices. When TCs with controlling motivational orientations were instructed and trained to use autonomy-supportive instructional methods (e.g., they were provided with information about why these practices were important, and explicit examples of practices that support students’ autonomy), their motivational orientations became more autonomous and they used fewer controlling teaching practices. In a second study, Reeve et al. demonstrated that when TCs were provided with supports for their competence (information about practices, rationales, models), and the freedom to assess the utility of practices for themselves, their motivational orientations within specific contexts were changeable. These findings indicated that motivational orientations are likely more fluid than Deci and Ryan (1985) originally proposed, and suggested there may be opportunity to shape orientations over time through features of the contexts in which people function.

How and whether the TCs in the Reeve et al. (1999) studies continued to develop and use autonomy supportive practices over time as well as if they became integrated into their values and sense of teaching identity remains unknown. However, the research of Reeve et al. aligns with research about teacher beliefs (see: Dignath-van Ewijk, 2016; Irez, 2007; Kiehues, Bromme, & Stahl, 2008; Korthangen, 2004) and warrants further examination. Specifically, research is needed that examines whether and how TCs’ motivational propensities toward seeking supports for their learning and their needs for autonomy, competence, and relatedness are implicated in their beliefs about learning, teaching, and implementation of complex teaching strategies, like those associated with SRL. SDT, along with theory and research about teacher
beliefs, provides useful frameworks for examining how the TCs in my study took up SRL theory and practices.

**Study Overview**

I examined the experiences of four TCs enrolled in a 12-month TEP at a university located in western Canada to understand how their personal characteristics (i.e., beliefs, motivations, histories, and perceived knowledge of SRLPPs) and features of their learning contexts (on campus and in practicum schools) were implicated in both their development of SRLPPs and their valuing and implementation of SRLPPs. TCs were enrolled in a cohort focused on middle years learners (ages 11-14) and SRL—the MY/SRL Cohort. This study took place over the course of 11 months (September 2014–July 2015). During this time, data were gathered from the TCs along with documents related to the program, coursework, and practicum activities. Additionally, information about the TEP and MY/SRL Cohort was gathered during interviews with the TCs’ faculty associates (FAs)—seconded or retired school teachers, now university personnel, that worked with the MY/SRL Cohort. FAs were responsible for overseeing TCs learning in relation to practice. Their role was to mentor TCs, provide feedback on TCs’ practices and support TCs in making connections between their university and practicum experiences. Table 1.2 outlines the research phases, timeline and activities.

**Table 1.2**

*Research Phases, Timeline, and Activities*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Phase</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Research Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Phase 1 (Term1; Pre-practicum) | September - December | The study was introduced to TCs  
FA1 was interviewed  
Program documents were collected and analyzed (general program and cohort information)  
TCs completed a motivational questionnaire (General Causality Orientation Scale; GCOS) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1 (Term 1)</td>
<td>September – December</td>
<td>TCs were interviewed, FAs were interviewed, Phase 1 included 10 weeks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2 (Term 2; Pre-practicum)</td>
<td>January – March</td>
<td>Program documents were collected and analyzed (unit plans, inquiry projects), FA1 was interviewed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3 (Term 3; Practicum)</td>
<td>April - June</td>
<td>Documents were collected and analyzed (unit plans and lesson plans), TCs were observed teaching, TCs were interviewed after observations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 4 (Term 4; Post-practicum)</td>
<td>July</td>
<td>TCs were interviewed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research activities took place in four phases, that aligned with the terms of the TEP. Phases 1 and 2, occurred prior to TCs’ extended 10-week practicum. Phase 3 occurred during TCs’ extended 10-week practicum, and Phase 4 after TCs’ 10-week practicum. In Phase 1, TCs were enrolled in campus-based courses, including an inquiry seminar that invited reflective practice and infused SRL content within TCs’ learning experiences throughout the year. During this time, TCs also visited their practicum schools one day a week and completed a two-week “mini” practicum at the end of November. Personnel involved in supporting them were course instructors, FAs, and school associates (school based mentors). During this period, data collected included: (a) TCs’ completion of Deci and Ryan’s (1985) General Causality Orientation Scale (GCOS) to gather information about TCs’ motivational orientations, (b) a pre-practicum interview probing TCs’ knowledge and beliefs about teaching and SRL and their previous in-school and work experiences, (c) documents pertaining to the context of the TEP and Cohort, and (d) an interview with one of the Cohort’s two FAs (see Appendices C and D for FA consent and interview protocol). FA 1 was the lead FA for the MY/SRL Cohort. FA 1 had extensive
experience supporting the MY/SRL Cohort and was familiar with SRLPPs. FA1 worked closely with the academic leads (two university professors who supported the MY/SRL Cohort) to communicate the goals of the Cohort to the TCs and school associates. FA 1 also coordinated TCs’ practicum placements and supervised TCs in their practicum placements. FA 2, a retired school administrator new to the Cohort, supported FA 1 to supervise TCs in their practicum settings. Both FAs acted as representatives of the university in TCs’ practicum contexts and oversaw and assessed TCs’ development over the course of the program. I chose FA 1 as a key informant for the study because this FA had past experience working with the MY/SRL Cohort and was knowledgeable about what TCs in the MY/SRL Cohort experienced, program-wide.

In Phase 2, TCs were engaged in on-campus coursework four days a week and continued to visit their practicum classrooms one day a week. TCs were also enrolled within their second inquiry seminar, in which they began to investigate research questions they had developed in the previous term. During this phase of the study I conducted an interview with FA2 (See Appendix D) and collected documents from TCs for analysis (e.g., developing unit plans and inquiry projects).

In Phase 3 of the study, TCs’ learning experiences were exclusive to their practicum settings. TCs were placed within middle years schools in local school districts to complete their six-week (extended) practicum. Over the course of the extended practicum, TCs gradually assumed teaching responsibilities, teaching approximately 20% of the time in the initial weeks of their practicums before assuming 80% of teaching responsibilities. During this phase of the TEP, TCs’ supports were primarily FAs and school associates. In this phase of the study, I observed TCs in their practicum settings on three occasions (at the beginning, middle, and end of the practicum). Observations documented TCs’ efforts to implement SRLPPs. After each
observation, TCs participated in a short interview to clarify their teaching intentions and how their teaching practices were linked to their interpretations of students’ needs; reflect on their developing practices and perceptions of support for the development of these practices; and identify their ongoing perceptions of constraints and affordances for their learning in the MY/SRL Cohort and TEP program. TC documents, created during their previous on-campus learning experiences, were also collected and examined (e.g., lesson plans, unit plans, inquiry projects). These documents served to supplement data gathered during interviews and observations and to provide insight into TCs’ experiences in the TEP and MY/SRL Cohort.

In Phase 4 of the study, after their practicum had concluded, TCs returned to campus and engaged in full-time (five days a week) coursework led by instructors within the TEP and the final inquiry seminar facilitated by FA1. During this phase of the study, I met with the TCs on-campus to conduct a post-practicum interview. This interview focused on their experiences over the course of their TEP year. It probed their beliefs about and understandings of SRL and SRLPPs and their perceptions of supports and constraints for their development of SRLPPs throughout the TEP.

Data from all sources (the motivational questionnaire, program and course-based documents, interviews, and observations) were triangulated to examine: (a) TCs’ perceptions of social and contextual supports and barriers in their university and practicum experiences for their developing practice, (b) the role of contextual features in their development of beliefs and practices associated with SRL, and (c) how TCs’ beliefs and practices shifted or remained stable over the course of their TEP year. These data enabled me to address the following research questions:

1. What personal characteristics did TCs bring to the TEP?
What were TCs’ work and educational histories?

What were TCs’ motivational orientations?

What were TCs’ emergent beliefs about SRL?

2. What forms of motivational and structural affordances and constraints for developing general teaching practices and SRLPPs did the TCs in this study perceive in their university and practicum settings?

3. How did TCs in this study implement SRLPPs throughout their practicum experiences?

4. How were TCs’ implementations of SRLPPs connected to their personal characteristics and learning contexts?

This dissertation is organized in six chapters. Chapter 2 provides a detailed review of the theory and research used to develop the research questions and methods used to address them. Chapter 3 presents an in-depth overview of the methodology used to conduct this study. In Chapters 4 and 5, the results of the study are presented. Finally, Chapter 6 discusses results in relation to the existing theory and research, and extends to implications and directions for future research and practice.
Chapter Two – Literature Review

In Chapter One, I identified the purpose of this thesis: to examine how personal characteristics and contextual features may be implicated in TCs’ valuing and implementation of complex teaching strategies known to support students’ SRL. In this chapter I examine theory and review research from three fields that inform this purpose: SRL, teachers’ beliefs, and SDT. First, I provide an overview of the theory and research in each field. Then, I offer a comprehensive framework for examining how personal characteristics and contextual features are implicated in TCs’ development of beliefs and practices about SRL and SRLPPs. For the purposes of this thesis, personal characteristics include TCs’ personal histories (e.g., educational and work experiences), beliefs about SRL as a framework for teaching and learning, and self-determined motivations for becoming a teacher. Contextual features are divided into two subcategories: structural and relational. Structural affordances and constraints refer to features of TCs’ TEPs that support (or thwart) their exposure to and development of SRL knowledge and practices (e.g., inquiry seminars, on-campus coursework, practicums, and school associate and FA informational support). Informational support is defined as support TCs’ receive for their planning and development of lessons and units, understanding of SRL, as well as opportunities for TCs to see SRLPPs modelled and receive feedback about their plans and practices. Relational support refers to the presence of positive relationships with students, TC peers, university and school associates (i.e., school-based mentors), and FAs. I also consider how students’ personal characteristics (e.g. learning and behavioural strengths and needs) may impact the quality of TC-student relationships.
Self-Regulated Learning Theory and Research

The following section will further define SRL and provide a description of how the promotion of SRLPPs supports students’ learning and engagement in educational settings. Challenges teachers experience when trying to implement SRLPPs will be discussed, along with current research identifying ways in which TCs and teachers can be supported in their development of SRLPPs.

**Self-Regulation and Self-Regulated Learning.** Self-regulation is the ability to control and direct emotions, thoughts, and actions toward the achievement of goals in response to environmental demands and considerations (Zimmerman, 2008). The term *self-regulated learning* refers to the metacognitive, motivational, and strategic processes learners use to control, sustain, and direct their behaviour and attention while engaged in learning tasks (Greene, 2018; Winne & Perry, 2000; Zimmerman, 1990; 2008). Self-regulated learners are able to regulate their behaviour, emotions, and thoughts when engaging in challenging learning situations (Hadwin Jarvela, & Miller, 2011; 2018). They use metacognitive processes to assess learning tasks and then plan, monitor progress, and adjust their actions in response to feedback, all to achieve desired goals. Self-regulated learners are persistent and motivated to engage in challenging tasks. To this end, they are able to develop and use a wide range of learning strategies; they have both the ability and the will to adapt these strategies to suit not only their learning needs, but also the demands of specific contexts (Perry, 2013; Rohrkemper & Corno, 1988).

As described in Chapter One, models of SRL are typically viewed as cycles of three phases: forethought, performance, and self-reflection (See: Butler & Cartier, 2005; Winne & Hadwin, 1998; Zimmerman, 2002; 2008). During the forethought phases, learners interpret tasks, articulate learning goals, and create a plan to achieve those goals for themselves. They assess
their repertoire of strategies and select which strategies to apply based on the task at hand. During the performance phase, learners utilize motivational strategies to regulate their emotions, overcome challenges, and persist with assigned tasks. They apply learning strategies, monitor their progress, seek feedback and support if required, and revise strategies as necessary. Finally, during the self-reflection phase, learners reflect upon their performance, use of strategies, and both their challenges and successes within the task through self-assessment. They use this knowledge to then identify, readjust, and set new goals (Butler, Schnellert, & Perry 2017).

A wealth of research demonstrates that the promotion of SRL improves students’ academic, personal, and social functioning in and beyond school settings. In school settings, students’ self-regulation is predictive of academic success (Rimm-Kaufman, Curby, Grimm, Nathanson& Brock 2009; Zimmerman & Schunk, 2011), regardless of SES and social demographics (McCelland & Wanless, 2012; Vernon-Feagans et al., 2016). It is also correlated with improved working memory (Diamond, Barnett, Thomas, & Munro, 2007), literacy and numeracy outcomes (Blair & Razza, 2007; McClelland et al., 2007) and positive development, both emotionally and socially (Cleary & Zimmerman, 2006). In sum, learning conditions that promote students’ SRL support their success in diverse learning, work, and personal contexts. The potential benefits indicated by these findings warrants further research into how teachers and school systems can support student development of SRL.

**SRL as a framework for learning.** In Canada, as with many places in the world, it is widely recognized that preparing students to successfully participate in society requires educational initiatives and innovations that enable the development of flexible learning competencies that can be applied to diverse learning contexts (e.g., creative and critical thinking skills, communication skills, problem-solving skills, social responsibility and personal awareness
SRL provides a framework for teachers to develop and implement teaching practices aligned with these competencies. In the following section, I provide a brief overview of SRL research that informs how SRLPPs can be implemented in classroom settings to address the above competencies.

**Overview of SRLPPs**

The implications of teachers’ use of SRLPPs are well documented in educational literature (for example: McCaslin & Good, 1996; Pino-Pasternak, Whitebread & Neale, 2018; Whitebread, Grau & Somerville, 2018; Zimmerman & Bandura, 1994; Zimmerman, 2008). The research indicates that students benefit when teachers promote SRL through multifaceted instructional methods that create learning opportunities and guide students through cycles of self-regulation. Perry and colleagues (Perry, 1998, 2013; Perry et al., 2018; See Table 1.1.) have identified a set of practices that include teachers’ provision of structural supports (e.g., through task design and instructional strategies), opportunities for students to take control of their learning (e.g., making meaningful choices, controlling challenge, and self-evaluating learning), and timely, targeted teacher and peer support. Through these practices, students’ metacognition, motivation, and cycles of strategic action are fostered.

**SRL supportive tasks.** Teachers’ creation of complex tasks that require creative and/or critical thinking and problem solving are instrumental in the promotion of SRL (e.g., Many, Fyfe, Lewis, & Mitchell, 1996; Neuman & Roskos, 1997; Kramarski, 2018; Perry, 1998; 2006; 2013; Perry et al., 2017; Samarapungavan, Manizicopolous, & Patrick, 2008). Complex tasks span subject areas, involve multiple lessons, require students’ active engagement in metacognition and strategic action, support individualized approaches to tasks, and allow for a wide range of responses and products to demonstrate knowledge and understanding (Lodewyk,
Winne, & Jamieson-Noel, 2009). To facilitate students’ involvement in complex tasks, teachers can introduce or prompt learning and behavioural routines (e.g., participation structures for providing peer feedback and/or support). Complex tasks create opportunities for students to engage in cycles of SRL (e.g., forethought, performance, self-reflection). Throughout the task, teachers can provide support and non-threatening feedback that enables students to plan and adjust their course of action to meet task and personal goals (Perry, 2013); in this endeavour, teachers act as both guides and collaborators. They acknowledge students’ autonomy and encourage students to make decisions, create solutions of their own, and engage in tasks in a way that is personally meaningful (Stafanou, Perencevich, DiCinto & Turner; 2004). Complex tasks incorporate multiple individualized learning goals (e.g., goals for comprehending, communicating, subject content). The depth and extended nature of complex tasks provides students with the opportunity to approach tasks at their level of understanding, make meaningful choices (e.g., choices about processes, resources, products), seek and provide peer support, as well as time to reflect upon their engagement and performance (Butler et al., 2017). All of the above teaching strategies require teachers to be acutely attuned and responsive to students’ individual motivational and academic needs (Brown & Campione, 1994; Perry, Hutchinson, & Thauberger, 2008).

Although SRLPPs are beneficial, little is known about how teachers develop these practices and promote them in their classrooms (Dignath & Büttner, 2018). Furthermore, multiple researchers have demonstrated that implementing these sophisticated teaching practices in general classroom settings is challenging for teachers (See: Brown & Campione, 1994; Kramarski, 2018; Perry, 2013; Michalsky, 2014; Spruce & Bol, 2015). For TCs, new to the realm of teaching, the development of these practices is likely particularly difficult. In some
cases, TCs may be placed in classroom and school contexts where they have limited exposure to models (i.e., school-based mentors who are effectively applying SRLPPs). In these contexts, TCs have few opportunities to observe SRLPPs and may not be encouraged or supported to attempt them on their own. Additionally, even when TCs are placed in practicum settings where their mentors model the principles of SRL, several barriers may prevent TCs from fully understanding the complexity of SRLPPs. As Michalsky (2014) notes, mentor teachers’ in-depth understanding of students’ needs regarding SRL and their knowledge of how to structure learning environments to support SRL may not be immediately apparent to TCs. During early teaching experiences, TCs may instead be focused on more obvious and immediate concerns, such as developing classroom management techniques and planning lessons (Fuller & Bown, 1975; Kyriacou & Stephens, 1999). Although SRLPPs are closely aligned with positive forms of classroom management (Sierens, 2009), TCs may not see connections between these goals and SRLPPs.

Moreover, evidence suggests that even in classrooms where mentor teachers are implementing forms of instruction aligned with promoting SRL, mentor teachers may not provide TCs with the support they need to look beyond the procedural aspects of teaching or to push TCs to think in-depth about individual students’ needs (Perry et al 2008; Whitaker, 2000). In their study of TCs learning to teach toward SRL, Perry et al. found mentor teachers, even those who implement practices known to support SRL effectively, had tacit, rather than explicit, knowledge of SRL. Often, they were unable to explain to TCs how and when SRL was occurring in their classrooms. For TCs working with these mentors, this lack of opportunity to have SRL made explicit may have prevented them from linking theory to practice and fully realizing the depth and complexity of instructional methods occurring in their practicum settings.
Given that the development of SRLPPs may be especially challenging for TCs, but highly effective for student learning, it is recommended that we examine further ways in which TCs can be supported to learn about these practices (Michalsky, 2014). Below, I review findings examining how TCs’ understanding of SRLPPs may be facilitated through their university and school experiences.

Supporting Teacher Candidates’ Understanding of Self-Regulated Learning

**Structural supports for TCs’ development of SRLPPs.** Through exposure to multiple examples of theory within research and examples in practice, teachers are able to abstract general theoretical principles to apply and adjust them in ways that meet the learning needs of both themselves and students (Randi & Corno, 2007; Michalsky, 2014). TCs, therefore, are likely to benefit from opportunities to learn about and see SRL theory in practice. However, given TCs’ inexperience, it is probable that they will require support to interpret their observations of theory and to adapt theory to meet the needs of their specific practicum contexts. One way to support TCs in their developing understanding of SRL theory and practices is to make the principles and the practices associated with SRL explicit within TCs’ learning experiences. In this way, TCs are able to link what they see in classrooms to what they are learning in university settings.

Perry et al. (2008) examined how discourse supported TCs’ development and implementation of SRLPPs. These researchers listened to audio recordings of TCs (enrolled in a teaching cohort that focused on SRL) discussing lessons they had implemented with their school associates and FAs. Perry et al. looked at how this discourse facilitated TCs’ understanding and uptake of SRLPPs. Findings revealed FAs were most likely to initiate conversations about SRL in comparison to school associates and TCs (71%, 13%, and 16% of the time, respectively), and TCs’ exposure to SRL content was greatly dependent upon their FA. Furthermore, the quality of
FAs’ conversational support was related to TCs’ implementation of SRLPPs \( (F(1, 42) = 3.8, p = .05, R^2 = .09) \). In short, when FAs made the principles of SRL explicit, TCs were more likely to implement SRLPPs in their classrooms. Of some concern, school associates (with whom TCs work throughout most of their practicum) were the least likely to link TCs’ implemented lessons to SRL theory or to offer suggestions about how TCs could incorporate SRLPPs in their lessons.

Perry et al.’s (2008) study informs my work in several ways. First, it identifies supportive discourse as a means of facilitating TCs’ understanding of how SRL applies and is of value in practicum settings. Furthermore, it provides a detailed description of how FAs successfully scaffolded TCs’ development of SRL. The FA who appeared to be most successful in facilitating TCs’ development of SRLPPs: (a) provided examples or suggestions for the promotion of SRL, (b) offered post observation feedback linked to what TCs did in their lessons to support SRL, (c) used metacognitive questions (e.g., What did you think?), (d) prompted transfer (e.g., identifying how SRL could be integrated in to the lesson), (e) modelled how SRLPPs might apply to the lesson, (f) highlighted SRL in their written observations, and (g) used debriefing outlines that explicitly asked TCs to consider SRL. It appears, then, that structural supports in the MY/SRL Cohort, such as opportunities to consider SRL in the context of debriefing teaching, may facilitate TCs’ understanding and development of SRLPPs. My study further investigates how TCs identify and define forms of support they receive from their FAs and school associates and how these supports may contribute to TCs’ understanding and valuing of SRLPPs.

While the above study indicates school associates may not always make SRLPPs verbally explicit, earlier work by Perry et al. (2006) indicates that when TCs are provided with time and support to reflect on and discuss observed practices within their practicum classrooms, they are able to make connections between theory and practice for themselves. Perry et al. investigated
how and whether structural supports in university and practicum settings contributed to TCs’ development of SRLPPs. During a professional seminar, TCs engaged in cycles of reflection and action (Halbert and Kaser, 2013). TCs were asked to plan and implement tasks that provided opportunities for students to develop and engage in SRL (i.e., tasks that embedded opportunities for students to make choices, control challenge, and self-evaluate learning). Throughout the seminar, TCs observed the SRLPPs of their school associates to consider how and if these practices were reflective of or challenged their own beliefs about teaching and learning. During each seminar meeting, TCs participated in: (a) a free write (writing about their experiences promoting SRL), (b) air time (sharing their experiences about promoting SRL), (c) whole class discussion (directed at providing TCs with informational support about SRL), (d) planning time (for SRL tasks), and (e) a reporting out time (TCs described how they would implement their plans). TC and school associate data was collected in the form of video discussions (with FAs, school associates and TCs), observations (of TCs and school associates in practicum settings), interviews (with TCs), and written documents (free writes and work samples). Findings indicated that 53% of school associates demonstrated high implementation of SRLPPs in their classrooms. Similarly, 47% of TCs received high ratings for their implementation of SRLPPs. In most cases, TCs’ implementation of SRLPPs were reflective of the practices they observed in their practicum contexts.

**Extended learning opportunities.** Perry, Mazabel, Dantzer, and Winne (2018) worked with volunteer music instructors from an inner city after-school music program to foster students’ self-determined motivation through SRL. Many instructors had no formal teaching background. Together instructors and researchers identified and constructed three shared research goals: (a) to support children’s development of SRL, (b) to develop teaching skills that
enhance SRL and self-determined motivation, and (c) to learn and implement evaluation practices to guide the development of these goals. Over the course of three years, researchers and instructors met as a “learning team” on nine occasions (three times annually) to plan and reflect on cycles of inquiry (See: Halbert & Kaser, 2013). Between meetings, researchers supported instructors to implement plans of action suited to their objectives, and to reflect upon their implementation of SRLPPs. Together, researchers and instructors tailored and adapted strategies to fit the needs of students and contexts. Using researcher observations and instructors’ anecdotal comments, Perry et al. (2018) found the above strategies, implemented over time, fostered SRL and self-determination in both instructors and their students.

The results of these studies yield findings of interest for my work. Specifically, these findings demonstrate that TCs and those new to teaching can design and implement complex teaching practices associated with SRL when they are provided with on-going support to do so. Secondly, collaborative forms of learning seem to foster TCs’ and instructors engagement in learning about SRL.

**Attending to TCs’ knowledge of SRL and beliefs about teaching practices.**

Michalsky (2014) examined TCs’ abilities to describe, evaluate, and interpret observed SRLPPs in classroom settings and how their ability to do so influenced their descriptions and implementation of SRLPPs. During the study, 26 Israeli TCs took part in a 24 hour course. During this time, they received instruction about how to notice and describe SRLPPs, viewed videos of experts implementing SRLPPs, and were provided with discussion and reflection time after each video. TCs submitted an analysis of SRL content seen in a video at the beginning and end of the course. Initially, TCs’ descriptions of SRLPPs were brief and limited in their identification of SRLPPs, particularly those related to metacognition, however, by the end of the
Kramarski and Michalsky (2009) examined how supporting TCs’ own SRL contributed to their valuing of SRL and, subsequently, their promotion of SRL in their classrooms. Kramarski and Michalsky explored whether providing supports for TCs’ SRL during a 14-week course (4 hours/week) focused on hypermedia improved their understanding of course content knowledge and their ability to design lessons supportive of students’ SRL (N=95). TCs in this study were divided into two groups. During all classes, both groups of TCs were provided with: (a) a short lesson about hypermedia technology, (b) practice time, (c) discussion time, (d) reflection time, and (e) a summary of the lesson’s content. In addition, the experimental group received metacognitive support in the form of comprehension questioning (e.g., What is the task’s goal?), strategy use (e.g., What are the tools and strategies to solve the task?), and reflection (e.g., Does the task make sense?). Online reflections and self-report measures of their use of SRL strategies were collected. Upon completion of the course, TCs were asked to design a lesson about hypermedia. Researchers analyzed these lessons to find evidence of course content knowledge and SRL content.

Kramarski and Michalsky (2009) found the provision of metacognitive support improved TCs’ ability to self-regulate their own learning and resulted in improved comprehension of course content and their design of SRL supportive tasks (Cohen's $d = 1.64$ and 0.74, for comprehension and design skills, respectively). These findings suggest that providing TCs with supports for their own SRL may increase the likelihood of TCs fully understanding pedagogical content and planning tasks that can support students’ development of SRL. However, the findings from this study are limited, in that TCs who received support for their SRL did not
implement their designed lessons in actual classroom contexts. Researchers in this study inferred that TCs who were able to incorporate SRL strategies in their lesson plans may be more likely to use SRLPPs in classroom settings. However, no observations of TCs implementing these lessons occurred. It may very well be that TCs in the group that received support for their SRL were more able to recall and explicitly include SRL features because they had the language and experience to do so. In this study, whether and how TCs’ knowledge of SRL translates into actual practice in real class settings remains unknown.

Recently, Dignath and Büttner (2018) investigated how teachers’ valuing and understandings of SRLPPs influenced their use of them within their classrooms. Using video observations of teachers with varied levels of experience, these researchers examined how secondary math teachers promoted SRL in their classrooms. Following observations, teachers were interviewed using a semi-structured interview protocol designed to prompt teachers to share their views about SRL. While Dignath and Büttner found teachers used SRLPPs (e.g., provided cognitive strategies, created learning environments conducive to SRL), very few teachers taught or discussed the metacognitive strategies during their interviews. Despite this lack of implementation, teachers indicated that they valued the role of metacognition in promoting SRL. They explained that they hesitated to actively promote metacognitive strategies within their classrooms due to their lack of knowledge about metacognition. The results of this study suggest that, when teachers value SRLPPs, they can implement these practices when they feel competent in doing so. Therefore, as other researchers have noted (e.g., Keller-Schneider, 2014), examining ways to provide teachers, and by extension TCs, with learning conditions that support their understanding of SRLPPs is of particular importance.
Both Perry et al.’s (2006) and Kramarski and Michalsky’s (2009) studies provide evidence that TCs’ development of SRLPPs is linked to their observations of SRLPPs. Despite these findings, several unknowns remain. For example, in Michalsky’s (2014) study, TCs’ implementation of SRLPPs was not examined. Within Perry’s (2008) study, some TCs’ in low-SRL practicum environments displayed high levels of SRL implementation, while other TCs in high-SRL practicum settings demonstrated low levels of SRL implementation. Why? All TCs in the university setting received the same instruction. Their school associates’ level of implementing SRLPPs may have shaped their practice to some degree; however, it appears other factors may have contributed as well, such as TCs’ beliefs about SRL and SRLPPs and their motivation to implement them. My dissertation examines these issues further. Specifically, data about TCs’ on-campus and practicum experiences was collected and used to examine TCs’ interpretations of SRLPPs, their perceived utility of these practices, and their implementation of SRLPPs in practicum settings.

Supporting Teachers’ and TCs’ Development of SRLPPs

Findings from the above studies indicate that TCs benefit from: explicit instruction of SRL theory and SRLPPs, opportunities to observe and discuss SRLPPs, instruction that attends to TCs’ own SRL and beliefs, and instruction that takes place over an extended period of time. Below I present two approaches to professional development from the literature that address these supports for TCs’ learning.

Explicit instruction: Dual Role Training Program. Recently, Kramarski (2018) proposed a model, The Dual Role Training Program, to support TCs’ and teachers’ development of SRLPPs. Kramarski’s program provides opportunities for TCs to: become familiar with SRL theory, receive instruction about practices that promote SRL, engage in reflective thought, and
learn in interactive environments with knowledgeable others. Throughout the program, TCs and teachers view and analyse videotapes of “live” teaching scenarios of experts modelling SRLPPs. In these sessions, TCs have multiple opportunities to see SRL in practice within authentic classroom contexts. They also have access to ongoing, in-situ support for their learning, as well as ongoing opportunities to reflect on their promotion of SRL through discussions with knowledgeable others.

Collaborative inquiry. Butler and colleagues’ (Butler, Lauscher, Jarvis-Selinger, & Beckingham, 2004; Butler & Schnellert, 2008; 2012) research with practicing teachers provides further insight into how supports for teachers’ SRL and the provision of explicit supports for teachers’ promotion of SRL may facilitate the translation of SRL theory to practice. Building upon Lave and Wenger’s (1998) Communities of Practice model, Butler and Schnellert designed a collaborative inquiry framework for professional learning that provides a forum for teachers to discuss their teaching experiences and share their development of theory and practice. Within Butler and Schnellert’s framework, instructional coaches (district based teachers, literacy teachers) and teachers work together to develop theory and practice. Coaches provide teachers with knowledge about theoretical concepts. Teachers in turn provide researchers and their teaching colleagues with information about how they use and sometimes adapt theory to meet the needs of students in particular settings. In this way, the development of practice and theory are viewed as flexible, united constructs, rather than separate, unchanging entities.

To scaffold teachers’ adjustment to this role and to support their ongoing engagement in the development of new practice, teachers are provided with supports for their SRL (Butler & Schnellert, 2008, 2012). Teachers engage in ongoing cycles of inquiry and SRL: they identify a focus for learning, frame an inquiry question, plan an approach to investigating the question, take
action within their practice, reflect on outcomes, and adjust their practice and theory as needed to meet the needs of students (Butler & Schnellert, 2008; Butler et al., 2017; Kaser & Halbert, 2013). Regularly scheduled meetings provide support for teachers’ SRL by creating opportunities for teachers to: (a) receive informational support (e.g., scaffolding from coaches); (b) meet with other teachers, often from various schools, and district personnel to share their experiences; (c) think about and reflect upon and evaluate their practice; and (d) receive support to interpret and adjust theory and research to suit their professional practice (Butler, 1998).

Butler et al.’s (2004; 2008) results indicate that teachers who participated within this model of professional development were more apt to experiment with, adjust, and reflect upon strategies that supported students’ SRL. Furthermore, teachers reported using more SRLPPs in their classrooms (Butler et al, 2008) and valued the opportunity to be treated as partners in the development of teaching practice (Butler et al, 2004). Importantly, given Dignath and Büttner’s (2018) findings, these teachers described more frequently using metacognitive questioning to support students’ learning. Additionally, teachers indicated their use of SRLPPs increased meaningful classroom discussions and helped them focus more on students’ learning processes.

In a following study, Butler and Schnellert (2012) investigated how teachers participating in cycles of inquiry (described above) used students’ reading assessments to set learning goals for themselves as learners, for their practice, and for students. To gather insight into the extent that teachers were engaging in specific SRL processes (planning, enacting, reflecting and monitoring, and adjusting), researchers used a rubric to judge the depth and quality of the teachers’ involvement in each of these processes. Teachers received scores ranging from 0 (no involvement) to 5 (high involvement) for each SRL process. The mean score of teachers’ enactments of classroom practices that attended to the goals they had set for students was
reported as 3.72 out of 5. Teachers’ mean scores for reflecting and monitoring and adapting these goals was reported as 3.22 out of 5 and 2.50 respectively. In all, 89% of teachers reported revisions to their practice. These findings suggest that, for the most part, teachers did enact, monitor, and reflect upon the goals they had set for classroom practice. However, few teachers reported self-regulating their own learning goals (e.g., to learn about a particular theory), focusing instead on improving practice for the benefit of students.

The above findings have important implications for supporting TCs in school environments. It appears most teachers can and do develop and implement practices that foster students’ SRL. However, evidence from these studies also indicate that classroom teachers, and by extension, TCs, need time and support to develop their own learning goals, based within students’ learning needs.

**Summary.** The above overview makes connections between various bodies of work aimed at supporting teachers’ and TCs’ understanding of SRLPPs. Dignath and Büttner (2018), Michalsky (2014) and Perry and colleagues’ (Perry, 1998; Perry et al. 2008) research emphasized how mentors’ (FAs and school associates) explicit discourse, combined with modelling and structural supports in TEPs (e.g., opportunities for TCs’ to reflect on practice, ongoing practicum experiences) acted to facilitate TCs’ development of SRLPPs. Kramarski and Michalsky (2009) took an indirect approach to supporting TCs’ understanding of SRLPPs. They investigated how supporting TCs to be self-regulating learners prompted their understanding of SRL and their ability to apply this knowledge when designing lessons for students. Finally, Butler and colleagues (Butler et al., 2004; Butler & Schnellert, 2008; 2012) and Kramarski (2018) intertwined explicit supports for teachers’ understanding of SRL and engagement in SRL with their promotion of SRL practices in their classroom and university settings.
While each of these research programs focused on different aspects of supporting teachers and TCs to teach toward SRL, several common themes emerged across studies. These included creating opportunities for TCs/teachers to have embedded opportunities to: (a) learn about SRL theory and why it is important, (b) learn with others, and (c) engage in extended practice over time. These themes align with Randi and Corno’s (2007) view that the “transfer” of theory to practice involves teachers’ “mindful abstraction of general principles that can be applied to new situations” (p. 340). More recently, Ord and Nuttal (2016) referred to this concept as the *embodiment of knowledge*, a knowledge TCs form through having multiple opportunities to “test” the applicability of theory in real life settings paired with the time and experience to integrate this knowledge into their sense of self.

**Teacher Beliefs**

This section will provide a general definition of beliefs and describe the role of beliefs in shaping teachers’ development of classroom practices with particular focus on implications for TCs. Current research examining teachers’ beliefs about SRL will be reviewed and limitations of this work discussed. Finally, structures for supporting teachers/TCs to assess their beliefs will be presented.

**What are beliefs?** Beliefs are a person’s understanding and assumptions about what is true. According to Irez (2007), beliefs are the basis of all intentions and behaviours. Shaped by actions, contexts, and past experiences, beliefs are unique to each individual and, once formed, are relatively stable in nature (Cabaroglu & Roberts, 2000; Irez, 2007; Tillema, 2000). Beliefs link pre-existing knowledge with perceptions of what is happening in the present, thereby affecting a person’s: (a) comprehension of events, (b) engagement and selection of activities, (c) behaviour, and (d) judgments about their experiences (Brownlee, 2003; Irez, 2007; Kane et al.,
In summary, beliefs are a mental filter for all new knowledge (Pajares).

Although beliefs are shaped and influenced by contexts, they are generally stable. This stability of beliefs allows people to create generalized frameworks to guide their thoughts and behaviours across time in a wide variety of experiences and contexts. While this stability is beneficial in many ways, the inflexibility of beliefs can be detrimental to the assimilation and accommodation of new knowledge and behaviours (Freisen & Besley, 2013).

**Teachers’ and teacher candidates’ beliefs and practices.** Parjares (1992, p. 308) described beliefs as “the most valuable psychological construct to teacher education.” Beliefs are important predictors of teachers’ classroom behaviour, performance, and decision-making abilities (Irez, 2007). The beliefs teachers hold about teaching and learning affect their use of instructional practices and behaviour in classroom settings—they shape teachers’ instructional pedagogy (Farrell & Ives, 2014; Minor, Onwuegbuzie, Witcher & James, 2002; Pajares, 1992; Richardson, 1996). Therefore, indirectly, teachers’ beliefs shape students’ trajectories: they determine what teaching orientations and practices teachers will adopt, and how teachers relate to and support students, which, in turn, likely impacts student outcomes (Kuzborska, 2011; Milner, 2005; Staub & Stern, 2002).

TCs enter their TEPs with pre-existing beliefs about educational practices formed while they were students or engaged in teaching-related experiences (e.g., volunteering in classrooms, tutoring, coaching). These beliefs may or may not be congruent with the goals of their TEPs (Mansfield & Volet, 2010; Pajares, 1992). Often tacit in nature, these pre-existing beliefs act as a foundation for new knowledge and practice (Farrell, 2015; Lofstrom & Poom-Valickis, 2013). In
this way, beliefs influence TCs’ engagement with and use of instructional practices (Barnard, Crooks, Lan & Paton, 2008; Farrell & Ives, 2014; Milner, 2005; Tsai & Chuang, 2005).

Very few studies have examined both teachers’ beliefs about SRL and the value teachers place on supporting students’ SRL. Lombaerts and colleagues (Lombaerts, deBacker, et al., 2009; Lombaerts & Engels, 2007; Lombaerts, Engels, & Athanasou, 2007; Lombaerts, Engels, & van Braak, 2009) developed three teacher self-report scales to identify teachers’ beliefs about SRL, their implementation of SRLPPs, and their perceptions of the support they receive for their promotion of SRL. The Self-Regulated Learning Teacher Belief Scale is a 10-item self-report scale used to assess teachers’ personal beliefs about the value of SRLPPs (Lombaerts, deBacker, et al., 2009). The Self-Regulated Learning Inventory for Teachers is a 23-item self-report scale that assesses teachers’ implementation of specific SRLPPs in their classrooms (Lombaerts et al., 2007). Lastly, the Self-Regulated Learning Contextual Influence Scale is a 17-item self-report scale that examines teachers’ perceptions of supports (e.g., supports from school, community, and educational policy) for their implementation of SRLPPs (Lombaerts & Engels, in Lombaerts, Engels, & van Braak, 2009).

Lombaerts, Engels and van Braak (2009) used these scales to examine relationships among teachers’ perceptions of contextual supports for their implementation of SRL (e.g., presence of a collaborative environment, supportive curriculum), their beliefs about SRL (the suitability of SRL practices in elementary schools), their past experiences implementing SRL in classroom settings (experiences supporting “individualized learning”), and their self-reported use of SRL practices (providing opportunities for students to engage in cycles of forethought, performance, and reflection). Participants in their study were 172 teachers in Belgian elementary schools. Findings from this work revealed a statistically significant positive correlation between
teachers’ reported use of SRLPPs and their beliefs about the suitability of these practices in elementary school settings \((r=.37)\). In addition, a statistically significant positive correlation was found between teachers’ reported use of SRL practices and their past experiences supporting independent learning in their classrooms \((r=.33)\). These findings suggest that teachers’ beliefs and their levels of experience supporting SRL are related to their use of SRLPPs. Of interest, in this study only teachers’ personal characteristics (e.g., age, beliefs, past experiences with SRLPPs) appeared to be related to teachers’ self-reported use of SRLPPs. No statistically significant correlations were found between teachers’ identification of contextual supports for their promotion of SRL and their reported use of these practices. The authors strongly suggest readers interpret these results with caution, citing previous (unreported) findings indicating that contextual conditions influence teachers’ use of SRLPPs (Lombaerts & Engels, 2007 in Lombaerts, Engels, & van Braak, 2009).

Recent evidence from Yan (2018) supports Lombaerts, Engels and van Braak’s (2009) findings. Yan investigated 873 teachers’ (primary and secondary) beliefs about SRL and their implementation of SRLPPs via a self-report questionnaire. Yan found that teachers’ positive beliefs about the utility of SRLPPs in fostering student learning predicted their self-reported use of SRLPPs. However, Spruce and Bol (2015) found teachers’ beliefs and self-reported implementation of SRLPPs were not congruent. Unlike previous studies, the methodology of Spruce’s and Bol’s study included interviews, surveys, and observations. These instruments allowed for more nuanced results than survey methods alone. The researchers concluded that, although teachers stated they valued SRLPPs, these statements were not aligned with their actual classroom practices.
The equivocal results of these studies demonstrate a need for further investigation into the role of teachers’ beliefs in their implementation of SRLPPs. It also seems prudent to examine characteristics of the contexts in which teachers are being asked to develop SRLPPs (e.g., Are they supportive or challenging?) along with the quality of professional development they receive. Moreover, the above studies indicate a need to conduct research inclusive of actual observations of TCs’ and teachers’ implementation of practices, in addition to providing opportunities for TCs and teachers to describe in their own words (i.e., through interviews) the contextual conditions that shape their beliefs about and development of these practices.

Regardless of the current limitations of research in this field, several important themes arise from a review of the literature. For example, it becomes apparent that TCs and teachers need opportunities to surface and attend to their pedagogical beliefs. Research indicates that the creation of these opportunities is most beneficial to TCs’ learning trajectories if they begin early in TCs’ educational experiences and continue throughout their TEPs (Tillema, 2000; Vartuli & Rohs, 2009). It is through this process that TCs have the opportunity to articulate and consider how their pre-existing beliefs fit with and/or shape their interpretations of (and orientation to) new practice.

A question remains about how best to provide TCs with a forum to examine their beliefs. This question has been, and continues to be, a central topic of research in the field of teacher beliefs (see Chong, 2011; Dignath-van Ewijk, 2016; Irez, 2007; Karavas-Doukas, 1999; Ke & Rue, 2016; Milner, 2005; Pajares, 1992; Spruce & Bol, 2015; Tillema, 2000; Vartuli & Rohs, 2009). A summary of research findings indicates TCs’ beliefs are best addressed through structures that provide them with opportunities to: (a) identify their beliefs, (b) make their pre-existing beliefs explicit, (c) challenge and examine their beliefs, (d) gather new knowledge about
practice, (e) apply new knowledge to practice in supportive contexts, and (f) reconstruct their beliefs throughout their TEPs. These opportunities allow TCs to continually “review, assess, and test their personal systems of beliefs” through cycles of theory, application, reflection, and reconstruction (Cabaroglu & Roberts, 2000, p. 399). They enable TCs to examine, select, assimilate, and accommodate new knowledge with their pre-existing knowledge and systems of beliefs — or in Ord and Nutell’s (2016) view, through this process TCs are able to “embody” new forms of knowledge.

Below, I explore how contextual conditions can be created in professional and educational settings to provide TCs with opportunities to consider their beliefs about new practices through an SDT framework. Connections will also be made between the provision of contextual supports for TCs’ motivation and their exploration and personal valuing of practices promoted in their professional programs, which in my study will be practices associated with the promotion of SRL.

**Self-Determination Theory**

The following section provides a brief overview of SDT and identifies what supports and constraints exist for people’s self-determined motivation and learning. Research about how SDT applies in employment and educational settings is reviewed. Subsequently, supports for employees’ and students’ self-determined motivation and learning are mapped onto instructional practices associated with SRL. This section concludes with an examination of supports for teachers’ and TCs’ self-determined motivation and how these supports may contribute to TCs’/teachers’ development of SRLPPs.

**Self-determination theory overview.** SDT offers a lens through which to view personal characteristics and contextual features that might foster TCs’ understanding and development of
SRLPPs. SDT is a scientifically grounded framework for examining barriers to and supports for “optimal” human functioning (Sheldon & Ryan, 2011). This theory assumes that people are driven towards growth, specifically the desire to contribute and connect to society, and to master challenges in their environments (Ryan & Deci, 2017). According to SDT, this innate drive towards positive growth is where cultural values and behaviours are learned, assimilated, and maintained (Sheldon & Ryan).

Across cultures, internal motivation to engage in social practices is nurtured by the satisfaction of three basic psychological needs, autonomy, competence, and relatedness. Autonomy refers to a person’s sense of volition to act, to be open to the influence of others, and yet maintain a sense of choice and freedom about their thoughts and actions (Ryan and Deci, 2017). Competence is defined as people’s perceived experiences of being able to influence and master tasks within their environments (Evelein et al., 2008; Ryan & Deci, 2017; White, 1959). Relatedness is the perception of being able to connect with others and maintain trusting, respectful relationships (Reeve & Assor, 2011; Ryan & Deci, 2002; 2017). Collectively these needs are referred to as self-determination needs (SD needs; Chirkov, Ryan, & Sheldon, 2011; Ryan & Deci, 2017). The fulfillment of these needs has been associated with positive outcomes including increased adaptability, task engagement, vitality, self-confidence, and well-being (Howard, Chong, Bureau; 2017; Reeve & Jang, 2006; Ryan, 1995; Ryan & Deci) — all of which facilitate not only people’s ongoing growth, but also their full engagement in their surroundings. Conversely, conditions that thwart the fulfillment of these needs hinder personal growth (Howard et al.; Jang, Reeve, & Halusic, 2016; Reeve, 2015; Ryan, 1995). When SD needs are not met, outcomes include increased negative emotions, behaviours focused on self-protection, and decreased cognitive flexibility and self-determined motivation, often resulting in
maladaptive functioning and stagnation in personal growth (Baard, 1994; Evelein et al., 2008; Ryan & Deci, 2017; Sheldon & Ryan, 2011).

**Forms of motivation and regulation: an SDT perspective.** SDT distinguishes between three motivational orientations, referred to as causality orientations. These motivational orientations (further described below) include amotivation (absence of motivation), controlled (external) motivation, and autonomous (internal and self) motivation (Deci & Ryan, 2017; Reeve, Ryan & Deci, 2018). Five forms of motivational regulation are identified in SDT, each related to the level of autonomous motivation that individuals experience and the degree to which their behaviours are self-determined (Reeve, Ryan, & Deci; Roth, Assor, Kanat-Maymon, & Kaplan, 2007). The least autonomous form of motivational regulation is controlled regulation, which occurs when people perceive an outer locus of control/causality (e.g., they engage in tasks for external rewards) (Deci & Ryan, 2008; Vansteenkiste, Lens, & Deci, 2006; Ryan and Deci, 2017; Reeve, Ryan & Deci). The second form of regulation, introjection, is also dependent upon external sources of motivation, although it is influenced to some degree by internal processes (e.g., internally controlled behaviour that is performed to bolster self-esteem) (Deci & Ryan, 2008; Ryan and Deci; Vansteenkiste, Lens, & Deci). The third form of regulation, identified, is mainly autonomous (e.g., people understand the value of a given task/activity and determine whether or not to engage in it) (Ryan & Deci). The fourth form of regulation, integrative, occurs when tasks are performed to achieve a desired outcome, but are aligned with personal values (Ryan & Deci). Finally, the most autonomous form of regulation is internal, which occurs when behaviour is performed solely for the meaningfulness of the activity itself (Ryan & Deci).

**Causality Orientations and Contexts.** In SDT, motivational (causality) orientations describe the forms of regulation people are likely to use and the extent to which they seek
features in their environments that are supportive of autonomous, controlled, and amotivated forms of motivation (Deci & Ryan, 2008). While people hold all three motivational orientations (autonomous, controlled, and impersonal) to some degree, one form of motivation is generally dominant in learning contexts (Deci & Ryan, 2012). SDT posits that people’s motivational (referred to as causality orientations) are formed through dialectic interactions between people and the contexts in which they function over time (Reeve, Ryan, & Deci, 2018). People’s perceptions and orientation to supports for their motivation in their environments are shaped by their motivational orientations (Vallerand & Ratelle, 2002) which in turn are determined by the extent to which they have been exposed to environments that support their motivational needs (Reeve, Ryan & Deci). People with mainly autonomous motivational orientations perceive a sense of choice about engaging in behaviours, and orient themselves toward features in their environments that support self-determined (autonomous) motivation (e.g., seek feedback and personal challenge). Conversely, those who mainly hold controlled motivational orientations are sensitive to features in their environments that provide external indicators of their performance (e.g., rewards); they rely on external forms of motivation to support their engagement in activities. Finally, impersonal motivational orientations are people’s beliefs that outcomes are not in their personal control. Those who hold impersonal motivational orientations demonstrate an absence of motivation (amotivation) to engage in their environments (Ryan & Deci, 2002).

The motivational orientations people hold are known to influence their engagement in activities, emotional well-being, and performance. In comparison to those with controlled motivational orientations, people with autonomous motivational orientations have been found to demonstrate higher levels of self-regulation, engagement, perceived competence, relatedness with peers and authority figures, cognitive flexibility, performance, and well-being (Baard, Deci,
& Ryan, 2004; Black & Deci, 2000; Deci & Ryan, 2008; Deci & Ryan, 1985; Williams & Deci, 1996; Reeve, Ryan, & Deci 2018). In turn, those with controlled motivational orientations report higher levels of self-consciousness, power seeking and competitive behaviours, anxiety, depression, and self-degradation (Deci & Ryan, 1985; 2008). People with impersonal orientations are prone to apathy, withdrawal, and a tendency towards maladaptive environmental influences, all of which promote feelings of incompetence (Deci & Ryan, 1985; 1991). In the past, these forms of motivational orientations were considered to be relatively stable indicators of how people oriented themselves toward supports for their engagement in activities across time and contexts (Deci & Ryan, 2008). However, as in the case of teacher beliefs, current research indicates that motivational orientations are malleable, and can be influenced by contextual conditions (i.e., contextual support for SD needs) especially in specific contexts (Deci & Ryan, 2000; Gagne & Deci, 2005; Reeve, Nix, & Hamm, 2003; Reeve, Ryan & Deci 2018).

**Contextual supports for motivation.** Autonomy-supportive environments are contexts that provide support for autonomy, competence, and relatedness; they foster the development of people’s autonomous motivational orientations (Baard & Deci, 2000; Reeve & Jang, 2006; Ryan & Deci, 2000). These environments facilitate the fulfillment of all three psychological needs by providing choice, informational support, meaningful rationales, models for socially desired behaviours, and opportunities for self-initiated behaviour (Deci, Eghrari, Patrick & Leone, 1994; Gagne & Deci, 2005; Vansteenkiste, Lens, & Deci, 2006; Reeve, Ryan & Deci 2018). Through the availability of these contextual supports, people have opportunities to: (a) form personal beliefs about the value of tasks, (b) increase their feelings of competence, and (c) collaborate with others, all of which facilitate engagement and autonomous motivation (Baard et al., 2004; Gagne & Deci, 2005; Ryan & Deci, 2017; Reeve, Ryan & Deci, 2018).
In contrast, *controlling* environments hinder engagement and the development of autonomous forms of regulation. These environments limit choice and information; they shape behaviours through the use of rewards and punishments (Black & Deci, 2000). Such conditions serve to undermine personal valuing of tasks, thereby fostering a reliance on external conditions and forms of regulation to elicit, maintain, and promote task engagement (Black & Deci; Reeve, Ryan, & Deci 2018).

**Self-determination theory in the domain of teaching.** In educational settings, a large body of research indicates the provision of contextual supports for teachers’ self-determined motivation increases the likelihood they will use instructional practices known to support students’ self-determined motivation and learning (Korthagen & Evelein, 2016; Liu, Wang, Kee, & Reeve, 2019; Pelletier, Seguin-Levesque, & Legault, 2002; Niemiec & Ryan, 2009; Reeve, 2009; 2016). Not surprisingly, given the overlap in foci across SRL theory and SDT (e.g., developing self- or autonomous regulation), many of the instructional practices associated with support for SRL are also cited in self-determination literature (see: Baard et al., 2004; Deci et al., 1994; Deci & Ryan, 2000; Gagne & Deci, 2005; Lee & Reeve 2017; Pelletier et al., 2002; Niemiec & Ryan, 2009; Perry, 1998, 2013; Perry et al., 2002; Reeve, 2009; 2016; Reeve, Ryan, & Deci 2018; Vansteenkiste, Lens, & Deci, 2006; Zimmerman & Schunk, 2011). Table 2.1 below summarizes common instructional strategies found across SDT and SRL literature.
## Table 2.1

*Instructional Practices that Support Learners’ SRL and Self-determined Motivation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD Needs</th>
<th>Instructional Practices that Support SD Motivation</th>
<th>Instructional Practices that Promote SRL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>Minimize directives</td>
<td>Provide opportunities for students to take control of learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communicate flexible expectations</td>
<td>Individualize expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide choice</td>
<td>Provide choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide rationales for tasks</td>
<td>Give students opportunities to select meaningful tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>Encourage student involvement</td>
<td>Establish familiar routines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide appropriately challenging activities</td>
<td>Structure supports for participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide ongoing scaffolding support for task engagement</td>
<td>Provide appropriately challenging activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide informative feedback</td>
<td>Provide ongoing scaffolding for SRL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Provide informative feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatedness</td>
<td>Respond to students’ needs and interests</td>
<td>Respond to students’ current interests and abilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sustain positive teacher and student interactions</td>
<td>Provide individualized instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Offer teacher encouragement and opportunities for student collaboration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the field of SDT, multiple studies have linked these instructional practices to positive student outcomes (See: Black & Deci, 2000; Pelletier et al., 2002; Jang, 2008; Jang, Deci & Reeve, 2010; Levesque, Zuehlke, Stanek & Ryan (2004); Niemiec & Ryan, 2009; Reeve et al., 1999; Skinner & Belmont, Reeve, 2009; Roth et al., 2007). A summary of this research indicates that when students’ SD motivation is supported, they are more likely to value tasks, perceive an internal locus of causality, and self-regulate their behaviour. Additionally, teachers’ provision of autonomy-supportive environments has also been linked to higher levels of student well-being (Sheldon & Krieger, 2007; Cheon & Reeve, 2017), self-esteem (Deci, Nezlek, & Sheinman, 1981) and task engagement (Cheon, Reeve, Yu & Jang, 2014). In these ways, student effort, persistence, and performance are supported both from internal and external sources.

As in the case of students, teachers too are more willing to attempt and engage in new and challenging activities if their motivational needs are supported. Hardre (2007) found contextual features at all levels of the educational system (e.g., state-mandated performance testing, administrative directives for practice) were implicated in teachers’ experiences of self-determined motivation to engage with educational innovations. At the school and policy level, teachers reported higher levels of SD need fulfillment and an openness to incorporating new educational practices they believe in if they were provided with: (a) meaningful rationales for new educational initiatives, (b) reasonable timelines and performance evaluations, (c) choice in instructional techniques and modes of assessment, (d) access to adequate resources, and (e) a sense of being trusted and valued.

In contrast, when teachers’ self-determined motivation is thwarted by the presence of external forms of control (e.g., rigid directives for practices), their willingness to consider new
educational practices declines (Ryan & Brown, 2005; Ryan & Weinstein, 2009). Together, these findings suggest that “top down” models of professional development, intended to support teachers’ ongoing growth, may make teachers resistant to exploring new practices over time, thereby limiting their engagement in and opportunities to discover the value of new practices for both themselves and students (Butler, Schnellert, & MacNeil, 2015).

**Contextual supports for teachers’ and TCs’ motivational needs: Relatedness.** In Relationship Motivation Theory, a mini theory included within SDT, Deci and Ryan (2014) highlight the importance of quality relationships in fulling people’s need for relatedness. The giving and receiving of autonomy and support characterize quality relationships; relatedness is fostered through such relationships, leading to increased perceptions of attachment and well-being at the individual level (Deci, La Guardia, Moller, Scheiner, & Ryan, 2006; Reeve, Ryan & Deci, 2018). Conversely, when the need for relatedness is unfulfilled, a wide range of negative reactions have been observed, including withdrawal and decreased feelings of well-being (Skinner & Edge, 2002). In most organizational settings, employees identify relationships with colleagues as facilitating their need for relatedness (e.g., Deci et al., 2001). For teachers, their sense of relatedness also seems particularly dependent upon the quality of connections they have with students (Evelein et al., 2008; Klassen, Perry, & Frenzel, 2012a). Klassen et al. found teachers who reported high levels of relatedness with students were more likely to experience positive teacher outcomes (as measured by emotional well-being, exhaustion, engagement, and perceived competence) in comparison to teachers whose main connections were with their colleagues. Evelein et al.’s (2008) earlier work may help with the interpretation of these findings. Evelein et al. found student characteristics were strongly related to the fulfillment of TCs’ need for relatedness. For example, these researchers found TCs who reported fewer children with
problem behaviours in their classrooms also reported higher perceived experiences of relatedness.

Additional findings examining teachers’ sense of relatedness with students suggest the establishment of positive connections with students may impact TCs’ development of teaching and communication practices throughout their practicum experiences. Evelein (2005, as cited in Evelein et al., 2008) found TCs who reported positive connections with students experienced more frequent affirmative interactions with students. These interactions, in turn, increased the likelihood of TCs demonstrating behaviours that sustained constructive teacher-student exchanges and facilitating the development of positive emotional climates in classroom settings (Evelein). Evelein’s findings suggest that TCs’ establishment of positive and productive connections with students may also be related to a reduction in students’ disruptive behaviour; however, the direction of this relationship is unknown.

For TCs who are developing their identities as teachers, it may also be the case that they are more prone to seek relationships with their TC peers/colleagues than teachers who have been practicing for some time. TCs may view their relationships with peers/colleagues an important means of gathering information about the teaching profession and receiving feedback. In this way, teacher colleagues may be central in fostering TCs’ sense of relatedness. My study examines further whether and how TCs’ perceptions of relatedness with school associates, FAs, peers, and students facilitate their perceived self-determined motivation and their development of SRLPPs.

**Contextual supports for teachers’ and TCs’ motivational needs: Autonomy.**

Experiencing a sense of autonomy supports authenticity; it allows people the freedom needed to implement practices in a way that is congruent with their own values, beliefs, and
sense of self (Evelein, 2005). When a person’s perceived autonomy is thwarted, they are likely to feel threatened, leading to increased defensive and resistant behaviours, as well as disengagement from activities as a means of self-protection (Skinner & Edge, 2002).

In the case of TCs, supports for autonomy may be especially relevant. The beliefs TCs hold upon entering their programs will initially act as a foundation for their professional beliefs (Lofstrom & Poom-Valickis, 2013). For TCs to authentically accommodate new knowledge into their existing belief systems, they need the freedom and space to explore their beliefs and interpret and develop teaching practices that “fit” into their existing values and beliefs (Evelein, 2005). If TCs are placed in environments that lack supports for their autonomy, their focus may be on self-protection rather than on the successful development and implementation of new knowledge and practices. In this way, the provision of contextual supports for TCs’ autonomy has the potential to greatly impact their beliefs about SRL and their development of SRLPPs both positively and negatively.

Little evidence exists exploring the effect of autonomy-supportive environments on TCs’ adoption and implementation of teaching practices in practicum settings. However, links between teachers’ perceived experiences of autonomy and their use of instructional strategies and practices are well documented. Hardre (2007) and other researchers (see Carson & Chase, 2009; Deci & Ryan, 2002; Lam, Cheng, & Choy, 2010; Pelletier et al., 2002; Reeve, 2002; Roth et al., 2007) cite school and district level support (e.g., teachers’ perceived freedom to choose teaching methods and assessment procedures) for teachers’ perceived autonomy as leading factors in teachers’ motivation to engage in work-related tasks and educational initiatives. Additionally, Taylor, Ntoumanis, and Standage (2008) along with others (Marshik, 2010; Pelletier et al., 2002; Reeve, 2002; Reeve & Jang, 2006; Ryan & Brown, 2005) provide evidence
that links teachers’ perceived fulfillment of autonomy with their use of teaching practices associated with SDT and SRL. A summary of the findings from these studies indicates that when teachers’ needs for autonomy are fulfilled, they are more likely to: (a) experience higher levels of self-determined motivation, (b) provide students with meaningful rationales for tasks, (c) minimize controlling forms of classroom management and instruction, (d) encourage student input, (e) create opportunities for students to make choices and decisions, and (f) provide instrumental support—which, combined, provide support for students’ SRL and SD motivational needs.

The above evidence drawn from teacher populations suggests that the provision of support for autonomy may increase the likelihood of TCs attempting practices known to be supportive of students’ self-determined motivation and SRL. However, the extent to which TCs’ personal characteristics and contextual features of their TEPs shape TCs’ perceptions of autonomy and their development of SRLPPs remains unknown. This study examines connections between these constructs.

**Contextual supports for teachers’ and TCs’ motivational needs: Competence.** School level influences appear to have the greatest impact upon teachers’ perceived sense of competence; when administrators ensure reasonable workloads and coordinate opportunities for staff development, teachers feel that their needs for competence are supported appropriately (Lam et al., 2010). In addition, teachers’ perceived experiences of competence and self-determined motivation have been positively influenced through constructive informational feedback from administrators, mentors, colleagues, and students (Elliot, McGregor, & Trash, 2002). This informational feedback provides teachers with ongoing guidance, allowing them to
better implement and refine their practice over time (Elliot et al.; Pelletier & Sharp, 2009; Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2007).

Higher levels of teacher efficacy increase the likelihood that teachers will engage in, and persist with, challenging teaching practices directed at improving student outcomes (Jesus & Lens, 2005; Schellenbach-Zell & Cornelia, 2010). Additionally, when teachers feel efficacious, they use fewer controlling classroom management techniques, encourage student autonomy during problem solving tasks, provide appropriately challenging activities, and persist in supporting students with learning challenges (Podell & Soodak, 1993; Woolfolk, Rosoff, & Hoy, 1990). Viewing this research from an SDT perspective, teachers with high self-efficacy (i.e., teachers who have high levels of perceived competence for teaching tasks) are more apt to use student-centered forms of classroom management (supporting autonomy and relatedness with students), support student choice during tasks (supporting autonomy), scaffold student learning, and provide students with instrumental support (supporting competence). Recently, and more specific to SRL, Dignath and Buttner (2018) found that teachers who reported higher levels of knowledge about SRL felt more competent in their understandings of SRL and were more likely to implement SRLPPs in their classrooms in comparison with teachers who reported limited understandings of SRLPPs.

In the case of TCs, research indicates that reasonable workloads, constructive feedback, and supervisory guidance in planning and designing lessons are of particular importance in raising TCs’ perceived levels of competence (Carson & Chase, 2009; Evelein et al., 2008). Moreover, TCs’ espoused beliefs about the value of the utility of SRLPPs also appear to be associated with feelings of competence. Perry, Brenner, and Collie’s (2012) findings indicated that when TCs perceived SRLPPs to be useful (i.e., they helped them perform other teaching
tasks, such as managing problem behaviour and accommodating diverse learning needs in their classrooms), they were more likely to report higher levels of perceived competence.

While limited, this evidence suggests that TCs’ beliefs, combined with motivational and structural supports in their TEPs, may foster their feelings of competence and, in turn, their engagement in developing new practices. There now exists a need to further identify the presence of supportive and non-supportive conditions that may act to shape TCs’ competence and engagement in particular practices throughout their TEP. Additionally, further information needs to be obtained exploring how TCs’ motivational orientations and beliefs about SRL interact with and shape how they respond to and make use of the contextual supports available to them in their practicum and university settings.

**TCs’ and teachers’ motivational orientations, contexts and instructional practices.**

As posited by SDT (Reeve, Ryan & Deci 2018), motivational orientations and contextual features appear to act together to shape teachers’ perceptions of self-determination and use of professional practices. Taylor et al. (2008) demonstrated this interaction by examining relationships among school contexts, teachers’ motivational orientations, and their use of instructional strategies in physical education classes. Taylor et al. found teachers’ motivational orientations and their perceptions of contextual factors (e.g., administrative pressure) predicted their perceived feelings of autonomy, relatedness, and competence. The fulfillment of these needs in turn led to increases in teachers’ self-determined motivation and their use of autonomy-supportive teaching practices.

In the case of TCs, few studies exist that investigate the relationships between TCs’ perceived self-determination and their teaching practices and experiences (see Reeve et al., 1999; Evelein et al., 2008; Korthangen & Evelein, 2016). In 2016, Korthangen and Evelein
investigated the relationship between Dutch teacher candidates’ (N=36) need fulfilment and their classroom interactions. TCs’ perceptions of their SD needs were initially measured with the Basic Psychological Needs Questionnaire (Sheldon, Elliot, Kim & Kasser, 2001). Over a 14 week period, TCs then self-rated their classroom interactions on a questionnaire entitled, Questionnaire on Teacher Interaction (Reis, Sheldon, Gable, Roscoe, & Ryan, 2000). This measure provided data about TCs’ “proximity” behaviours, or behaviours that indicate a balance between “control and “submission” in interactions between TCs and students within their practicum setting. A balance in these behaviours indicated TCs were interacting with students in an autonomously supportive manner (e.g. teacher leadership with space for student voice, flexible expectations, and structures for support). Results from this study indicated a strong correlation between TCs “leadership behavior” (autonomy supportive practices with structure) and their perceptions of competence (r=.93, p=.001).

Early evidence of the impact of contexts on TCs’ causality orientations emerged from a series of laboratory controlled studies Reeve, et al. conducted in 1999. Reeve et al. found TCs with autonomous motivational orientations (as measured by the General Causality Orientation Scale; see Deci & Ryan, 1985) were more likely to listen and respond to students, use fewer directives, encourage student initiative, and focus less on seeking student compliance. In contrast, TCs who exhibited more controlling motivational orientations demonstrated lower levels of self-determined motivation to teach, were less socially engaged with students, and were more controlling in their interactions with students. However, when TCs with controlling motivational orientations were provided with a rationale explaining the importance of supporting students’ self-determined motivation and given specific strategies to do so, they significantly increased their autonomy-supportive instructional behaviours. Reeve et al.’s study provides
evidence that, as in the case of teachers, TCs’ motivational orientations act in tandem with contextual features to shape teaching practices. Perhaps of even greater importance, this study provides compelling evidence of the malleability of motivational orientations in specific, albeit experimental, contexts.

Evelein et al. (2008) extended Reeve et al.’s (1999) work by examining TCs’ perceived fulfillment of SD needs in authentic settings. Evelein et al. found that TCs’ perceived relatedness appeared to be related to the group of students that they were teaching (TCs taught three different groups of students throughout their practicum). In turn, TCs’ perceptions of fulfillment for their needs for autonomy and competence were influenced most by: (a) the TCs’ teaching experiences during single lessons, (b) the time lessons were taught during TCs’ practicum (at the beginning, middle, or end of their practicum; measured at six time points throughout the practicums), and (c) TCs’ personal characteristics (variance in responses by individual TCs). These findings suggest TCs’ experiences of need fulfillment are fluid—they change in response to TCs’ experiences teaching individual lessons and throughout their TEPs.

**Extending Current Research**

The findings of Evelein et al. (2008) and Korthangen and Evelein (2016) reveal a need to attend to TCs’ motivational experiences in addition to their acquisition of knowledge about teaching practices throughout their TEPs. In summarizing their study, Evelein et al. put forth several recommendations to extend research examining the connections between TCs’ motivation and their teaching behaviour. These researchers call for future studies that: (a) clarify the connections between TCs’ perceptions of SD need fulfillment and their practicum teaching experiences, (b) more thoroughly identify and examine contextual features that serve to support or hinder TCs’ experiences of need fulfillment throughout their practicum, (c) investigate how
TCs may be better supported throughout their TEPs, and (d) attend to TCs’ motivation and learning over a prolonged period of time.

Other researchers have also cited the need to investigate more thoroughly the role of contextual features and personal characteristics on TCs’ and teachers’ motivation and development of teaching practices (e.g., Klassen, Perry, Gierl, & Shanahan, 2012b; Klassen et al., 2012a; Klassen, Tze, Gordon, & Betts, 2011; Lombaerts, Engles, & van Braak, 2009). Klassen et al. (2012b) have begun to examine how motivational variables (e.g., self-efficacy, perceived fulfilment of SD needs, engagement, and commitment) may be related to TCs’ and early career teachers’ implementation of teaching practices. However, Klassen and colleagues (see Klassen et al., 2011; Klassen et al., 2012a) also acknowledge more research is needed that seeks to understand how contextual features influence teachers’ self-efficacy, perceived fulfillment of SD needs, engagement, and motivational orientations.

Furthermore, both Lombaerts, Engels, and van Braak (2009) and Steinback and Stoeger (2016) call for more in-depth studies examining the connections between contextual supports and barriers for teachers’ development and implementation of SRLPPs. Specifically, Lombaerts, Engels, and van Braak cite a need to further examine teachers’ perceptions of contextual supports and the actual availability of these supports in teaching contexts. Additionally, these researchers recommend that future studies examine teachers’ personal characteristics (e.g., level of experience, educational experiences, SRL experiences, “eagerness to innovate”) in relation to their development of SRLPPs.

Finally, a need clearly exists to investigate TCs’ and teachers’ understanding and use of SRL and SD promoting practices in authentic classroom settings using more varied methods of data collection. Randi and Corno (2007) indicate that there is a need for TEPs to attend to TCs’
development of a solid theory base, a base that will allow TCs to evaluate, select, and apply theory to meet the needs of students in the contexts in which they teach. To this end, further studies are needed to better understand what features of teachers’ and TCs’ workplace and professional learning environments enable them to become reflective practitioners and use theory to select practices that foster the SD and SRL of students. With the exceptions of Perry (1998; 2013), Butler and Schnellert (2008, 2012), and Reeve, Jang, Carrell, Jeon, and Barch, (2004) few programs of research exist that investigate teachers’ implementation of SRLPPs and/or support for students’ self-determined motivation in actual classroom settings. While Perry and Butler have used multiple methods in their studies to gather information about teachers’ promotion of SRL, most studies in the fields of SDT and SRL have relied heavily on self-report questionnaires to learn about teachers’ practices. As a result, these data may not be an accurate reflection of what is actually occurring in classroom settings.

Integrating multiple perspectives to extend current research. The following section will provide a brief overview of how research from the fields of SDT, SRL, and teacher beliefs can be integrated to examine the role of personal characteristics and contextual features in TCs’ orientation to and development of SRLPPs.

Pulling It All Together: Beliefs, Motivation, and Learning

Teachers’ beliefs shape teachers’ instructional pedagogy by determining what teaching orientations and practices teachers will adopt (Milner, 2005; Minor et al., 2002; Pajares, 1992; Staub & Stern, 2002; Richardson, 1996). TCs enter the MY/SRL Cohort with varying beliefs that may or may not align with SRL practices. Although outwardly beliefs appear to remain stable, they are continually shaped by experiences and contexts. Therefore, it seems important to provide TCs with opportunities throughout their TEPs to examine their beliefs about teaching
and learning so they are able to consider how these beliefs might support or thwart their openness to new practices.

Research from the field of SDT offers insight into the role of TCs’ beliefs in shaping their engagement in their TEPs. Specifically, SDT suggests that TCs’ beliefs about their own motivational orientations and their valuing of instructional practices are open to change if contextual conditions are in place that support TCs’ engagement in new practice. In order for people’s beliefs to change, SDT identifies the need for informational support and scaffolded instruction to facilitate their feelings of competence when engaging in new activities. SDT also recognizes that relationships and the need to feel connect to others often shapes what people choose to learn (i.e., what they value). Finally, SDT acknowledges the importance of providing people with the autonomy to engage in learning experiences in a way that fits with their prior knowledge and (life) goals. Through an SDT lens, the provision of these supports is what underlies people’s internal motivation to engage in tasks so that they are able to gather information and make judgments about the value and worth of activities for themselves.

In SRL theory and teacher belief theory, similar organizational structures are identified as supporting people’s openness to and valuing of new practices. Research from the field of teacher beliefs indicates TCs’ and teachers’ beliefs about the value of new practices are best addressed when TCs and teachers have opportunities to: (a) identify and make their beliefs explicit (Irez, 2007, Pajares, 1992), (b) challenge and examine their beliefs (Pajares), (c) gather new knowledge and practice (Kiehues et al., 2008; Tillema, 2000), (d) apply new knowledge and practice in supportive contexts (Kiehues et al.; Tillema; Trent, 2011), and (e) reconstruct their beliefs throughout their TEPs (Tillema; Vartuli & Rohs, 2009).
Similarly, research drawn from SRL theory suggests TCs may be more likely to value and use SRLPPs if they have opportunities to: (a) receive informational support, (b) discuss their practice with others, (c) think about and reflect upon and evaluate their practice, and (d) receive support to continually interpret and adjust both theory and research to suit their professional practice (Butler, 1998). Common among both of these frameworks aimed at addressing TCs’ and teachers’ beliefs and practice, respectively, is the need for people to be provided with supports for autonomy (to interpret and restructure beliefs and practice in a way that is personally meaningful), relatedness (to have their beliefs challenged by others, to discuss new practice with others), and competence (informational support). Research from both SRL theory and teacher belief theory implies these supports enable people to examine, select, assimilate, and/or accommodate new knowledge and beliefs.

Summary

Through the sensitizing lenses of SRL, SDT, and theory about teachers’/TCs’ beliefs, this chapter reviewed research illuminating how personal and contextual features likely affect TCs’ sustained implementation of SRLPPs. This review suggests TCs’ practicum and university experiences play an important role in facilitating TCs’ exploration, construction, and possible reconstruction of their beliefs about teaching, which in turn influences their development of teaching practices (e.g., SRLPPs). Despite the potential importance of attending to TCs’ beliefs and examining how these beliefs are related to practices associated with SRL, little research has taken place in this field to date. When the current study began, with the exception of Lombaerts and colleagues (Lombaerts, deBacker, et al., 2009; Lombaerts & Engels, 2007; Lombaerts et al., 2007; Lombaerts, Engels, & van Braak, 2009), no studies could be found directly examining how teachers’ beliefs about SRLPPs are associated with their implementation of these practices.
The foundational research of Lombaerts and colleagues (Lombaerts, deBacker, et al., 2009; Lombaerts & Engels, 2007; Lombaerts et al., 2007; Lombaerts, Engels, & van Braak, 2009) served to identify contextual features and teachers’ personal characteristics, inclusive of their beliefs, that were associated with teachers’ self-reported use of SRLPPs. However, as Lombaerts and colleagues point out, findings from these studies were limited in two important ways. First, due to the reliance on rating questionnaires in these studies, teachers’ responses were restricted, thereby narrowing their identification of contextual and personal features. Second, much of the data from these studies relied on self-reported measures. Therefore, whether and how contextual features and personal characteristics shaped teachers’ actual implementation of SRLPPs remained unknown. Yan’s (2018) recent study confirmed Lombaert’s and colleagues’ findings. However, Yan’s study was bound by the same limitations noted in Lombaert et al.’s study.

Although Spruce and Bol’s (2015) research begins to attend to these limitations by providing information about teachers’ SRL beliefs, their stated practice, and actual use of SRLPPs, the study was limited to the examination of teachers’ personal characteristics and did not consider contextual features (e.g., mandated curriculum) that might shape teachers’ beliefs and, consequently, their practices. Additionally, these researchers focused their interview questions and observations on a narrow definition of SRLPP (e.g., planning SRLPPs and SRLPPs that support students to monitor and evaluate their progress and work).

My study extends the above research by examining how TCs’ personal characteristics and contextual features of their learning environments were implicated in their beliefs and implementation of SRLPP. Specifically, I examine how the “fit” between TCs’ motivational orientations and beliefs about SRL, and their experiences in their TEP and SRL themed cohort,
shaped their developing practices and their valuing of these practices. SRL theory provides a framework through which to understand TCs’ development and implementation of their Cohort related practice over the course of their TEP. Belief theory supports the examination of TCs’ developing beliefs about SRL and SRLPPs. Finally, SDT provides a framework to examine how TCs perceive features of their learning environments (the TEP and practicum sites support or thwart their valuing and development of SRL and SRLPPs.
Chapter Three – Methods

This study followed four TCs through their TEP and examined how their personal characteristics (i.e., beliefs, motivations, histories, and perceived knowledge of SRLPPs) together with features of their TEP (i.e., motivational and structural supports) were implicated in their development and implementation of SRLPPs. Using case study methodology (Yin, 2009, 2017) and diverse data collection methods, motivational supports (e.g., support for relatedness, competence, and autonomy), and structural supports (e.g., provided through on-campus [coursework, inquiry seminar] experiences, and off-campus [practicum] experiences) for TCs’ development of SRLPPs were examined. Four questions guided the research:

1. What personal characteristics did TCs bring to the TEP?
   - What were TCs’ work and educational histories?
   - What were TCs’ motivational orientations?
   - What were TCs’ emergent beliefs about SRL?

2. What forms of motivational and structural affordances and constraints for developing general teaching practices and SRLPPs did the TCs in this study perceive in their university and practicum settings?

3. How did TCs in this study implement SRLPPs throughout their practicum experiences?

4. How were TCs’ implementations of SRLPPs connected to their learning contexts and personal characteristics?

Positioning Myself as a Researcher

For the past 22 years, I have worked as a classroom and special education teacher in culturally and economically diverse settings. As an educator and researcher, my epistemological
beliefs are rooted in social perspectives on learning that make use of social cognitive (e.g., Bandura, 1977), social constructivist, and social cultural (e.g., Vygotsky, 1978) theories. Fundamentally, I believe knowledge is socially constructed in the context of interactions and transactions with others. Therefore, the extent to which features of learning contexts, including tasks/activities, instructional practices, and interpersonal relationships, offer supports and/or constraints for people’s learning is of particular interest to me.

Although many theories and perspectives on learning are consistent with my sociocultural view, I chose to focus on SRL, SDT and teachers’ beliefs for several reasons. Within my own practice I have come to value SRLPPs as a means of supporting diverse learners. However, through my own teaching experiences and mentoring early career teachers I understand that developing and implementing SRLPPs is challenging. TCs in the MY/SRL Cohort are tasked with learning about SRLPPs within a relatively short period of time. Furthermore, they bring with them to TEPs their own experiences and beliefs about learning that likely shape how they incorporate new knowledge. Therefore, I believe it is important to examine how they can be supported in their development of SRLPPs. In my dissertation, I wanted to examine how TCs’ personal characteristics (i.e., histories, beliefs, and motivational orientations), along with their perceptions of motivational and structural supports within their TEP, shaped their professional learning and development. I chose to examine these questions through multiple lenses—SRL, SDT and teacher beliefs—that attend to the social, contextual, and cultural aspects of learning, teaching and motivation. For example, theory from the field of SRL, originating with the social cognitive tradition, has expanded to include deeper examination of social and cultural aspects of learning. More and more, SRL theorists acknowledge that regulation for learning is a socially shared process, formed within interpersonal, environmental and individual interactions.
Self-regulation for learning is developed and internalized through a process of coregulation (McCaslin, 2009) in which more knowledgeable others scaffold learners development of regulatory processes within their zones of proximal development (Hadwin & Oshige). Similarly, SDT and theory from the field of teacher beliefs situate development and learning within social contexts. Theoretical underpinnings from both fields identify social interactions and contexts (both past and present) as foundational for people’s development of motivation and beliefs (Parjares, 1992; Reeve, Ryan & Deci, 2018). Together, these theories provide a guiding framework for examining how TCs’ personal characteristics and features of their teacher education program are implicated in their professional learning and development.

I view my history and my current status as a student, educator, and mentor as beneficial to my research. This experience allowed me to build practical and theoretical knowledge of SRL, learn how to promote it, and to consider events from multiple perspectives. However, I am aware that my personal history has shaped the way I see and interact with the world and sculpted my views and orientation to specific teaching and learning strategies. My interpretation of the world is confined to my specific perspective. As I collected, reviewed, and analyzed data, I did so with this limitation in mind. Specifically, I tried to address this limitation by analyzing data multiple times and cross-checking each source of data with other forms of evidence (e.g., comparing data collected in observations, interviews, and lesson plans) in addition to having a second reader check my interpretation of data. Furthermore, TCs had the opportunity to member check my interpretations of their experiences throughout the study. In response to member checks, revisions were made to ensure I represented their experiences as authentically as possible.
Addressing power differences. Due to my age, teaching experience, and position as a researcher, it is possible that participants may have perceived a power difference between us. I was aware of this issue and tried to address it throughout my interactions with TCs. Specifically, I tried to alleviate any anxiety TCs might have felt about participating in the study. I assured TCs that I was not in the position to evaluate them and that all data was confidential, meaning it would not be shared with anyone in a position to evaluate them. I encouraged TCs to think about their involvement in this study as a means of gathering additional support for their developing practices. To this end, throughout the study I reiterated to TCs that observations and interviews were a time for them to freely express and reflect upon their teaching experiences. All TCs were invited to review my classroom observational notes and interview transcripts.

Furthermore, as much as possible, I encouraged TCs to think of themselves as partners in the research process and to take charge of their research experiences (e.g., TCs chose dates and times for observations, and locations for interviews, and TCs were invited to member check my interpretations of events at all stages of the research process). TCs also had choice about how they participated in the research as they were free to choose what documents they submitted and whether or not to participate in specific research activities. Also, prior to my visits to their classrooms, I encouraged the TCs to plan as they normally would (i.e., not to try to please or accommodate the researcher).

Research Design and Rationale

Within this study, TCs’ personal characteristics were examined together with the influence of contextual factors on their perceptions and behaviour (Baxter & Jack, 2008; Crabtree & Miller, 1999). Integrating personal and social-contextual frameworks is particularly well suited to research using case study methodology: a design that allows for an in-depth
understanding of dynamic relationships between phenomena being studied and the environments in which they exist (Creswell, 1998; Yin, 1994; 2017).

Case study methodology was used to gather data about TCs’ experiences during their TEP year. Case study methodology has been identified as particularly suitable for research in educational settings (Butler, 2011; Merriam, 1988). One requirement for successful case studies is that they occur within a bounded system (Creswell, 1998; Yin, 1994; 2003). The organizational structure of the TEP provided natural boundaries for the study. TC cases were “bounded” by the TEP, and embedded within the MY/SRL Cohort. Furthermore, although case study methodology requires the acknowledgement of confounding variables, it does not require the phenomena of study (in this case the TCs’ developing beliefs, valuing, and implementation of SRLPPs) be “free” of confounding variables (Baxter & Jack, 2008; Butler, 2011; Creswell; Merriam, 2009; Yin, 2003). The inclusion of unknown and uncontrolled variables allows for the examination of multidimensional and complex relationships between TCs’ beliefs, behaviours, and environmental conditions in authentic school settings (Cresswell; Yin, 2003; 2017; Zimmerman, 2008).

From a practical viewpoint, case study methodology is a form of inquiry that facilitates communication and understanding between the scientific community and practitioners. Case studies require extended, close contact between researchers and study participants. This conduit for communication provides researchers with insight about the application of theoretical knowledge, about how practitioners adapt their practice to respond to pressures and challenges in the systems in which they work. Through prolonged researcher engagement in authentic contexts, theoretical reasoning can become grounded in “real-life” practice, thereby increasing the likelihood that theory will be of relevance and value to those it is intended to benefit. Such
relationships are likely to foster increasingly frequent and open communications amongst researchers, teachers, and institutions (e.g., school districts, universities), thereby facilitating ongoing growth in research and practice.

From a theoretical standpoint, and in view of the goals of this study, researchers in the fields of SRL, SDT, and teacher beliefs have advocated case study methodology as a valuable inquiry tool. Multiple SRL researchers view case study methods as essential in developing an in-depth understanding of the interaction between personal and contextual influences on SRL (Butler, 2011; Corno, 2008; Knobloch & Whittington, 2002; Perry, Turner, & Meyer, 2006). Similarly, researchers from the fields of SDT and teacher beliefs have advocated the use of observational methods and case study methods, respectively, as a means of exploring the role of contexts in shaping teachers’ beliefs, actions, and development of teaching practices in classroom settings (Roth et al., 2007; Irez, 2007). Therefore, case study methods were appropriate for this study.

**Sensitizing lenses.** Three sensitizing lenses - SRL theory, SDT, and theory about teachers’/TCs’ beliefs - provided a framework for the design of this study. Figure 3.1 shows how these theoretical frameworks served to both define and refine research and interview questions, and shaped my decisions to implement particular research methods and instruments used in this study accordingly. Importantly, these sensitizing lenses provided a framework when it came time to code and interpret data.

*Figure 3.1 Sensitizing Lenses*
Context for the study. This study was conducted at a university located in western Canada. The MY/SRL Cohort focused on supporting middle years learners to become self-regulating learners and introduced TCs to SRL theory and research. The focus on SRL fit with the middle years focus because of the unique academic, social, and emotional needs of middle school learners. The framework for promoting SRL in classrooms can support middle school learners’ need to establish their identity and autonomy (Wigfield & Eccles, 2002). Furthermore, the promotion of SRL has been found to be particularly successful with adolescent learners who seek autonomy and social interaction (Germeroth & Day-Hess, 2013). To this end, SRLPPs provide students with opportunities to identify their strengths and needs as learners and create opportunities for middle school learners to take control of their learning (in the context of, e.g., meaningful choices and formative assessment, including self-assessment).

TCs registered for the TEP online. Cohorts were attached to specific school districts and themes (e.g., Self-Regulated Learning; Social Emotional Learning; Kindergarten, Primary...
Program). TCs were invited to indicate up to three themed cohort choices (See Figure 3.2) based upon their learning and teaching interests and their access to specific school districts.

Figure 3.2. Cohort Selection Within the TEP

Self-regulated learning cohort. In the MY/SRL Cohort, one of two FAs (FA 1; FA 2), and two academic leads (university professors) supported TCs in their development of SRLPPs. Each TC was assigned to work with one of 22 school associates throughout the year. School associates were practicing teachers who served as school-based mentors for TCs over the course of the year. FA 1 was selected for the FA role in part because of her interest in and use of SRLPPs in her teaching. FA 2, although not an SRL specialist, had taught for many years and additionally had acted as a school administrator. FA 1 worked closely with the academic leads to communicate the goals of the Cohort to the TCs and school associates and coordinated TCs’ practicum placements. Both FAs acted as representatives of the university in TCs’ practicum contexts and oversaw and assessed TCs’ development over the course of the program.

School districts and school communities. All TCs completed their practicums in middle schools (grades six to eight) based in two large, urban school districts in a western province of Canada. The school districts and province in which this study was conducted operate on the philosophy of inclusion. Therefore, students with exceptional learning needs attend neighbourhood schools and, as much as possible, are included in general education classrooms.
The majority of TCs were placed in District 1, where census data for 2016 (Statistics Canada, 2016) indicates approximately 44% of the population was born outside of Canada and 49% spoke a language other than French or English at home. Similarly, census data for District 2 indicates 40% of the population was born outside of Canada and 41% spoke a language other than French or English at home. As of 2016, 14% and 15% of the foreign-born population was under the age of 15 in neighbourhoods served by Districts 1 and 2, respectively. Both districts served the full range of SES communities.

**Overview of TCs’ Learning Experiences and Research Activities**

Table 3.1 provides an overview of TCs’ learning experiences throughout the TEP and research activities used to examine TCs’ experiences in the TEP. The 12-month TEP was scheduled over four phases that aligned with terms within the TEP: September-December (Phase 1), January-March (Phase 2), April-June (Phase 3) and July (Phase 4). As much as possible, the academic leads and FAs tried to articulate TCs’ on-campus MY/SRL focus and in school/practicum experiences within the structural constraints of the TEP (e.g., the scheduling of TEP courses, the diverse objectives of courses, diverse practicum settings). In the first phase of the TEP (September-December), TCs were paired with a school associate who was anticipated to act as their school-based/practicum mentor throughout the year. Below I present a detailed description of TCs’ learning activities during each phase of the study. In particular, I describe how the Inquiry seminars were used as the primary space to weave content about SRL and SRLPPs into TCs’ learning experiences.
### Table 3.1

**TEP Timeline, Research Phases and Activities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month and Phase</th>
<th>TC Course work</th>
<th>Inquiry Seminars</th>
<th>TC Practicum Experiences</th>
<th>Research Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September Phase 1</td>
<td>Course work: four days a week</td>
<td>Inquiry 1</td>
<td>Teacher job action delays start of School-Based Orientation Practicum</td>
<td>Study introduced to TCs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October Phase 1</td>
<td>Course work: four days a week</td>
<td>Inquiry 1</td>
<td>School-based Orientation Practicum Begins (TCs visit practicum one day a week)</td>
<td>GCOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November Phase 1</td>
<td>Course work: four days a week</td>
<td>Inquiry 1</td>
<td>November 7 School-based Orientation Practicum ends</td>
<td>Pre-practicum interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December Phase 1</td>
<td>Course work: four days a week</td>
<td>Inquiry 1</td>
<td>TCs visit practicum classroom one day a week</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January Phase 2</td>
<td>Course work: four days a week</td>
<td>Inquiry 2</td>
<td>School-Based Orientation Practicum (TCs visit practicum one day a week)</td>
<td>FA (2) Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February Phase 2</td>
<td>Course work: four days a week</td>
<td>Inquiry 2</td>
<td>School-based Orientation Practicum (TCs visit practicum one day a week)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Month</td>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>Course Work</td>
<td>Inquiry</td>
<td>Practicum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Course work: four days a week</td>
<td>Inquiry 2</td>
<td>School-based Orientation Practicum (TCs visit practicum one day a week)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>No course work</td>
<td></td>
<td>School-based Extended Practicum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>No course work</td>
<td></td>
<td>School-based Extended Practicum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>No course work</td>
<td></td>
<td>School-based Extended Practicum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>No course work</td>
<td></td>
<td>June 8 -26: Community field experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July/Aug</td>
<td>Phase 4</td>
<td>Full-time course Work</td>
<td>Inquiry 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Post-Practicum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Phase 4</th>
<th>Course Work</th>
<th>Inquiry</th>
<th>Practicum</th>
<th>Document Collection/Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July/Aug</td>
<td>Phase 4</td>
<td>Full-time course Work</td>
<td>Inquiry 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Post-practicum interviews</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Phase 1.**

Between September and March, TCs participated in teacher education courses, weekly visits to their practicum classrooms, a brief two-week practicum, and the first of three Inquiry Seminars.

**Coursework.** TCs in the TEP participated in six courses, four days/week. TCs in the MY/SRL Cohort took most of their courses together, which meant there were many opportunities for them to make connections with each other. Courses included: Curriculum Development; Human Development, Learning, and Diversity; Education, School, and Social Institutions; Teaching and Learning Language as an Additional Language; Classroom Discourse; and one course focused on Social Studies, Science, or Physical Education curriculum and pedagogy (their choice/specialization). These courses were not specific to the MY/SRL Cohort and, as such, did not necessarily connect to SRL theory and practice. To support connections between TCs’ coursework and the focus of the MY/SRL Cohort, the academic leads working with the Cohort invited course instructors from the TEP to attend workshops that would provide them with information about the Cohort theme in order to help them link SRL to their course focus. However, due to the busy schedules of these instructors, these sessions were poorly attended.

**Classroom visits and 2-week practicum.** TCs visited their practicum classrooms on Thursdays of every week. During the last week of October and first week of November, TCs participated in a brief two-week practicum where they spent 10 days in the classroom. This experience was intended to: (a) support TCs’ integration into school environments, (b) provide opportunities for TCs to observe their school associates’ teaching practices, and (c) allow for TCs to engage in limited teaching experiences (e.g., individual and small group instruction with support from their school associates). This early exposure to the realities of teaching and
classroom life created an opportunity for TCs to begin to bring the theory they were learning about in coursework into practice. They observed what happened in classrooms in relation to the theories and practices they were exploring in the MY/SRL Cohort, and began to build relationships with their school associate and students. In some cases, TCs engaged in limited, supported teaching experiences that offered the opportunity to plan, enact, and reflect on some of the SRLPPs they were reading and thinking about on-campus. After the two-week practicum, they returned to their university classes, continuing with their coursework and visiting practicum classrooms on a weekly basis until the end of the term (mid-December).

_Inquiry 1._ Regardless of foci, all cohorts within the TEP participated in three inquiry-based learning seminars across their TEP year (one per term, except when they were completing their extended practicum). For instructors and academic leads working with the MY/SRL Cohort, the inquiry seminars were one of few opportunities to infuse SRL content within TCs’ learning experiences. One of the academic leads taught each of Inquiry 1 and 2 (academic lead 1 and academic lead 2, respectively) and FA 1 taught Inquiry 3. Inquiry 1 introduced TCs to the inquiry process, using the Spirals of Inquiry Framework (Kaser & Halbert, 2013) – a process of identifying a focus for learning, framing an inquiry question, planning an approach to investigating the question, taking some action, reflecting outcomes, and adjusting to promote ongoing and increasingly deep understandings of the identified topic. The framework maps well onto cycles of self-regulation (see Butler, 1995; Zimmerman, 2002), so it not only supported TCs’ understanding of SRL, but also encouraged them to be self-regulating learners themselves. In the context of carrying out professional inquiry, they engaged in iterative cycles of planning, enacting, reflecting, and adjusting their practice (just as self-regulating learners do), and the instructors of the inquiry seminars modelled SRLPPs to support TCs’ learning.
For TCs, the inquiry process focused on the identification of an educational issue and the framing of a question for investigation (Inquiry 1); planning and enacting an approach to addressing their line of inquiry by engaging in research/professional learning about the issue and/or “experimenting” within their practicum setting (Inquiry 2); and then presenting their findings (Inquiry 3). During Inquiry 1, TCs’ learned about SRL theory, engaged in classroom observations that targeted SRLPPs, and conducted a series of mini inquiries to build their understanding about the inquiry process. Toward the end of Inquiry 1, they developed their own inquiry questions about SRL or an educational issue they were interested in. For example, they could choose to investigate how the provision of choice facilitated students’ engagement in cycles of SRL in science. However, TCs were free to explore an educational topic of their choice but were encouraged to connect it to SRL. There was a lot of leeway to relate SRL to other topics they were covering in their coursework and practicum placements (e.g., they might link SRL to a curricular domain or an aspect of human development or diversity). During this time, TCs were also encouraged to try practices in their teaching during their days in their practicum classrooms, then reflect on implications for their learning and practice.

**Phase 2.**

**Coursework.** Between January and March, all TCs continued with on-campus coursework four days/week. During this time, they took seven courses: Assessment and Learning in the Classroom; Cultivating Supportive School and Classroom Environments; Education, Knowledge, and Curriculum; Literacy Practices and Assessment; and three curriculum and pedagogy courses chosen based on their focus (e.g., Art, Social Studies, Mathematics, Physical Education).
**Inquiry 2.** During Inquiry 2, all TCs began to carry out the inquiry project they proposed in Inquiry 1. They researched their inquiry topics, and developed materials that incorporated practices (including SRLPPs) they wanted to try as part of their inquiry. During their weekly visits to their practicum classrooms, TCs began to collect information related to their inquiry projects. Additionally, if they were provided with the opportunity, they began to experiment with teaching practices associated with the inquiry within their practicum settings. Toward the end of Inquiry 2, TC’s prepared a report on their inquiry project. This report was intended to bridge their inquiry topics with theory, research, and practice. TCs were then encouraged to take their inquiry plans into their extended practicum and reflect on their implementation of their inquiry in Inquiry 3.

**Phase 3.** Throughout the third phase of the TEP (April-June), all TCs participated in an extended, 10-week, full-time practicum experience, followed by a two-week, full-time community field experience (e.g., teaching abroad or working within a local alternative educational setting). Within their practicum settings, TCs implemented units they had designed through coursework and gradually began to assume (by the fifth week of their practicums) full-time (80-100%) teaching responsibilities. Throughout their practicum experience, TCs expected to receive feedback from their school associates as well as regular (approximately bi-weekly) observations and feedback from their FAs. A formal assessment process (including TC self-assessment, school associate assessment, and FA assessment) occurred toward the end of their 10-week practicum. Note that this assessment, and likely much of the support TCs received from their school associates, was focused on general teaching practices. SRLPPs were not part of the formal assessments of TC practices in the TEP.
For the last 3 weeks of June, TCs engaged in a community field experience. For this experience, they had the option of requesting placements in Learning Resource Centers, alternative schools, private schools, or community based-programs. Alternatively, TCs could request a teaching placement abroad. These experiences, in diverse settings, were intended to broaden their understanding of the teaching profession.

**Phase 4.**

*Coursework.* In the final phase of the TEP, TCs took part in classes at the university five days a week. All TCs in the TEP participated in three courses: Aboriginal Education in Canada, Ethics and Teaching, Development Exceptionality in the Regular Classroom, and their final Inquiry Seminar.

*Inquiry 3.* FA 1 led the third and final Inquiry seminar. During Inquiry 3, TCs reflected on their teaching and prepared a professional portfolio that expressed their goals and identity as teachers. TCs also presented their Inquiry Projects and research findings linking theory to their lines of inquiry. These presentations provided TCs with an opportunity to reflect upon their learning, make connections between theory and teaching practices, and finally, to reflect upon the impact of their inquiry as they summarized their research findings and practical experiences. Additionally, TCs’ presentations of their inquiry projects supported the dissemination of their findings, providing opportunities for all of the TCs to gather feedback and connect their research and practicum experiences to those of their peers.

**Participants**

Seventeen of 22 TCs in the MY/SRL Cohort initially consented to completing the GCOS. Among the 22 TCs, six also agreed to participate in remaining research activities (i.e., in the pre-practicum interview, practicum observations and debriefing interviews, and the post practicum
interview). One of these TCs left the TEP in term 1, so data from this case was not included in analysis. A second participant was excluded from advanced stages of analysis because the case record was missing data and I was unsuccessful, despite numerous and varied attempts, to contact this participant to complete member checks, as other participants did, to establish trustworthiness of data. Moreover, this case record did not add to or distinguish itself substantively from the others and, therefore, in order to keep the commitments made with participants, I made the decision to drop this case from analysis. Consequently, four fully participating TCs became the focal cases for my dissertation. Detailed demographic data for these TCs are provided in the case reports in Chapter Four.

**Recruitment**

Participants were recruited to this study with the aid of the academic lead teaching Inquiry 1. Upon receiving approval from the university’s Behavioural Research Ethics Board and the two school districts in which TCs were placed for their practicums, I arranged to attend an Inquiry 1 class early in Term 1 in which all of the TCs in the MY/SRL Cohort were present (N = 22). During the class, I described the nature of the study and distributed information letters and consent forms for the first phase of the study: TCs’ participation in the GCOS (see Appendix A). The academic lead teaching the course was my advisor. To address any perception of coercion TCs may have felt, we emphasized that TCs’ involvement in the study was strictly voluntary and that their decision of whether or not to participate would have no bearing upon their assessment in any part of the TEP. Additionally, my advisor did not participate in data collection or recruitment beyond providing me access to the Cohort during an Inquiry meeting, nor was my advisor aware of which TCs consented to participate in the study. Upon receiving TCs’ consents and after their completion of the GCOS, I followed up via email with TCs to request their
participation in future phases of the study. If TCs expressed interest, I met with them in person to
review the consent form for future phases of the study and to address any questions or concerns
they had about the study. Six TCs were initially included in the second phase of the study but, as
indicated above, one TC withdrew from the TEP and another did not complete all aspects of the
study. A decision was made to focus on the four TCs whose case records were complete.

Data Collection and Analysis

Over the course of 11 months (October 2013–July 2014), participants took part in a
variety of research activities (as outlined in Table 3.1). Research activities were chosen and
designed with the research questions in mind. Originally, the study included interviews with
TCs’ school associates. However, although all school associates were willing to informally
communicate with me throughout the study, they all declined formal involvement in the study.
This was likely due to recent job action that had delayed the start of the school year and placed
school associates under tight time constraints to plan the start up of the year. Below, Table 3.2
shows how research activities addressed the study’s four research questions. Following the table,
I provide a description of each research activity. Due to the unique forms of analysis for each
data source, the specific procedures used to analyze each activity are discussed after each
description.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>GCOS</th>
<th>Pre-Practicum Interviews</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Debriefing Interviews</th>
<th>Post-Practicum Interviews</th>
<th>Document Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What personal characteristics did TCs bring to the TEP?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What forms of motivational and structural affordances and constraints for developing general and SRLPPs did TCs perceive in their university and practicum settings?</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How did TCs implement SRLPPs throughout their practicum experiences?</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How were TCs’ implementation of SRLPPs connected to their personal characteristics, learning contexts, and beliefs?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TC interviews.** TCs participated in five interviews over the course of their TEP year. Interviews included a pre-practicum interview (see Appendix E), three debriefing interviews (after each observation; see Appendix F) and a post-practicum interview (see Appendix G). All interview questions were developed through the sensitizing lenses of SRL theory, SDT, and theory about teachers’/TCs’ beliefs. Interviews gathered information about: (a) TCs’ histories (e.g., Tell me why you decided to become a teacher); (b) program fit (e.g., Would you say this cohort is a good fit for you?); (c) practicum experiences (e.g., Have you had chance to see or use SRLPPs in your practicum setting?); (d) perceptions of affordances and constraints for learning (e.g., Do you feel supported to develop and implement SRL promoting practices?); (e) TCs’ perceptions of congruency across their learning contexts (e.g., Is there congruency between your experiences in the TEP generally—the courses you’ve taken, the theories and practices promoted—and the themes that are part of the SRL Cohort?); (f) relationships TCs were developing (e.g., “What are key relationships in your teacher education experience?”); and (g) TCs’ goals and expectations (e.g., What are your goals for [this practicum] [this lesson]?).

Pre-practicum interviews took place toward the end of October and November, after TCs had been in the TEP for two months. These interviews allowed for insight into TCs’ emerging beliefs about SRL and an opportunity to gather information about their early experiences in their TEP.

Within one to two weeks of conducting interviews, each interview was transcribed and I began reading through the transcripts and listening to the audio recordings to familiarize myself with the data. I checked the congruency between the transcripts and audio recordings and made notes in the margins of the transcripts about non-verbal elements of the interview, such as TCs’ tone of voice (e.g., noted if any of them seemed frustrated). In subsequent readings (ranging from a day to several weeks after the first reading of the transcripts), I began noting first
impressions of meaning and assigning rudimentary codes to data (e.g., freedom to attempt SRLPPs, positive beliefs about SRLPPs). My sensitizing theories provided a broad, overarching structure that focused my analysis on TCs’ perceptions of affordances and constraints for their learning. However, my main goal was to assign codes to data that reflected TCs’ words — what they said about their experiences (Agar, 1996; Saldana, 2003). Therefore, as Glasser and Strauss’ (1967) recommended, all data was considered and summarized in short phrases in the margins of transcripts. In this way, coding was both deductive and inductive. As I read and re-read the transcripts I kept my sensitizing lenses in mind, but also remained open to issues that seemed important to TCs (i.e., reoccurring in the transcripts). Codes — representative of words, phrases, and sentences in the transcripts — were developed to encompass participants’ perspectives and inserted in the margins of the interview transcripts. Initially, all data within the transcripts related to TCs’ teaching and learning experiences was coded. As I progressed through TCs’ interviews (pre-practicum, debriefing 1 through 3, and post practicum), I refined and developed the codes. Codes made from initial interviews helped me assign meaning to the data in subsequent interviews. Throughout the coding process, codes were added and refined as needed to capture participants’ developing understanding of their learning contexts. Furthermore, although many codes were used across all four cases, codes unique to individual TC cases and specific interviews were also developed and assigned. During the coding process, I largely focused on manifest content. However, there was some level of abstraction in the process, as I used my judgement to determine the meaning of data (Viasmoradi, Jones, Turunen, & Snelgrove, 2016).

Throughout the process of interpreting data for different TCs, I continually refined and consolidated codes in an effort to make them increasingly representative of what TCs said about their experiences, or to make them more inclusive of their reported experiences. During repeated
readings of the transcripts, I compared codes across cases to ensure they captured and encompassed related data. I identified and merged redundant codes. For example, initially I identified many codes related to student behaviour (e.g., students not attending, calling out, offering respectful feedback, indicating engagement and interest in lessons). Subsequently I collapsed related codes under the codes of “challenging” and “supportive” student behaviours. Conversely, in some instances, I added codes in order to better capture data. For example, I clarified that “support” FAs and school associates provided was “informational” (e.g., modeling/explaining SRLPPs) and “relational” (e.g., offering emotional support).

Once the coding for all cases was complete, I began to aggregate codes that shared similar characteristics (Glasser & Strauss, 1967), forming descriptive categories (Graneheim & Lundman, 2004). These descriptive categories served as labels for groups of codes sharing similar characteristics (Vaismoradi, Turunen & Bondas; 2016). The categorization of codes was an iterative process. I continually compared categories and codes to examine the relationships between them and I returned to the transcripts to check whether they were representative of TCs’ comments. During this process, I also began to recognize patterns that would later become the themes in my cross case analysis (described later).

Once all codes had been clustered into categories, four overarching categories emerged from the data (see Table 3.3): Personal Characteristics, Relationships, Student Characteristics, and Structural Supports/Constraints. The category of Personal Characteristics included codes related to TCs’ beliefs about SRLPPs, confidence, and motivational orientations. The category of Relationships subsumed codes related to the relational bonds TCs had formed with their school associate, FA, students, and peers. The category of Student Characteristics included codes indicating TCs’ perceptions of students’ behaviour, motivational orientations, and previous
experiences with SRL. Finally, the category of Structural Supports/Constraints included codes related to TCs’ perceptions of freedom to implement SRLPPs, alignment between their learning experiences, the availability of resources (e.g., technology, professional development, sufficient time), and school associate, FA, and peer support. Table 3.3 identifies these categories (highlighted in blue), the subordinate codes associated with them, along with units of text with that are representative of codes.
Table 3.3

Motivational and Structural Affordances and Constraints For TCs’ Development of SRLPPs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories and Codes</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Example of Affordance</th>
<th>Example of Constraint</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCs’ Beliefs about SRLPPs</td>
<td>TCs’ expressions of the utility of SRLPPs in supporting students’ learning and their own teaching practice.</td>
<td>“[SRLPPs are] invaluable … “fantastic way to teach [it enables students to develop] life skills that you need for success and maintaining yourself … supporting mental health and well-being.”</td>
<td>“It’s just not working because of the context … I need something more.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>TCs’ expressions of their abilities to develop teaching practices that will lead to success in the TEP.</td>
<td>“I’d say I’m very confident in terms of like how I feel in a classroom implementing anything”</td>
<td>“I feel defeated! The issue is that I don’t feel like I have the skillset to implement it (SRL) effectively with this group of children.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivational Orientation</td>
<td>TCs’ comments and GCOS suggest an autonomous motivational orientation.</td>
<td>“I want to learn more strategies and understand [SRL] better … I think that all relies on me.”</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationships</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC relationships with peers</td>
<td>TCs’ expressions of their connection with their peers.</td>
<td>“We have a Facebook group … we all remind each other and give support that way … everybody’s really friendly and nice … We try to do study groups and—we’re all trying to help each other.”</td>
<td>“I don’t necessarily relate myself with this group of people.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
[We share] “mistakes when we’re teaching … we share our own resources and own experiences …”

| Relationship with school associate and teachers | TCs’ expressions of their connections to their school associate and/or other teaching staff in the school. Their expressions of being respected and valued by school associates and staff. | “… I feel supported by my school associate. By all the teachers on my team. All the teachers in the school…” | “… any idea that I had had to be presented with my FA in the room, otherwise it was shot down no matter what… [school associate] didn’t support the implementation of the process … [school associate] treated what I was teaching as completely irrelevant and not necessary.” |
| Relationship with FA | TCs’ expressions of their connection to their FA. | “She is like a mini counsellor.” | “[FA] …didn’t really make a point to have a rapport with me.” |
| Relationships with Students | TCs’ expressions of their connections to students. | “We had a connection, and then I was able to better connect and pick up on things.” | “… They complain about my teaching. They complain about what they’re doing. They say that they hate all of my lessons …” |

**Student Characteristics**

| Motivation | TCs’ expressions of students’ motivation to learn and engage in classroom activities. | “…because to me that demonstrated a lot of self-regulation within themselves.” | “The kids do not care at all. I have no idea how to motivate them—at all.” |
| Behaviour | TCs’ expressions of students’ behaviour and on-task engagement. | “I’ve been blessed with very good kids, they’re all very mature.” | “We go outside to do learning and they’re gone! Like they just take off! … … these kids do not have any idea how to regulate themselves.” |
Experience with SRL

- TCs’ expressions of students’ prior experiences engaging in academic practices that foster SRL.

- "([school associate’s name] has done a lot of work with them to get them aware of that and what they need to do for themselves.)

- "… got to the point where they were realizing that they need to change how they’re working or that they did come and see me at lunch and we worked together. That it’s really valuable, but it was a really long time getting them there…"

Structural Supports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Freedom to try SRLPP</th>
<th>TCs’ expressions of having or lacking the freedom to try new practices in subjects of their choice.</th>
<th>“I’m given the freedom to do whatever I want”</th>
<th>“Whenever I offered suggestions on how we could incorporate or integrate subjects, [school associate] said no.”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Associate Informational Support</td>
<td>TCs’ expressions of support for planning, implementing lessons, and developing general and SRLPPs.</td>
<td>[school associate helped] “pinpoint a couple of areas that were weaknesses … [things] to be improved upon”</td>
<td>“I don’t get the feeling I would be emailing my school associate that [school associate] would gladly fill me in on everything that happened during the week.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA Support</td>
<td>TCs’ expressions of FA support for planning, implementing lessons, and developing general and SRLPPs and communicating with their school associate (if required).</td>
<td>“[FA] is amazing at giving constructive feedback” “If I give [FA] a lesson, she will respond to it with all of these questions—how could you make this better? How could you do this? How could you do that? … It really gets me to think about it.”</td>
<td>“I don’t really feel supported by [FA] … comes in and tells me what I’m doing wrong … “</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>TCs’ expressions of sufficient time for them to develop SRLPPs</td>
<td>I learned how to streamline doing that process so much, I was able to get all my planning done on the weekends…it</td>
<td>“I don’t think I had enough time to really fully get at all 60 of them in terms of what they actually needed”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
actually died down even though I had more to do

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>TCs’ expressions of sufficient resources for them to develop SRLPPs</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>“I want to implement technological devices…but not all students have those devices”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- **Resources**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>“…everyone here [in practicum setting] speaks a lot of the same language around [SRL]. It’s not disjointed.”</th>
<th>“It fits in with what I learned at (name of university) before the practicum.”</th>
<th>[within the Cohort]“We didn’t really talk about any strategies for promoting SRL in the classroom. We talked a lot about theory stuff.”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- **Alignment between practicum placement and Cohort focus**

| Subject                           | Description                                                                 | “I’m seeing the school community that’s really promoted [SRL] by the administration and it trickles down.” | “It just wasn’t matching up with like what I’m learning at [name of university] to what I thought would be evidenced in the classroom.” |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

- **Alignment between university and practicum settings**

| Subject                           | Description                                                                 | “I’m seeing the school community that’s really promoted [SRL] by the administration and it trickles down.” | “It just wasn’t matching up with like what I’m learning at [name of university] to what I thought would be evidenced in the classroom.” |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
Once the codes and categories were developed, and all transcripts were coded, an external check of the analysis was conducted. Following Bradley, Curry and Devers (2007) and Saldana (2008) consensus coding was utilized to check that codes were trustworthy – in other words, consistent and representative of the data. Per Bradley et al., an unmarked transcript along with a description of categories and codes was provided to a second coder. The second coder had in-depth knowledge of SDT and SRL theory. Using the category and code descriptions the second coder then coded the data and reviewed the suitability of codes and categories. After the coded transcript was returned to me, I examined the consistency, referred to as interpretive convergence (Saldana), between the second coder’s identification of categories and codes with my coding of the data. This was accomplished by placing codes and units of data the second coder identified within a table. The second coder’s findings were then cross referenced with my own to ensure codes were consistent and representative of the data (see Appendix H). The second coder’s identification of codes generally mapped well onto my coding. However, some discrepancies did arise and were noted (in the table). Specifically, the second coder identified more codes representative of TCs’ motivational orientations while I identified more codes representative of TCs’ beliefs and perceptions of structural affordances and student characteristics. Via email and in person, discrepancies in coding were extensively discussed until consensus in coding was reached and categories into which codes were placed were agreed upon (per Bradley et al.; Saldana).

Observations. Classroom observations provided evidence about TCs’ implementation of SRLPPs. Paired with interview and document data, they also allowed me to link TCs’ intentions (i.e., comments indicating how TCs planned to incorporate SRLPPs into their lessons, SRLPPs
embedded within lesson plans) to their actual observed actions within their practicum settings. Observational data thereby allowed for my examination of TCs’ implementation of SRLPPs.

Observations took the form of running records, per Perry’s (1998) protocol. Perry’s protocol includes three sections. The first section identifies the time, date, TC being observed, school grade, subject, number of students, and the name of the observer. The second section provides space to keep a running record of classroom activities and interactions. The final section includes categories specifically related to TCs’ provision of opportunities for students to: (a) experience choice (e.g., how, where and with whom they work); (b) engage in complex tasks (e.g., extended tasks that span subject areas, involve multiple learning goals, encompass student interests); (c) control their level of challenge (e.g., self-selection of appropriately challenging, meaningful tasks); (d) self-evaluate (e.g., multiple, ongoing, supports that allow students to direct and assess their own learning and performance); (e) access teacher support (e.g., teacher scaffolding for: strategy use, motivational engagement and metacognitive processes); (f) seek peer support (e.g., through collaboration or adaptive help-seeking), and (g) receive feedback from non-threatening evaluation practices (e.g., on-going forms of assessment focused on individual improvement and effort). These conceptual categories, derived from research linking particular practices to students’ development of and engagement in SRL, guided my examination of how TCs supported SRL in their classrooms. For further description of the categories, see Appendix I. Running records were reviewed for the presence/absence of categories and to document whether and how TCs implemented SRLPPs. TCs’ implementation of teaching practices were coded 0-2 to indicate: no evidence of a category, no opportunity to observe (0); presence of a category (e.g., choice), but not in a way that would support SRL (1); and presence of a category in a way that would support SRL (2). This categorical coding scheme helped me to
identify the extent to which TCs were implementing SRLPPs within their practicum settings. However, I did not include numerical codes in my narrative descriptions of cases in order to provide a more integrative narrative.

On separate occasions, two research assistants conducted observations with me, acting as second coders. During these occasions, both the research assistants and myself produced running records. Upon completion of the observations, we independently coded our own running records. Comparisons were then made between the content of the running records and codes of both observers. When discrepancies in coding arose, examples within running records were discussed and a consensus was reached to achieve consistency/consensus across codes (see: Bradley et al., 2007).

Although Perry’s (1998) conceptual categories guided this phase of data collection, codes also emerged from observational data. Through inductive analyses, it became increasingly apparent that a focus on management concerns and strategies were particularly implicated in TCs’ implementation of SRLPPs. For example, all of the TCs noted early in their practicums that they experienced challenges with some aspects of student behaviour (e.g., off-task behaviours, following routines) that challenged their implementation of SRLPPs. Upon examining the prevalence of management concerns across their experiences, TCs’ emergent understanding of management issues and the contextual features that impacted their development of management strategies, a decision was made to create the additional category of management. This category included a wide range of management challenges TCs encountered and strategies they used to create positive and well-functioning learning environments (e.g., calm demeanour, cues, humour). These practices appeared to facilitate TCs’ implementation of SRLPPs; the maintenance of a respectful classroom environment appeared central to their development of
SRLPPs. Therefore, this category was included in analysis. As in the case of other observational categories, management was coded on a 0-2 scale. A code of 0 indicated no management strategies were observed. This was a neutral code (i.e., it does not suggest a missed opportunity or that a management strategy should have been present), whereas a code of 1 indicated that one or more management practices were present but they were used sporadically and did not appear to facilitate or contribute to a respectful classroom environment, and a code of 2 indicated that management practices were used and facilitated and contributed to a respectful classroom environment. For reasons described above, numerical codes were not included in my narrative of cases. After the addition of this category, all interview transcripts were reviewed to ensure data related to management was considered in each case. All categories (highlighted in blue) and codes for observational records are presented in Table 3.4, along with descriptions and examples of codes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Categories and Codes</th>
<th>Descriptions</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>Learning Resources</td>
<td>Students have choice of what resources they use</td>
<td>Students can create and present work in various ways (e.g., document, dictation, video).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Students have choice in where they complete their work (e.g., various work locations in room)</td>
<td>A student asks if they can move to another group to see … TC agrees as long as the student is able to concentrate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td>Students have choice about their approaches to assignments (e.g., the order in which they complete their work)</td>
<td>“Okay I’ll show you how I write my observations but if you have another way that is all right … go ahead”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Partners</td>
<td>Working Partners</td>
<td>Students are able to choose their own working partners</td>
<td>“They get to work in pairs or work with whoever they want.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>Students have choice about how they present final products (e.g., report or PowerPoint)</td>
<td>“In my class, the ones that really love poetry are very quiet and shy, and so I’m hoping to be able to offer where they present to either a partner or a group and it’s on the iPad so I can assess that way rather than in front of the whole class, and I’ll offer those that have a goal to work on their public speaking can try in front of the class.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Students have the option to spend increased time on tasks</td>
<td>Extended time is provided to students who request it</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Control Over Challenge

| Tasks, activities, and discussions are designed to provide students with varied levels of challenge and expectations appropriate to individuals’ learning needs | “I want to make it clear that they do have expectations (referring to teacher assessment); however, they can set the amount that they do.” |

Teacher Support

- **Model Provided**
  - TC provides student with a model of task and assignment
  - Must have legend … shows on overhead an example of how pictures are used in legend … (Minimum of 3 items, maximum of 6 legend items).

- **Verbal and Visual Instruction**
  - Models, diagrams and demonstrations are provided
  - “So, this is the point in the demonstration where we stop and we are going to fill out the sheet [graphic organizer] … I’ll go over it on the overhead … ”

- **Procedural**
  - TC provides students with instructions about how to complete the task
  - “Strategies for note taking … reading the poems aloud, and then I had them record what images come to mind, so I did a little sketch. What sounds do you hear? What feelings do you get?”

- **Reviewing Tasks and Concepts**
  - TC reviews tasks and concepts multiple times to support students’ understanding
  - TC reviews with individual students how to find volume of rectangular solids … reviews formula … provides demonstration …

- **In-Depth Questions**
  - TC uses in-depth questions to guide students to thinking more deeply about concepts and how they will engage in tasks
  - “Okay, how could you record the plot? How could you do these things?”

- **Summarizing information**
  - TC summarizes and simplifies information
  - TC sits next to a student to help them get started. TC reviews and summarizes main points of the instructions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Support for Individual Differences</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Providing Resources</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC provides students with resources to complete task (e.g., planning frameworks, summary of instructions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC gradually lets students move to their own working spots if they are on task.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scaffolding Independence</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC guides individual students towards increased independence (e.g., provides appropriate choices and academic expectations for students’ current level of functioning)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monitoring Progress and Understanding</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC is aware of and monitors individual student needs, strengths and interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I’ll be giving some guidance as to how to refine some of the trends I noticed, okay, you weren’t taking down anything…writing anything here, you might want to go back and find somebody and so I want to look at it as kind of a comprehensive assessment.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC adjusts time expectations for individual students when required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I’d rather go slower and everybody understand something rather than put students through that anxiety.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Small Group Instruction</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC provides opportunities for small group instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC looks around class and says, “Anyone who needs extra help just come over here with a fresh sheet of paper.” Seven students go to get extra help. TC goes over what to do step by step … gets a textbook and a game box to give an example with.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual Support</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC provides opportunities for students to have 1:1 teacher support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Almost all of my time when I’m circulating with a couple of tables that are really far behind and really need the support.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Breaking Up Tasks</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC presents tasks to students in small manageable parts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| TC uses overhead to demonstrate to students how to make a number. “This … see … [counts ticks that create grid] … [students at table are watching and completing their own] … got it? … MR … So here now … we put directions like this and how many coordinates you would like to have … the minimum
Adapting Tasks | TC adapts the difficulty, length, and complexity of tasks to suit individual needs.
--- | ---
Knowledge of Students’ Strengths and Needs | TC demonstrates understanding of students’ learning and behavioural strengths and needs.
Observations | TC observes students’ understanding of concepts and adjusts lesson and support as needed.
Differentiated | Tasks are easily differentiated to offer students multiple entry and exit points and successful engagement.

### Embedded Assessment

**Student Feedback** | TC asks students to indicate if they understand concepts and instructions.
--- | ---
“Can I see everyone’s hands … a five tells me you know what to do; a one tells me you are not sure.”
“I’m going to come around and check and make sure everyone got that …”

Go to student still writing and aids with writing out prediction.

TC gives a student the overhead to provide a model for their own number lines.

“…just playing to their strengths, a lot of students need help in recording notes and stuff … So, whenever I make photocopies of anything now, I’ll kind of pre-fill out some of them … I can tell, like, oh okay, they’re slower right now, I’ll just give this to them.”

“Then I came back and they still had nothing done, and that was after at least 12 to 15 minutes … But they had nothing, so I had to set them both up. And I said, do this do this do this do this, and set it up.”

Long term assignments are presented with options for the amount of content; style of presentation (e.g., final project can contain 3-7 typed or handwritten poems). Resources that are appropriate for students’ varied levels of development are made available (e.g., poetry books ranging in levels of difficulty).
### Assigned Questions
TC uses questions that provide insight into students’ understanding of concepts
Prior to beginning poetry lesson TC asked students to respond to a series of questions identifying what forms of poetry and literacy devices they understood.

### Task
- **Extended**
  - TC provides tasks that extend through multiple lessons
  - “We are going to have few blocks to work on this.”
- **Authentic**
  - TC connects task to the relevance of everyday life
  - TC designs tasks for Health and Career Education class that focuses on online safety. Students are given opportunities to discuss threats and responses to threats, and to make a safety pamphlet for their peers.
- **High Interest**
  - Task is designed to engage students through the use of technology, props, and active experimentation
  - TC dresses as a “mad scientist” with big googles, rubber gloves, and oversized tongs to conduct water density experiment. Students are actively engaging in assisting and making predictions throughout the experiment.

### Self-Assessment
- **Reflection**
  - TC provides opportunities for students to reflect on their learning experiences
  - “I have it on my clipboard to remind students what—especially during their work periods—what are you being asked to do? Oh, okay, well are you on task?”
- **Provision of Criteria**
  - TC provides or creates criteria with students for task
  - “Cartesian plane that you are going to make a map of … when we did this with division one, we made up criteria … criteria is on overhead projector.”
- **Provision of Clear Expectations for Behaviour**
  - TC provides students with clear expectations
  - TC clearly states behavioural expectations and establishes routines for in-class behaviour (e.g., name on board if you leave the room, walk in quietly and gather materials).

### Peer Support
- **Collaboration**
  - Opportunities for students to work together
  - Several students are checking with each other about what to do (observational notes).
Many students are working together to complete task (observational notes).

“So, this is where you pass the story off to everyone in the room.”

Students give mapped coordinates to their peers to decipher and provide feedback.

TC provides students with opportunities throughout lessons to discuss class content with peers (e.g., working in table groups to discuss forms of internet safety).

### Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment</strong></td>
<td>Opportunities to engage in peer assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discussions</strong></td>
<td>Opportunities for small and large group discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proximity</strong></td>
<td>TC moves throughout the room, spending time where needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stating Behavioural Expectations</strong></td>
<td>TC clearly states behavioural expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wait Time</strong></td>
<td>TC provides wait time after requesting student attention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cues</strong></td>
<td>TC has developed verbal and visual cues to gather students’ attention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Students’ Active Involvement</strong></td>
<td>TC plans active, hands-on opportunities throughout lesson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Empathy</strong></td>
<td>TC reacts to student behaviours with empathy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demeanour</strong></td>
<td>Calm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Circulating helping students.

“Okay, I’m going to leave you for now … when I come back, I want to see at least something drawn down here.”

“I’ll wait until I have everyone’s eyes up here.”

“We have a common vocabulary now to be able to use with them.”

Students have multiple opportunities to be involved in demonstrations and hands-on experimentation.

“You seem like you need to get up and walk.”

“I know we have been talking a bit and we are going to carry on and for those doodling you need to put down your pens because this is about your personal safety … I know it might seem silly now, but you never know.”

TC uses calm, composed voice, actions, and expression.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private,</td>
<td>When redirection is needed, TC speaks quietly and privately with student</td>
<td>“I’m noticing that at this table, you’re not able to support each other’s learning right now.” “What do you think that we can do to make this work better?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redirection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Routines</td>
<td>TC has established classroom routines (e.g., how to get materials, routines for entering and exiting room)</td>
<td>“I used the rolling of the dice method to select the tables, and then also we have numbered heads, so being able to roll the dice twice and select a table and then select a student to participate.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with Colleagues</td>
<td>TC works with colleagues to ensure school behavioural expectations are supported</td>
<td>A few students return to the room … they have been sent back by another teacher for not being on task (observational note). The teacher who sent them back to the room spoke briefly to TCs. TCs thanked her for her help.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humour</td>
<td>TC uses humour to engage class</td>
<td>e.g., Dressing up as a “mad scientist” for a science experiment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Unit plans, lesson plans, and inquiry projects.** TCs’ unit plans, lesson plans, and inquiry projects were placed in TCs’ case records. These plans/projects were considered as supplemental data, as it seemed important to view TCs’ larger plans and intentions with their actions during a particular observation. In some individual lessons, opportunities for SRL were limited; however, in the context of the larger unit plan, rich opportunities for students to engage in SRL were revealed. Therefore, these documents were reviewed and summarized to understand TCs’ intentions for supporting SRL and they were helpful when it seemed important to view interview and observation data within a wider context.

**Cross Time Analysis**

Saldana’s (2003) framework for examining qualitative, longitudinal data guided my process of examining changes in TCs’ beliefs about SRL, perceptions of supports and constraints for their learning, and changes in their implementation of SRLPPs over the course of their TEP. Saldana outlines a series of framing, descriptive, and analytic questions to guide the examination of changes in qualitative data over time. I adapted these questions to fit my study and focused on: (a) changes that occurred over time; (b) codes that increased, decreased, or emerged through time; and (c) epiphanies or turning points.

With regard to my research questions, I examined changes in TCs’ perceptions of affordances and constraints for their development of SRLPPs, beliefs about the value of SRLPPs, and implementation of SRLPPs. In particular, I tried to identify “turning points” in TCs’ experiences during the TEP. At all times, I kept the contextual and motivational features surrounding shifts and stability (e.g., availability of supportive relationships, forms of structural support that were available for the TCs, opportunities the TCs were afforded to attempt new
practices) in mind, and considered how these features, along with TCs’ own beliefs, might have shaped their perceptions and use of SRLPPs in their classrooms.

To structure this examination, I created tables for each TC. Initially, in each table, I chronologically ordered units of text drawn from their interviews that were representative of their beliefs and knowledge about SRL, as well as the supports and constraints for their development of SRLPPs. Then, to make the tables manageable, I replaced units of text with their corresponding codes (see Appendix J). I then created similar tables for observational data to examine changes in TCs’ development of SRLPPs. These tables allowed me to examine the stability of TCs’ beliefs about the value of SRL and SRLPPs, their implementation of SRLPPs, and the consistency (or lack thereof) in their perceptions of supports and constraints for their learning throughout the TEP year.

**From Codes and Categories to Themes**

After the intensive exercise of generating codes and categories to cover the experiences of individual TCs, I shifted to a high inference lens to establish and present themes across cases. While categories refer to a collection of similar codes, themes in this study are defined as the integration of codes and categories viewed overtime to capture patterns in data across cases (Braun & Clarke, 2006; Sandelowski & Leeman, 2012; Vaismoradi et al, 2016). Interpretive in nature, themes are comprised of both manifest (e.g., TCs’ words) and latent (my interpretations of TCs’ descriptions) content (Graneheim & Lundman, 2004). For example, during cross case analyses, five themes emerged in regard to the quality of supports available for TCs’ SD motivation. These themes included: (a) opportunities for TCs to see their school associate’s formation of classroom participation structures prior to entering their extended practicum; (b) the provision of freedom for TCs to experiment with practices along with in-situ scaffolded support;
(c) adequate support for TCs to integrate SRL content into their practice; (d) TCs’ perceptions of alignment across their learning experiences; and (e) adequate time and support for TCs to establish relationships in their practicum settings. To facilitate my identification of these themes, I adapted questions from Saldana (2003) as follows:

1. What are the differences and similarities across TCs’ histories, beliefs about SRL, and level of motivation to engage in learning about SRLPPs?
2. Do TCs express similar or different constraints and affordances for their development of SRLPPs?
3. How do TCs differ in their implementation of SRLPPs?
4. How are changes in TCs’ beliefs, perceptions of supports, and implementation of SRLPPs connected to conditions within their learning contexts?

Utilizing these questions to review the data from TCs, I looked for patterns to generate interpretive themes across TCs’ experiences that helped me understand similarities and differences in their beliefs about SRLPPs, as well as their corresponding implementation and development of SRLPPs.

**Methodological Rigor**

Merriam and Tisdell (2016) provide a conceptual framework for promoting methodological rigor, thereby serving to improve the trustworthiness of qualitative analyses. Within this framework, three aspects of trustworthiness are defined: credibility, consistency, and confirmability. Credibility refers to whether or not the study’s findings are representative of what is happening from the perspectives and actual experiences of TCs. In qualitative research, credibility is enhanced by collecting data over long periods of time, conducting research in natural settings, triangulating data, and using multiple methods of data collection and sources of
Conceptualization and design. To bolster the study’s credibility, confirmability, and consistency, I chose theories that articulated broad conceptual categories. Theory from SRL encompassed metacognition, motivation, strategic action, and SRLPPs. Theory drawn from the field of teacher beliefs and SDT provided space to examine TCs’ beliefs about teaching, particularly as it relates to SRL, and their sense of autonomy, competence, and relatedness in their university and practicum contexts. I used these frameworks to support the study’s credibility and confirmability by designing protocols that were sensitive to my research purpose/questions but not too specific, thereby allowing both TCs and FAs to communicate their experiences and perceptions in their own words. I tried to remain open to TCs’ perceptions of their experiences at all times. Additionally, I conducted repeated observations in natural settings within the TEP and provided TCs with multiple opportunities to discuss and debrief their actions and experiences over extended time periods.

Data collection and analysis. During data collection and analysis, I used Saldana’s (2003) and others’ (Butler, 2011; Creswell, 1998; Mathison, 1988; Russell, Gregory, Ploeg, DiCenso, & Guyatt, 2005; Vaismoradi et al., 2013) recommendations for supporting credibility and confirmability in qualitative and, particularly, case study work. To this end, multiple forms of data were collected to allow for triangulation across sources. I kept an audit trail throughout the study (i.e., a clear and thorough record of how data was collected and handled), and

data, as well as member checks. Consistency is the extent to which similar results emerge under similar conditions. Finally, confirmability refers to the extent to which researchers’ findings accurately reflect participants’ words and actions. Below, I discuss how these aspects were addressed throughout all stages of this study (e.g., conception, development, implementation, analysis, and write-up).
maintained frequent and ongoing contact with each TC. Codes and categories were refined as required to remain inclusive of data and to provide clear representations of TCs’ experiences (Vaismoradi et al.). A second coder, who had extensive experience in the areas of SDT and SRL, additionally coded the data to examine the suitability of the chosen codes and categories.

Furthermore, throughout the study, TCs were encouraged to confirm whether my representation of their thoughts and experiences were reflected in the data and write-up. After observation sessions, TCs were invited to view my observational records and provide feedback during debriefing meetings. Throughout the data collection and analysis process, I communicated with each TC participant. On multiple occasions, I contacted them to request additional information or receive clarification of statements made during their interviews.

**Write up.** The goal of this research was to highlight the specific experiences of TCs as they moved through their TEP year in the MY/SRL Cohort. To support the study’s credibility and confirmability during the write-up phase, I tried (as much as possible) to portray TCs’ experiences as transparently and respectfully as possible (Merriam, 2009; Lincoln, Lynham, & Guba, 2011). Consistency, while impossible to ensure in any qualitative research, was supported by the creation of thick descriptions throughout the write up (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016; Brown, 2017). To this end, detailed information was provided about TCs’ practicum contexts, and care was taken to ensure that measures and procedures were thoroughly explained. These descriptions allow readers to judge whether the study’s methods, context, and results are appropriate to generalize to other settings and groups (Center for Innovation in Research and Teaching, 2017). In addition, all case write-ups were sent to TCs to member check. At this time, I encouraged TCs to provide feedback on the write-ups, and clarify and identify any misrepresentations of their
experiences. Case studies were then revised to incorporate any feedback made during the member check process.

Results for the individual cases are presented in Chapter Four and follow each TC’s case record. Chapter Five presents the cross case analysis with a heavier emphasis on themes and patterns.
Chapter Four — Individual Cases

This chapter explores the learning experiences of four TCs—Kendra, Catherine, Marika, and Oriale—over the course of their TEP year. Each case report is organized to address the research questions. Throughout the chapter, I provide low inference descriptions of the data. While discussing TCs’ beliefs, motivations, histories, and perceived knowledge of SRLPPs, as well as motivational supports and constraints for their learning, I try as much as possible to keep my interpretation of data close to their own words. For the interpretation of TCs’ SRLPPs, I use a slightly higher level of inference as I examine the implementation of SRLPPs within Perry’s (1998) Observational Framework for SRL. In Chapter Five, I shift to a high inference interpretation of the data as I present themes and patterns found within the data based on what TCs were saying and doing during their TEP experience.

Kendra

Kendra (age 22) enrolled in the MY/SRL Cohort with a focus on secondary science. Kendra’s decision to enter the teaching profession was rooted in her own experiences as a student. She described how teachers had spent extra time working with her to help her cope with her anxiety as a student (e.g., “They were there at lunch hour, and I could go for homework help. I was that super stressed-out student … They just [helped] me through all of that, and them taking the time to do that is amazing”; pre-practicum interview, November 10, 2014, p. 37). She felt teachers had a “major impact” on her social and academic development.

Kendra entered the TEP with some past experiences working with children and youth. As an undergraduate student, Kendra had acted as mentor and educator in summer education programs (e.g., at a local agricultural farming program and nature society). She expressed that
she enjoyed working with children and youth and felt that the profession of teaching would allow her to contribute to students’ lives in the way her teachers had contributed to her own life.

**Kendra’s Practicum Placement**

Kendra completed her practicum experiences at a recently opened middle school, located in an urban, high SES neighborhood in western Canada. The school was in its first year of operation and encompassed grades seven to nine. Teachers in the school indicated to me that self-regulation was a school-wide goal; however, they did not provide details about how this goal was being accomplished. From entering the facility, it was evident that spaces within the school had been specifically designed to support teacher and student collaboration. Classrooms were arranged in pods with a shared office for teachers in the middle of each pod, thereby creating opportunities for collaborative planning. Walls to the classrooms were retractable, allowing for team teaching and/or joining classes for projects and activities. Classrooms offered a variety of work-spaces, such as standing tables, regular tables and chairs, and wobbly chairs to accommodate the needs of a variety of students. Generally, the students sat at tables in groups of four to six. The school had a considerable amount of technology equipment (e.g., class sets of laptops, iPads, and computers), and each classroom was equipped with both a projector and an Apple TV. There was a strong wireless connection throughout the school. Most students also appeared to have personal technology devices.

Throughout her practicum, Kendra taught and planned collaboratively with all three teachers in her pod and, therefore, worked with three classes (96 students in total; grade eight). Teachers worked collaboratively to plan lessons. Across classes, 33 students were English language learners and four students had special education needs (two students had an autism designation, two students had brain injuries, and two students had learning disabilities).
observed the same class grouping on three occasions. In this class, there were 30 students, 15 were English language learners and one student had a learning disability. There were no educational assistants assigned to any of the classes.

**What forms of motivational and structural affordances and constraints for developing general teaching practices and SRLPPs did Kendra perceive in her university experiences and practicum setting?**

Throughout the TEP year, Kendra’s comments across her interviews indicated many affordances and constraints for her development of SRLPPs. These affordances and constraints *arose from the data* and are indicative both of Kendra’s perceptions of her experiences as well as my interpretations of them. Table 4.1 summarizes these findings. Throughout Table 4.1, notations indicate affordances (A) and constraints (C) for Kendra’s development of SRLPPs. Affordances and constraints listed indicate both personal characteristics and contextual features that were relevant to Kendra’s development of SRLPPs (codes differ across cases). Codes are organized into categories (highlighted in blue). Categories include: personal characteristics, student characteristics, relationships, and structural supports. Also indicated in the table are the data collection points when Kendra discussed specific motivational and structural affordances and constraints for her learning and development of SRLPPs.
Table 4.1

Motivational and Structural Affordances(A) and Constraints (C) For Kendra’s Development of SRLPPs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories and Codes</th>
<th>Pre-Practicum</th>
<th>Debrief 1</th>
<th>Debrief 2</th>
<th>Debrief 3</th>
<th>Post-Practicum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived utility of SRLPPs</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of SRLPPs</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of classroom management</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to cope with ongoing change</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student diversity</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationships</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive relationships with TC peers</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive relationship with School Associate</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive relationship with FA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive relationship with students</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structural Supports</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment between university and practicum settings</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Associate Support</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>AC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA Support</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty support</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support from TC peers</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom to try SRLPPs</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of resources</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New school</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kendra’s Personal Characteristics. At the time of Kendra’s pre-practicum interview, she had been participating in the TEP and MY/SRL Cohort for nine weeks. During her pre-practicum interview, Kendra recalled that she was initially unaware of the Cohort’s SRL focus. She had selected the Cohort because of its emphasis on middle years. Furthermore, Kendra indicated she had limited knowledge of SRLPPs. Despite these facts, her comments during the interview revealed that she valued teaching practices associated with the promotion of SRL. For example, Kendra stated that she believed the Cohort’s focus was a “fantastic way to teach” and thought the SRL focus of the Cohort fit well with her own goal of enabling students to develop “life skills that you need for success and to maintain yourself” (pre-practicum interview, November 10, 2014, p. 5). At this time, Kendra also noted she had some concerns about her ability to adapt to on-going changes in her practicum setting. She commented that she preferred predictable routines and found herself challenged by scheduling changes within her practicum setting.

Overall, Kendra’s responses to items on the GCOS reflected an autonomous motivational orientation – an orientation that aligns with SRL theory and pedagogy. On this measure, Kendra’s responses suggested that when faced with professional or academic failure and success, she tended to seek internal reasons for outcomes (e.g., effort, skill). However, data drawn from her pre-practicum interview indicated that, as a student, she tended to rely on external motivators for engaging in academic tasks. For example, in her pre-practicum interview, Kendra expressed that her academic goal as a student was often, “just check it off the list and that’s good—get an A!” (pre-practicum interview, November 10, 2014, p. 6). Furthermore, she noted that she had struggled with aspects of SRL as a learner (e.g., “goal setting, being able to manage your emotions, manage your behaviours, are things I’ve struggled with myself … ”; pre-practicum interview, November 10, 2014, p. 6). Also, Kendra commented that she felt challenged “with
how to apply [SRL theory] because [she had] never learned too much that way” (pre-practicum interview, November 10, 2014, p. 41). Due to her limited experiences with SRL, she felt her development of SRLPPs might be hindered.

Furthermore, in her pre-practicum interview, Kendra noted that her lack of knowledge about how to support and manage diverse learners, particularly English language learners might pose challenges for her. Kendra shared that she grew up in an area [of the province] with little cultural diversity. Therefore, she expressed having limited awareness of English language learners or practices that could support them. She stated that “around 70%” of her class were English language learners and remarked that she felt challenged to develop lessons that were appropriate for all students’ language levels: “I don’t know how to keep all of them interested as well as making sure they understand everything without losing some of them to boredom” (pre-practicum interview, November 10, 2014, p. 46).

**Student characteristics.** Kendra’s comments indicate that the high percentage of English language learners in her practicum setting, combined with her lack of strategies to support English language learners, posed challenges for her development of teaching practices (e.g., giving instructions, relaying content) and promotion of SRL. In Kendra’s pre-practicum and first debriefing interviews (November 10, 2014; April 1, 2015), she expressed that students’ difficulties engaging in writing tasks and classroom discussions created barriers for their development of SRL, as well as her own ability to implement SRLPPs. Particularly, she felt that students’ limited writing and oral capabilities hindered her ability to engage them in tasks that supported SRL, such as engagement in discussions about learning, written reflections, and goal setting.
Differences in students’ interests and abilities also posed challenges for Kendra in terms of classroom management. Specifically, Kendra felt that her promotion of SRL was impacted because of students’ differing “personalities and behaviours”. Throughout all debriefing interviews and the post-practicum interview (July 17, 2015) she remarked that the promotion of SRL was difficult for some students who required substantial support to stay on task and complete tasks in a timely manner. During her third debrief, she commented that she would have benefited from more opportunities to develop “… strategies of how to help with the behaviours…” (third debriefing interview, May 27, 2015, p. 5). These concerns prevailed throughout her practicum experience and, in Kendra’s view, impacted her ability to implement SRLPPs.

**Relationships.** A constant throughout Kendra’s TEP year – that aligned with her stated learning goals and GCOS results was her focus on developing positive relationships. GCOS scores indicated that Kendra greatly valued secure, open, and honest relationships with others. It was apparent from her responses to questions on the GCOS that without these ties, in unfamiliar social settings, Kendra tended to feel isolated. Therefore, I interpreted that for Kendra, the development of relationships with her FA (1), school associate, TC peers, and students were important sources of relational support. Upon entering her practicum, Kendra identified the establishment of relationships with students as her “main priority.” As evidenced in her pre-practicum interview (November 10, 2014), she immediately began to create opportunities to build relationships with students. She worked with students at lunch, volunteered to go on field trips, and played chess with students during break times.

Across interviews, Kendra described how her FA (1) had acted as her key source of emotional support. She expressed that her FA had “been quite understanding” and referred to her
as a “mini counselor” (pre-practicum interview, November 10, 2014, p. 37). Likewise, Kendra described a strong bond with her school associate and other teachers working in her classroom pod. In her pre-practicum interview, Kendra portrayed her school associate and other school staff as “positive,” “helpful,” and “supportive,” thus suggesting that these relationships acted as a source of emotional support for her throughout her practicum.

In addition to these relationships, Kendra appeared to value the connections she made with her peers in her Cohort. Although in her pre-practicum interview she described herself as “very shy,” she set a goal for herself to overcome her shyness and bond with others in her Cohort. Specifically, she stated that she was “going to talk with groups … and put in that effort …” (pre-practicum interview, November 10, 2014, p. 38). Likely as a result of these efforts, throughout the year Kendra developed multiple “open and honest” relationships with her peers. Through the establishment of positive relationship with her FA, school associate, co-teachers, and peers, many opportunities were created for Kendra to access structural and motivational (relational) supports for her learning.

**Structural supports.** During her TEP, Kendra focused on structural supports within her university setting that served to foster her development of SRLPPs and general teaching practices. At the time of her pre-practicum interview, she communicated that her coursework, and the Cohort’s Inquiry Seminar, were “quite aligned” with her practicum experiences, thereby providing her with links between theory taught in her university classes and her practicum experiences. She noted that her instructors and academic leads for the Cohort were available for support if needed. Additionally, she felt courses in Social Justice, Human Development, and English Language Development in the TEP were aligned with SRL and helped her to develop an understanding of students’ diverse needs, as well as strategies to respond to them. Specifically,
she described how assigned readings and lectures enabled her to build an understanding of students’ emotional and intellectual development, as well as their individual orientation towards learning. She stated that:

“… working with kids from a variety of backgrounds and seeing that it is dangerous to have assumptions going in and you have to have an open mind when you go into the classroom … we’re learning various strategies [they] get me thinking in a different way—I think that kind of aligns with being able to teach a very diverse group” (pre-practicum interview, November 10, 2014, p. 38).

Although recognizing links between her TEP and practicum experiences, in her post-practicum interview, Kendra expressed that her development of SRLPPs and teaching practices would have benefited from increased opportunities to embed theory in practice and to see SRLPPs modelled. Specifically, she voiced the need for more opportunities to engage in sustained and practical learning opportunities within her coursework about how to incorporate SRL into her formal lesson plans, provide students with choice, and support students’ engagement in self-assessment. These sentiments were expressed in her post-practicum interview when she remarked that: “In theory, they [course instructors] were talking about it [SRL], but in practice, I don’t feel the Teacher Education Program was quite there yet …” (post-practicum interview, July 7, 2015, p. 18). She commented that it would have been useful if TCs were provided with more opportunities to see the theory that they were learning about in coursework implemented. In Kendra’s words:

“… to know how to apply all of [the theories]. I can’t pick up a book and be like, oh, that theory’s interesting! I can’t then apply it … that’s where I think there’s a bit of a misalignment …” (pre-practicum interview, November 10, 2014, p. 42).
Furthermore, she remarked that TCs would have benefited from opportunities to apply theoretical concepts (inclusive of SRL) within guided, supported environments (e.g., she suggested that TCs read the theory before class and use class time to practice the application of theory). In her post-practicum interview, Kendra reiterated the need for these connections, explaining that she would have been more likely to engage in coursework if the practical nature of theory was directly apparent and relevant. She stated:

“I would engage with it more if it was more the practical side of things rather than talking about the theory of it. Because I think we all know it’s valuable to learn those skills [SRLPPs], but how can we actually teach them?” (post-practicum interview, July 7, 2015, p. 18).

Without support for making these explicit connections, Kendra felt the coursework would be of little use to her in the future (e.g., “…courses [that don’t link theory to practice] won’t be as successful for me to apply later on”; pre-practicum interview, November 10, 2014, p. 42).

In regards to structural supports, I interpreted that the positive relationships Kendra developed with people in and supporting the MY/SRL Cohort (e.g., her FA (1), school associate, teachers, and peers) created multiple conduits for her to access informational support (e.g., support for her planning, development of lessons and units, understanding of SRL, opportunities to see SRLPPs modelled, and opportunities to receive feedback). The presence of this support was evident in Kendra’s interview comments. Kendra remarked that she, “… could always shoot her (FA) an email and she’ll be supportive and in my week reflections, she always gives feedback back” (third debrief interview, May 27, 2015, p. 7). Kendra also described how her developing practice was enriched by her FA’s knowledge of SRL, ongoing feedback, and explicit directions. To this end, she noted that her FA gave her “tips for [her] formal lesson plans,” and
when she came to observe, she offered “helpful feedback” (pre-practicum interview, November 10, 2014, p. 37).

The informational support Kendra received from her FA appeared to be particularly beneficial during her first term in the TEP. Her university courses began on schedule in September, but due to teacher job action (a strike), the year in the province’s K-12 schools began a month later than usual. Kendra’s school associate and other teachers in the school had little time to support her as they were opening a new school in addition to trying to make up for the lost month. However, her FA (1) supported her to make connections between the MY/SRL Cohort’s focus and practices she was seeing in her practicum setting, thereby supporting her engagement in the TEP.

As the school year continued, Kendra also noted that the connections with her school associate and teachers at her practicum placement afforded her opportunities to engage with a variety of teaching experiences. To this end, Kendra commented that she felt “equal,” “respected, valued,” and included in all teaching activities (e.g., “parent conferences,” “planning discussions,” “Individual Education Planning meetings” [i.e., collaborative planning for students’ individual needs]). During her pre-practicum interview (November 10, 2014), she remarked that teachers in her school were knowledgeable about SRL. She also shared how she had regular opportunities to collaborate and discuss lesson and unit plans with her school associate and teaching partners, expressing that she was “part of all their planning…” (pre-practicum interview, November 10, 2014, p. 120). For example, during morning meetings, “they’d [school associate and teachers ask] ‘Okay, what lesson do you want to lead? Or which class?’” (pre-practicum interview, November 10, 2014, p. 12). Together, they would then plan cycles of learning for Kendra, involving times for her to observe lessons being modelled opportunities for
her to teach lessons, and space to receive feedback (“I watched the first one [class] and then I took over.”; pre-practicum interview, November 10, 2014, p. 12).

This inclusion and instrumental support was also evident during my observational visits. During this time, I saw teachers respectfully collaborating with Kendra and one another in classrooms, corridors, and in the designated collaboration area. These relationships facilitated Kendra’s engagement in discussions and the sharing of resources. She remarked that these relationships made it possible for her and her TC peers:

“to teach and engage in discussions with people … to [share] mistakes when we’re teaching … [and] share our own resources and own experiences that I think will help all of us out with our teaching. … [T]hat support system and that familiarity with people, I think it really helps… ” (pre-practicum interview, November 10, 2014, p. 38).

In terms of structural constraints, Kendra remarked throughout the year that she felt her development of SRLPPs was hindered due to time limitations. She explained that students, particularly those used to traditional forms of education, needed extended time to come to understand the value of SRL and learn how to engage successfully in activities that promote SRL. Due to this need, Kendra expressed that she was not able to “cover all the content that we needed to this year,” and further remarked that if students were preparing for provincial exams she likely would have “had to let go of some of the SRL, because we have to get through this content” (post-practicum interview, July 7, 2015, p. 29).

How did Kendra Implement SRLPPs throughout her practicum experiences?

Prior to Kendra’s practicum, she shared two-unit plans (poetry and science) and her inquiry project report (a report based on TCs’ interests that linked theory to practices; described
below) with me. Embedded in both units were opportunities for students to engage in SRL inclusive of complex, extended tasks. These tasks supported SRL by fostering students’ metacognition (students had opportunities to engage in reflection and self-assessment); motivation (students had choices, were able to control challenge); and strategic action (peer and teacher support guided students in the acquisition of strategies). For example, Kendra’s poetry unit consisted of 12 lessons that focused on a wide range of skills (e.g., strategies for comprehension, writing, responding, and presenting). Each lesson began with a short, high-interest activity followed by a mini-lesson focused on strategy development, individual or group work, and reflection centered around the completion of an inquiry project (e.g., learning about a class of animals). For the final project, students created portfolios of poetry and shared their portfolios during a Poetry Café (students presented poems and discussed literary devices and style). All lessons included adaptations for English language learners. Kendra’s science unit on biodiversity was similarly structured.

Kendra’s focus on students’ learning needs and her ability to connect those needs with her own professional development and context was evident in her inquiry project (carried out in Inquiry 2). Based in part on her own experiences as a student with anxiety, Kendra chose to examine how she could support students who were experiencing anxiety transitioning from traditional forms of learning towards those aligned with SRL. Her inquiry project explored how practices such as scaffolding or direct teaching of strategies for time management, self-monitoring (i.e., plan, reflect, reorganize), relationship building, and formative assessment (e.g., check-ins, feedback) might serve to reduce student anxiety and foster self-regulation of emotion, motivation, and cognition for learning. When cross-referencing these objectives with Kendra’s unit plans, the evidence shows that these foci were thoughtfully incorporated into her planning before she began her extended practicum.
For example, within her poetry unit, it was evident that Kendra had carefully considered the perspectives of English language learners. Embedded in her plans were suggestions for supporting English language learners (e.g., “Ask for students to share experiences with poetry in their first language?”; “Would they be willing to share a translation or share the poem in their first language?”; “Mixed reading ability of poems available, but each requiring unpacking of the meaning of the poem”). Additionally, across all her interviews, her comments indicated that she focused on creating lessons that addressed students’ diverse learning needs as well as their anxieties. For example, Kendra stated:

“I’m hoping to get approval for the blog post I want to put on of giving them guidance [about note taking strategies] …I know a lot of them are already concerned about university, and I feel I might be able to relieve that anxiety”; first debriefing interview; April 1, 2015).

Tailoring instruction to meet students’ cultural, learning, and language needs remained a prevailing consideration for Kendra throughout her practicum and she used SRLPPs to accomplish this goal.

Kendra’s intentions to implement SRLPPs, evidenced in her planning, were visible during observations. Table 4.2 indicates practices I observed Kendra using during observations.
### Table 4.2

**Observational Evidence of Kendra’s Implementation of SRLPPs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SRLPPs Categories</th>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Observation and Debrief 1</th>
<th>Observation and Debrief 2</th>
<th>Observation and Debrief 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Choice</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Content</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control Over Challenge</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Work</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Understanding</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher Support</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewing</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructions/Task</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Depth Questions</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scaffolding</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support for Individual Differences</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of Student Needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-Assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model Provided</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Peer Support</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Together</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Management</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stating Expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wait Time</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cues</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Involvement</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calm Demeanor</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
During my first observation (April 9, 2015), Kendra taught a grade eight language arts lesson. Throughout the lesson, Kendra used teaching practices aligned with SRL (recall Table 1.1). Aligned with her identified goal of accessing students’ prior knowledge, she began the lesson by asking students what they knew about poetry. Afterward, Kendra presented a mini-lesson (PowerPoint presentation) that provided students with strategies for recognizing literary devices within poetry (e.g., “Onomatopoeia … it is words that imitate sounds … Can you think of any? I’ll give you two minutes to think of some at your table”; observation notes, April 9, 2015). After the presentation (and until the end of the class), students worked in pairs to identify poems that demonstrated different literary devices (metaphor, simile, personification, alliteration, onomatopoeia, rhyming). While students worked, Kendra supported students to successfully engage in the task by repeating directions, providing both verbal instructions and visual displays (e.g., the PowerPoint slides and a worksheet/template), and reminding students that examples of the literacy devices were presented on the board. While this support was mainly procedural, it did provide students with the scaffolding they required to successfully engage in the task.

Despite some evidence of SRLPPs, the bulk of the lesson was teacher directed (40 minute PowerPoint presentation), with limited opportunities for students to engage deeply with the material. The length of the presentation led to many students exhibiting quiet, off-task behaviours (e.g., not attending, quietly chatting, texting). During this time, Kendra attempted to regain students’ attention by utilizing a variety of techniques including using cues (e.g., ringing a
chime, asking them, “What should we be doing when the teacher starts talking?”; observational notes, April 9, 2015). However, these methods were only successful for short periods.

A month later (May 5, 2015), I observed Kendra teaching the same class during a language arts period. Kendra began the lesson by presenting a writing prompt. On the board, she wrote: “What book do you want to tell the world about and why?” (observational notes, May 5, 2015). The prompt was personally relevant for students, thereby supporting their motivation to engage in the writing task. For the next 20 minutes, students wrote in response to the prompt. Classical music played in the background. They remained on task for the entire activity and were reluctant to end the activity. After handing in their responses, they returned to their seats. Kendra then introduced the class to literacy circles. To access students’ prior knowledge, she asked what they understood about literacy circles and then facilitated a brief discussion about why people read (e.g., for pleasure, for work) before distributing handouts for students to put in their literacy circle duotangs. The handouts included a title page, learning map, literacy circle roles, and literary luminary (a document explaining literacy devices).

Kendra then gave each student a copy of the story, “The Rabbit.” The story was intended to help students make connections between the previous class focus on poetry strategies and the use of literary devices in stories (e.g., simile, idiom, metaphor). She asked students to follow along as she read the story aloud and circle words and passages that they found meaningful. Throughout the reading, Kendra circulated, pausing to assess students’ comprehension of the task. At multiple points in the story, she paused and asked if they were able to identify literacy devices. For example, she read, “…if your dad was an animal, he would be a bird,” then paused and asked if any students were able to identify the literary device used in the phrase.

Furthermore, she encouraged students to take responsibility for their learning, stating that: “This
[the identification of literacy devices in the story] is for homework so you might want to highlight, write down notes like metaphors” (observational notes, May 4, 2015). Upon completion of the story, Kendra provided time for students to engage in discussion about the story. Opportunities for students to engage in metacognitive thought were also presented. Throughout the discussion Kendra asked in-depth questions about the meaning of the story and the emotions it provoked (e.g., “Can anyone relate to the tension the character felt?”; “What does that mean?”; ”Has anyone read a story told from this perspective before?” (observational notes, May 4, 2015). As students responded, she recorded their comments on the board.

Kendra stated in her debriefing interview (May 4, 2015) that she was trying to create more of a balance between student and teacher participation. Although this lesson was teacher led, throughout the lesson Kendra provided students with opportunities for active engagement that appeared to support students’ motivation. The lesson also served to bridge and extend students’ previous learning about literary devices to a new genre, from poetry to narrative text. Choice and control options helped to address students’ differing abilities and language development. Students were able to choose phrases from the text to examine, making the task personally relevant, and allowing students to control the level of challenge by selecting information that they could comprehend. Finally, based on Kendra’s interests in supporting English language learners, the lesson incorporated non-threatening opportunities for writing and reading that were intended to (and likely did) support students’ confidence and motivation to write.

In terms of management, students remained (for the most part) on-task and engaged. When students’ attention did veer from the task at hand, Kendra calmly restated expectations and described off task and appropriate behaviours. For example, when the noise level rose, she
calmly stated that she was “hearing a lot of chatter” and reminded students to put their “hands up” if they wished to contribute to the discussion (observational notes, May 5, 2015). It was apparent that Kendra had notably expanded her repertoire of management strategies since my first visit. To this end, she played music to help encourage student focus; provided clear, concise explanations of expectations and procedures; and assigned roles to some of the students (e.g. handout person). Additionally, she utilized a variety of ways of supporting students manage their own behaviour (e.g., wait time, chimes, visual reminders, individual redirection, and teacher proximity). At all times, her voice and actions demonstrated respect towards students.

On May 27, 2015, I visited Kendra’s practicum for my third and final observation. Unlike previous language-based lessons, this was a math lesson (a review of graphing), a subject area where Kendra was admittedly less comfortable implementing SRLPPs. Kendra expressed that she felt challenged to support students’ mathematical thinking due to students’ language limitations. She noted in her pre-practicum interview that the promotion of mathematical reasoning was a “slower process” which was “a struggle with the English language learners”. Also, Kendra expressed that supporting students to think deeply about mathematical concepts was challenging because, in her experience “you don’t discuss math, you just do the math … I never thought of mathematical thinking” (pre-practicum interview, p. 17). Additionally, the lesson I observed was not a lesson that Kendra had planned, which created a further hindrance to her implementation of SRLPPs. The morning of the observation, Kendra and the learning support teacher decided to conduct a math review lesson in response to students’ performance on a prior graphing assignment. The learning support teacher had suggested (and Kendra agreed) to divide the class into two groups for the lesson (15 of the 26 students worked in another room
with the learning support teacher). Kendra’s objective for the remaining 11 students was to review written feedback she had given them on the assignment.

During the lesson, Kendra utilized some practices associated with SRL (e.g., supporting students’ metacognition). For example, she asked students to spend the first ten minutes of the lesson reviewing written feedback in their duotangs, which prompted them to reflect on their application of strategies. As students reviewed their duotangs, Kendra circulated throughout the room and responded to questions by asking students questions that prompted metacognitive thought (e.g., “Remember what we did to figure it out?”). She also provided students with strategies to solve problems (“… so you go to your biggest number … then you look at what interval you need”; observational notes, May 27, 2015). For the remainder of the lesson (with the exception of three to four short opportunities for students to discuss math concepts in their table groups), there was little evidence of Kendra’s implementation of SRLPPs. Kendra (positioned in the front of the room) reviewed math concepts on the board (e.g., how to construct a graph and draw conclusions from graphs; how to incorporate titles, labels, units, and intervals in graphs). Although Kendra posed questions to students about the components of graphs throughout the lesson (“Should I have ones or fives?” “Who knows what interval means?”), questions were fact based and did not spur students to think deeply about concepts. Furthermore, only four students in the room were volunteering answers to the questions. The review mainly consisted of students writing down definitions and examples of graph components. After the lesson, Kendra presented students with an untitled graph. The graph displayed temperatures on the x axis and months of the year on the y axis. Kendra then wrote the following questions on the board: “What are the patterns or trends in temperature and rainfall? Is it summer? Winter? Is it in the northern or southern hemisphere? Is it a desert? Mountains? Ocean?” For the last 15 minutes of the lesson,
Kendra reviewed the responses to the questions with students. During this time, she attempted to support students’ engagement in metacognitive thought by asking them to think about the reasons for their answers (e.g., “When you are near the ocean, do you have much temperature difference?”). However, once more she quickly provided answers to the questions, thereby allowing little time for students to reflect on or attempt to answer the questions based on the reasoning prompts.

Kendra’s approach to teaching during this lesson was less SRL-supportive than the previously observed lesson, and more similar to the first lesson I observed at the start of her practicum. Rather than focusing on strategies for engaging students in active learning, her objective appeared to be conveying content related to graphs. This approach seemed to limit students’ engagement in the lesson (i.e., many students were quietly off-task—chatting). Moreover, rather than actively monitoring student engagement throughout the lesson, as she had during the literacy circle lesson (second observation), Kendra remained at the front of the classroom, often facing the board, which limited eye contact and proximity with students. She told students they would be reviewing feedback in their math duotangs but did not review behavioural expectations, or provide students with strategies to review and reflect on feedback. Instead, she seemed to revert back to words and actions that characterized her practices early in the practicum (e.g., “Everyone needs to be paying attention”). Realizing toward the end of the lesson that students were disengaged, Kendra tried to implement other management techniques. She stopped the lesson and asked everyone to do five “brain bumps” (students tapped a partner’s fist five times and repeated the instructions for that task) and asked for students to physically indicate their opinions: “Okay should I have ones or fives. Thumbs up or thumbs down … Hands up if you agree” (observational notes, May 27, 2015).
Reflecting back during her third debriefing interview, Kendra expressed that she felt disappointed with the lesson. She remarked that the lesson was too teacher directed and that she felt challenged to address “different levels” of students’ understanding and manage student behaviour. In hindsight, she realized the links between the directive nature of the lesson and student behaviour. In Kendra’s own words, student behaviour “was the biggest challenge … it would have been nice if I had been able to wrap my head around how to make it more interactive for them” (debriefing interview 3, May 27, 2015).

**Pulling it all together: How was Kendra’s implementation of SRLPPs connected to her learning contexts, beliefs, and other personal characteristics?**

In this section, I examine data in relation to affordances and constraints within TCs’ learning contexts and within Saldana’s (2003) guiding questions: “What changes occur over time? What increases, decreases or emerges through time? What epiphanies or turning points occur?”

Kendra’s use of SRLPPs fluctuated across observations; these inconsistencies appeared to be linked to both her comfort with the subject she was teaching and the time she had to plan. However, despite inconsistencies in her implementation of SRLPPs, across her TEP year, her beliefs about the value of SRL theory remained stable. As noted above, in her pre-practicum interview, Kendra valued SRLPPs and her beliefs about learning seemed to align well with the tenets of SRL. Additionally, she commented that she felt the Cohort’s SRL focus was useful and congruent with current educational goals. During her second debrief, she remarked that the Cohort’s focus was “really helpful,” and she continued to seek ways in which she could more thoroughly embed SRLPPs (e.g., “I am always thinking I want that bigger …” ; second debriefing interview, May 5, 2015, p. 5). In her third debriefing interview, a turning point
occurred for Kendra as she began to associate the implementation of SRLPPs with creating well managed, positive classroom environments, thereby reinforcing her beliefs about the utility of the Cohort’s focus. In her post-practicum interview, Kendra expressed that she continued to value SRL, stating that learning about SRL had been “invaluable” and would “always be [her] focus as a teacher”.

An examination of Kendra’s personal characteristics alongside features of her practicum context offers insight into her development and implementation of SRLPPs. Although Kendra’s concerns about differentiating instruction to meet the needs of learners remained relatively stable throughout her practicum, and she continued to struggle with unanticipated changes to her teaching schedule within her practicum setting (a teacher on her team went on medical leave, platooning with other classes shifted the daily schedule), her autonomous motivational orientation was apparent. Throughout her TEP year, she set concrete learning goals herself. For example, despite her self-professed shyness, she purposefully established connections with others in her Cohort to have ongoing support for her learning. Through the formation of positive, supportive relationships with others, and embedded within a practicum context that offered her multiple, rich examples of SRLPPs, Kendra was able to engage in her goals of developing SRLPPs and tailoring instruction to meet the diverse needs of students.

The examination of contextual conditions in relation to Kendra’s implementation of SRLPPs also provides insight into why SRLPPs were not always emphasized in her practice. On multiple occasions throughout interviews, Kendra commented that she had difficulty adjusting to the daily changes that took place at her school. It is likely that the need to adjust teaching plans constantly, often with short notice, did impact her implementation of SLRPPs. This was especially apparent in the final observation of Kendra’s teaching. Having made changes to the
day’s teaching plan in the morning, she was not provided with the time she required to carefully think through the lesson and plan ways of integrating SRL opportunities into the content. Furthermore, the lesson was in a subject area where Kendra admittedly felt less competent, thereby further taxing her personal resources. Surrounding this lesson was also the pressure Kendra perceived toward the end of her practicum to cover and report on required content. It appears that, under these pressures, Kendra reverted to a more traditional approach to teaching the math lesson.

**Summary**

Despite the challenges Kendra faced throughout her TEP year, it appears she had sufficient personal and contextual resources to support her ongoing engagement and success within the TEP. Throughout her TEP year, she actively sought relationships with others and maintained positive relationships with her FA, school associate, teaching partners, TC peers, and students. It is through these relationships that Kendra accessed the informational and relational supports she required throughout her TEP year to successfully develop SRLPPs.

**Catherine**

Catherine (age 24) enrolled in the MY/SRL Cohort with a focus on social studies. Like Kendra, Catherine’s decision to enter the teaching profession was based on her experiences as a student. She recalled how, as a student with a designated learning disability, teachers supported her to experience academic success. This support led Catherine to want to contribute to students’ lives in a similar manner. Catherine stated: “I realized how important education is and how important the teaching job is, and it’s kind of inspired me to do that myself; I want to help students” (pre-practicum interview, October 26, 2014, p. 3).
Catherine’s Practicum Placement

Catherine’s practicum placement was a middle school (grades six to eight) located in a large, low-middle SES neighborhood, located in western Canada. Approximately 800 students were enrolled in the school. The building was 20 years old and had a more traditional design than Kendra’s placement. It had four main corridors, with classrooms situated on either side of the corridors. While the library was used as a space for student collaboration, there was no specific area designated for teacher collaboration. In her main practicum classroom, desks were arranged in groups of six. A desk and table for the teacher were positioned at the side of the room. The room had a portable projector, screen, and whiteboard. Catherine used the projector and her own personal computer to provide visual displays of information. The classroom had a poor wireless connection, and only approximately half of the students had personal technology devices. In this context, students’ use of technology was limited.

During my first visit to the school, several teachers mentioned that the school’s focus this year was to promote SRL. Attempts to accommodate this focus were evident. When I arrived in the morning for my first visit, all grade eight classes and their teachers (including Catherine and her school associate) were gathered in the library for a meeting. The vice-principal (who taught one of the grade eight classes) shared how all classes would be participating in an upcoming “Renaissance Fair” with the students. After the presentation, the vice-principal explained to me that the school’s focus on the Renaissance Fair was an attempt to foster SRL within the school environment. Although the vice-principal did not directly link the school’s focus to the underlying process of SRLPPs (i.e., supporting students’ metacognition, motivation and strategic action), aspects of the students’ involvement in the Renaissance Fair likely would provide SRL opportunities. For example, the vice-principal explained that students were presented with higher
level choices. Students could select an aspect of the Renaissance to investigate, select resources, and choose how they would share their findings (e.g., via report, PowerPoint, play). Furthermore, upon completion of their projects (at the end of the term), students would then share their findings with other classes at a Renaissance Fair. It is likely that the provision of higher order choices and social opportunities for students to share their work would act to support students engagement in metacognitive thought and motivation.

Catherine taught three subjects: social studies, science, and language arts. Across all classes, she was responsible for 90 students in total. Classes were scheduled for 50 minutes each. Within the classes Catherine taught, nine students had special education needs, and three were English language learners. I observed the same grade eight class on three occasions. Catherine noted that five students in this class had special needs (two students had developmental disabilities, and three students had learning disabilities). In addition, one student was in the process of being assessed for a learning disability. Catherine did not have an educational assistant in the room.

**What forms of motivational and structural affordances and constraints for developing general teaching practices and SRLPPs did Catherine perceive in her university and practicum settings?**

Table 4.3 presents Catherine’s personal characteristics and her perceptions and my interpretation of motivational and structural affordances and constraints within her on campus and practicum contexts. Below, I discuss Catherine’s these affordances and constraints in greater detail and how they may have impacted her beliefs and developing practice.
Table 4.3

Motivational and Structural Affordances (A) and Constraints (C) For Catherine’s Development of SRLPPs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories and Codes</th>
<th>Pre-Practicum</th>
<th>Debrief 1</th>
<th>Debrief 2</th>
<th>Debrief 3</th>
<th>Post-Practicum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs About the Utility of SRLPPs</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of SRLPPs</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of Classroom Management</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Behaviour</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Student Outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationships</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Relationship with FA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Relationship with School Associate/Teachers</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Relationships with TC peers</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Relationship with Students</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structural Supports</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Associate Support</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA Support</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Support</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom to Try SRLPP</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Personal characteristics.** Similar to Kendra, Catherine selected the MY/SRL Cohort because of its connection with middle years learners and was unaware of the Cohort’s SRL focus when she entered the TEP. However, her pre-practicum interview comments indicated that she valued the Cohort’s focus. She felt the Cohort’s focus was important because it taught TCs ways
to provide students with the “… tools to help [themselves]” (pre-practicum interview, October 26, 2014, p. 5). She believed it was through the acquisition of these “tools” that all students, especially those with learning disabilities, developed the means to assume greater responsibility for their learning.

While valuing SRL at the time of her pre-practicum interview, Catherine expressed having little knowledge of SRL and was concerned about her ability to develop SRLPPs, noting she was “having a little trouble wrapping [her] head around it” (pre-practicum interview, October 26, 2014). Additionally, Catherine was apprehensive about the challenges she might face in the program. Specifically, she voiced concerns regarding her lack of general teaching knowledge, expressing that she would “be unsure what to do” (pre-practicum interview, October 26, 2014, p. 18). Catherine was also concerned about her abilities to form positive, professional relationships with students, indicating that: “I’m worried I’ll be too friendly or they won’t see me as their teacher when I am teaching … ” (pre-practicum interview, October 26, 2014, p. 17). She also voiced concerns about developing classroom management skills: “I’m hoping to pick up better classroom management skills” (pre-practicum interview, October 26, 2014, p. 17). However, she indicated she was open to learning about SRL, stating that she was looking forward to “learning more about it.

Like Kendra, Catherine’s responses to the GCOS indicated she had an autonomous motivational orientation. For Catherine, this appeared especially the case within academic settings. Evidence from the GCOS indicated that she was motivated to engage in academic and social activities for internal reasons (e.g., interest rather than status or financial gains).

Additionally, comments made during her pre-practicum interview indicate that she tended to assume sole responsibility for her success within these situations, which applied to the TEP (“I
think that all relies on me”; pre-practicum interview, October 26, 2014). Perhaps as a result, academic and social challenges were often accompanied by feelings of anxiety and stress for Catherine.

**Student characteristics.** Throughout her practicum experiences, Catherine conveyed that many students within her classes were focused on traditional learning activities and grades (“they were mark crazy”). She attributed this focus to students’ past classroom experiences noting that: “…all they have ever known is, ‘I need this mark’” (post-practicum interview, July 9, 2015, p. 25). The students’ focus on traditional aspects of learning and teaching presented challenges for Catherine in terms of motivating them to engage in less traditional forms of learning (e.g., inquiry projects). For example, at the mid-point of her practicum, she reiterated how students requested that she change her practice to a more traditional focus: “They’re like, ‘Can we just do a test?’” (third debriefing interview, May 26, 2015, p. 11).

It should be noted that while past experiences were likely implicated in students’ desire for traditional forms of learning, data suggests other conditions may have also impacted students’ orientations towards SRLPPs. For instance, Catherine commented that many students required extensive teacher support to learn strategies associated with SRL (e.g., selecting effective working conditions and working through social difficulties). This data indicates that perhaps acquisition of these new strategies and multiple inquiry projects overly taxed students’ resources, suggesting that they might have benefited from a more gradual approach to engaging in SRL.

**Positive relationships.** Throughout her TEP, Catherine established many positive relationships with those around her. These relationships appeared to serve as an important source of emotional and learning support for Catherine. While contact with her FA (2) was limited, Catherine described her relationship with her FA as positive. She expressed that her FA was
concerned about her well-being (e.g., he was aware of her anxiety disorder and asked how she was coping). Catherine also indicated that she felt her FA would be available for support if needed.

Additionally, Catherine indicated she had a positive relationship with her school associate. From the beginning of her practicum she expressed feeling welcomed, accepted, and respected within her practicum setting. She also described similar feelings of belonging with her peers in the MY/SRL Cohort. Catherine felt that these connections supported her emotionally throughout the year. For example, the establishment of a close relationship with a peer placed at her practicum school provided Kendra with support managing her anxiety: “I can talk to them and they know what I’m going through and we team teach a few subjects together, so we’re collaborating on units, and that’s taking my stress down a bit as well” (first debriefing interview, April 10, 2015, p. 7).

**Structural supports.** In her pre-practicum interview, Catherine expressed some alignments between her university and practicum experiences. She stated that she could “… see the theme of self-regulated learning starting to run along” (pre-practicum interview, October 2014, p. 13). Catherine voiced that this sense of alignment was an important affordance for her learning. Specifically, she felt that without alignment between her practicum and university experiences, “… it would be hard to navigate [the TEP], if everybody was on a different page” (pre-practicum interview, October 2014, p. 14). In her post-practicum interview, Catherine described how the Cohort’s SRL focus had also supported her learning by creating a theoretical framework for her to develop and refine her units and lesson plans. With this framework, she was able to see for herself how implementing SRLPPs supported students’ engagement and outcomes:
“It’s helped me with my units overall, I think, since I have been exploring self-regulated learning though the projects. So that’s been helpful for me there in just like seeing how that affects [students’] productivity and how it affects their motivation” (third debriefing interview, May 26, 2015, p. 150).

Although acknowledging the presence of structural supports, like Kendra, Catherine voiced a need for increased congruency between her university, Cohort, and practicum experiences. Specifically, she indicated in her post-practicum interview that her development of SRLPPs would have been improved had SRL been kept at the forefront of her learning experiences through her TEP:

“I don’t feel necessarily like I’m being supported specifically for SRL. I feel supported as a teacher candidate … But I feel more on my own for the SRL component … I don’t think we’ve ever talked really about the self-regulated learning. And my school advisor, we haven’t talked about it either” (third debriefing interview, May 26, 2015, p. 16-17).

In terms of her development of SRLPPs, she emphasized in her post-practicum interview that extended time was needed for TCs to develop SRL practices and for students (especially those from more traditional classrooms) to embrace it: “I think it’s super beneficial, but in a practical sense, it’s still hard to implement … it was hard getting them to a place where they could do that” (post-practicum interview, July 9, 2015, p. 31).

As in the case of Kendra, Catherine’s formation of positive relationships with others connected to the Cohort appeared to have offered structural supports for her development of SRLPPs and teaching practices. From the beginning of her TEP, Catherine described how her school associate guided her in facilitating positive relationships with students. She communicated how he modelled the formation of respectful relationships with students that
provided a foundation for successful management within the class. In Catherine’s words: “He [school associate] was very chill, but the kids still respected him” (post-practicum interview, July 9, 2015, p. 27).

She felt this support, along with opportunities to see management strategies modelled (e.g., clear criteria, respectful interactions) were instrumental in her development of successful relationships with students. Subsequently, these positive relationships appeared to facilitate her development of teaching practices. In her post-practicum interview, she remarked on how strategies to build and maintain positive relationships created a supportive environment for her own learning as she developed and refined her teaching skills: “It was really helpful having a good relationship with the students” (post-practicum interview, July 9, 2015, p. 27).

Catherine also voiced that she felt she was afforded the freedom to implement SRL-supportive lessons in her practicum classroom. Although not an SRL specialist, Catherine’s school associate was open to learning about SRL. He encouraged Catherine to attempt teaching practices advocated in her coursework and SRL Cohort. This support provided her with the freedom to experiment with practices that she was learning within the TEP and Cohort: “I can take any risks I want, unless it’s a safety concern … I was able to do what I wanted – implement it [lessons] close to what I wanted” (first debriefing interview, April 10, 2015, p. 6).

While given the latitude to experiment with SRLPPs, both Catherine’s school associate and FA had limited knowledge and understanding of SRLPPs (Catherine’s FA had noted in his interview that his understanding of SRL was limited). Therefore, she reported receiving little support to design and implement lessons with SRLPPs in mind. Rather, in this regard she felt left to her own devices to keep SRLPPs in the forefront of her learning. For example, she said: “it’s
more like myself having to remember it. I don’t get too many prompts from my FA or school associate about SRL particularly” (second debriefing interview, May 6, 2015, p. 12).

Unlike Kendra, Catherine voiced that she had limited support within her practicum to explore her own area of inquiry (the use of technology to support SRL). In Catherine’s practicum setting, her school associate and teachers within her grade group rarely used technology in their classrooms; she noted: “they don’t use technology a lot, it wasn’t just my classroom – [in the school] there wasn’t much use of technology” (post-practicum interview, July 9, 2015, p. 11). Although Catherine attempted to engage in her inquiry focused on improving students’ motivation for learning through the use of technology, she noted that she was left to “figure it out” on her own. Unfortunately, her attempts were often thwarted by a lack of availability of technology in her school and a poor wireless connection. Catherine expressed that these constraints limited her lesson development:

“I want to implement technological devices into the lessons because having the textbook can be hard for some of the things that we want to look at. But not all students have those devices … that can be a little constraining” (second debriefing interview, May 6, 2015, p. 14).

Despite these potential limitations, her establishment of informative relationships with her peers helped her to access structural support for her use of technology and implementation of SRLPPs. Catherine expressed how she was able to turn to peers for guidance about how to use technology within classrooms. Additionally, she participated in study groups and the exchange of information via Facebook with her Cohort peers. Furthermore, she discussed in her post-practicum interview how a TC colleague placed in her practicum school had been particularly supportive in regards to her developing practice. Having a TC peer within close proximity
provided opportunities for Catherine to work with a partner while planning and teaching units and lessons that integrated SRLPPs. Her comments indicated that she was grateful for this support: “we’re all trying to help each other – it is nice” (pre-practicum interview, October 26, 2014, p. 16).

**How did Catherine implement SRLPPs throughout her practicum experience?**

Catherine’s intentions to develop an understanding of SRL and implement SRLPPs were evident in her lesson and unit planning, practice, and comments throughout her TEP. Prior to her practicum, Catherine submitted two unit plans (science and social studies), in addition to her inquiry project, for analysis. These documents, along with observational data and debriefing interviews, reflected Catherine’s valuing of SRLPPs and her intentions to implement them throughout her TEP experiences.

The first unit Catherine completed was a science unit examining cell systems. Lessons within the unit were generally structured around a short lecture with PowerPoint (e.g., explaining what a cell system is), followed by a class or partner discussion (“Talk to a partner then share with the class,” “How is the cell a subsystem?”), student response (e.g., know, wonder, learn chart), independent activity (e.g., reading an article in a Science text), and reflection questions (e.g., “Why are the major functions of the organ systems are important for your body?”). These activities prompted students to think metacognitively about their knowledge and learning, as well as provided them with strategies to actively engage with their learning. At the end of the unit, there was a brief description of an extended project (the investigation of a unicellular and multicellular organism and the final product of a “Cell Wanted Poster,” described below). The project was extended, taking place over several weeks. Opportunities for student choice embedded within the unit. Students could choose a uni- or multicellular organism to research
and, from there, choose “an issue or critical question related to their organism to investigate” (e.g., Can viruses be helpful?). Upon completion of the project, Catherine had allotted time for students to reflect upon their learning by writing in their science journals about what they had learned and why they chose both their organism and question.

In addition to her science unit, Catherine also submitted a social studies unit about the Renaissance. The goals of this unit expanded beyond content (society and warfare) to include goals related to SRLPPs. The unit supported students to engage in their own inquiries about the Renaissance. It consisted of eight lesson plans and a final project (inclusive of a wide range of options in regards to topics and products). Lessons in the unit began with a “mini lesson” focused on the development of strategies (e.g., format of an essay, peer editing processes). Afterwards, students were given time to practice strategies together (e.g., peer editing) and work independently or collaboratively on their inquiry projects.

Analyses of the unit plans indicated consideration for incorporating SRLPPs were present in both. Both units included extended tasks (Cell Wanted Posters, Renaissance presentations) that supported student motivation by providing them with choice about the content of their projects, as well as offering opportunities for students to engage with work at individual points of challenge (e.g., differing requirements for written output). In addition, thought had been given to providing opportunities for students to think metacognitively. Catherine planned to co-construct criteria with students so they were able to engage in self-assessment throughout their work. Additionally, opportunities had been embedded within the units for students to engage in reflection (e.g., journals). While both units included SRLPPs, the second unit Catherine submitted (social studies) contained more in-depth SRL student experiences. This was especially evident in the way Catherine had structured lessons to allow for small group and individual
teacher support, peer support, and opportunities for embedded and peer assessment (e.g., mini-lessons [for content area and strategy development], peer and cooperative work, extended tasks, and opportunities for formative assessment). It is likely that Catherine’s expertise in the area of social studies (she held a previous degree in history) and her practicum school’s focus on promoting SRL through history helped to facilitate her inclusion of more complex teaching practices within her second unit.

Evidence of Catherine’s growing understanding of SRLPPs also emerged during her observed lessons. Table 4.4 shows SRLPPs and management strategies Catherine used throughout her practicum. The description below provides context for Catherine’s implementation of these strategies within her classroom setting. All observations took place while Catherine taught science.
### Table 4.4

**Observational Evidence of Catherine’s Implementation of SRLPPs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Observation and Debrief 1</th>
<th>Observation and Debrief 2</th>
<th>Observation and Debrief 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Choice</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Working Partners</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Responses/Topic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control Over Challenge</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amount of Work</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level of Understanding</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extension Task</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher Support</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visual</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedural</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reviewing</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instructions/Task</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In-Depth Questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summarizing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Providing Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scaffolding Independence</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monitoring Progress</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support for Individual Differences</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small Group Support</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual Support</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monitoring Understanding</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Breaking Up Tasks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adapting Tasks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge of Student Needs</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Embedded Assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observational Student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Catherine’s first observation occurred on April 10, 2015. During the lesson, students participated in an online, multiple choice quiz game called Kahoot to review science content. Other than students having choice in their working partners, access to peer support, and Catherine’s provision of teaching supports (visual and oral directions to log-on to the game, circulating answering questions about how to log-on), there were few opportunities to observe practices that supported SRL during the lesson. Rather, the game consisted of a series of true or false questions that students responded to (e.g., Bacteria is capable of living in earth’s
atmosphere?). Other than students’ true or false responses to the questions, there was no further discussion about topics. Although the lesson appeared motivating for students, and there were some opportunities for students to engage in metacognitive thought (e.g., assess their knowledge of the subject area) and access peer and teacher support, the lesson overall was limited with regards to SRLPPs.

In terms of management practices, throughout the lesson, Catherine appeared focused on developing her repertoire of classroom management skills. As the noise level rose, Catherine calmed the room by first asking students in a quiet voice for their attention and then waiting until the noise level decreased before continuing the game. At all times she spoke with students in a calm, respectful manner. The students were enjoying the game and actively supporting one another to engage in the game. For example, students who had successfully logged-on to the game offered their peers support to log-on (e.g., students went to where others were working and suggested that they restart their devices). When the flow of the lesson was disrupted by difficulties with the Internet connection and many students drifted off task, Catherine remained unfazed. In response, she quickly made adaptations to the game to allow for all the active participation of all students. She stated that: “those who are not connected, you can just write your answers on a piece of paper and hand them into me” (observational notes; April 10, 2015). With Catherine’s instructions, the students were able to quickly make the needed adjustments and the game continued until the end of the lesson.

In the second observation of Catherine’s classroom, on May 6, 2015, it was apparent that Catherine continued to focus on her emergent management skills. Beginning the lesson, she immediately used positive forms of classroom management (e.g., providing calm instructions for students to take seats, asking for students’ attention, waiting for students to respond to requests).
Throughout the lesson, these forms of management continued; Catherine would describe desired behaviour (e.g., asking students to raise their hands) and respond to students who were following classroom expectations.

While Catherine was clearly still focused on developing management strategies, it was evident she was becoming increasingly attentive to implementing SRLPPs. To begin the lesson, Catherine explained to students that they would be “working on science projects” (Cell Wanted Posters). The posters were part of a larger, multi-lesson inquiry project that examined body systems (described above). This task built on students’ prior knowledge, acquired through other activities in the unit. Catherine provided a handout with criteria for the posters at the beginning of the lesson and a visual representation/model of a Cell Wanted Poster that she had created. These resources supported students’ task understanding and monitoring of their progress. She provided a flexible completion date for the projects, remarking that she would like students “to try and get these [projects] done by Friday,” but would “check in tomorrow and see [how they were] doing”. She included choice within her behavioural expectations. For example, students were free to work with a partner and select a working location but asked to stay in their chosen location throughout the lesson. Catherine encouraged metacognitive thought by referring students to the criteria for the project to guide their learning and by asking students to assess whether they were “ready to share” their projects (observational notes; May 6, 2015).

The structure of this lesson differed from the first observed lesson. Rather than direct the class, Catherine allowed students to work where and with whom they chose. During the lesson, she continually circulated among students as they worked in locations throughout the room and with partners of their choice. Catherine appeared to be well aware of students’ individual learning needs. She spent time with individuals and small groups of students to guide their
engagement in the task. During these interactions she reviewed content with students, answered questions about format, and checked on student progress.

Although Catherine indicated in her debriefing interview that she felt her introduction to the lesson combined with her provision of choice in working partners and/or locations supported students’ engagement in the task, it was apparent that the collaborative nature of the lesson presented challenges for her in terms of management (e.g., some students became off task while she was working with other individuals and groups). Initially, Catherine effectively coped with the management challenges of supporting students to be successful with their choices. She implemented a wide array of management strategies (e.g., scanning the room, reminders for behaviour, cueing [e.g., eyes on me], clear directions and expectations, wait time, checks for comprehension, calm voice, eye contact, proximity, redirecting distracted students toward their work, responding to those students who sought her attention in appropriate ways [e.g., hand up rather than calling out]), but as the lesson progressed, she was less consistent in her use of these strategies. Toward the end of the lesson, several students again became quietly off task (e.g., surfing a teenage dating website). Upon realizing this, Catherine responded by clearly and calmly informing students that if they continued to use their personal technology devices inappropriately, they would not be able to use their personal devices.

By the time of my third observation (May 26, 2015), students appeared to clearly understand behavioural expectations and classroom routines. Without reminders, they entered the room calmly and sat in their table groups. The lesson was intended to help students identify how to select an inquiry topic and how to engage in the inquiry process. As students were seated, Catherine handed out an information sheet about gastrointestinal disorders. Catherine then cued students and waited for their attention (e.g., she counted down from five, asked for them to focus
on her, waited for student attention, reminded students to put papers and pens down and focus on
her instructions). Upon gaining students’ attention, she reminded them that their final inquiry
project was due in nine days. She then asked for a volunteer to read the handout. In response, one
student called out that they would like to volunteer. Catherine selected a student with their hand
up to begin the reading. As students took turns reading, a table group in the back of the room
became off task (chatting). In response, Catherine shifted her position and stood within close
proximity to the group and the group redirected their attention. Despite the sensitive subject
matter (e.g., information about bowel disorders), all students in the room were respectful,
appearing to take the material seriously. As their peers read, they offered each other support for
the pronunciation of difficult words.

Upon completion of the reading, students were then given a choice of different digestive
disorders to investigate during the class. Students were free to choose with whom and where they
worked. Catherine gave students the following criteria to consider: What is the problem? Where
and why does it occur? What does it do to the digestive system? What can be done about it? She
then suggested that students work in groups, pairs, and individually to investigate these
questions. Students were encouraged to use personal devices if they had them. Throughout the
lesson, Catherine circulated. She appeared to be well aware of the students’ learning and
behavioural needs, and spent time working with both groups of students and individual students
(e.g., monitoring students’ progress, reviewing with individuals what assignments were due,
scaffolding independence and provoking metacognitive thought by redirecting students to the
task criteria written on the board).

Reflecting back on her lesson during our third debriefing interview (May 26, 2015),
Catherine remarked that the lesson “went well.” She particularly “like[d] how [students got]
…the choice of which digestive condition to look at for their assignment” and select their working partners. She thought this provision of choice, along with the inclusion of technology supported students to engage in the lesson. Furthermore, she was pleased with “the timing” of the lesson, noting that students had “enough time for further reading and enough time for working on independent work [students were working collaboratively but the ‘independent’ portion of the lesson was not teacher directed]” (third debriefing interview, May 26, 2015, p.5).

Pulling it all together: How was Catherine’s implementation of SRLPPs connected to her learning contexts, beliefs, and other personal characteristics?

Throughout her TEP year, Catherine’s positive beliefs about SRLPPs remained stable. During her pre-practicum interview, she stated that she believed SRLPPs were “a good idea” for all students and likely “especially [important for] those with learning disabilities” (pre-practicum interview, October 26, 2014). Likewise, in her debriefing interview following the first observation, she relayed that promoting SRL within her practicum classroom would help all students develop strategies to effectively cope with learning challenges. She expressed that:

“If [students] had strategies to use to find ways to cope with things that they’re having problems with and not take it out in the wrong or inappropriate way … it would be really beneficial … to learn those kind of strategies”; first debriefing interview, April 10, 2015, p. 6).

Despite noting in her second debriefing interview that at times it was difficult to keep SRLPPs in the forefront of her teaching and learning, even stating: “…it’s hard sometimes, because I … I’ll forget about [the] strategies” (second debriefing interview, May 6, 2015, p. 11), her beliefs about the value of SRL remained unwavering throughout her practicum. This stance was evidenced in her third debriefing interview, when she stated that the Cohort’s SRL focus had
been beneficial in supporting students’ motivation to engage productively in tasks and additionally in her post-practicum interview when she stated her intentions to continue to develop and implement SRLPPs.

Similar to data drawn from interviews, observational data suggests that Catherine’s actual implementation of SRLPPs was linked to her beliefs about the value of SRLPPs combined with multiple contextual affordances within her practicum setting. As indicated in Catherine’s pre-practicum interview and unit plans, while her initial knowledge of SRL was limited, her positive beliefs about SRL and openness to incorporating SRLPPs into her ongoing planning was manifested in her unit, lesson plans, and practice. For example, although Catherine’s science unit was initially limited in opportunities for SRLPPs, her science lessons throughout her practicum evolved to include rich SRL experiences that reflected her growing knowledge, competence, and understanding of both SRL and students’ needs.

Her ability to implement SRLPPs was also likely facilitated by the positive relationships she shared with her school associate, TC peers, and students. In this regard, although Catherine encountered constraints for her implementation of practices in terms of students’ personal characteristics (e.g., challenging student behaviour, diverse learning needs and motivational orientations) and limited resources (internet connection, lack of technology), the quality of relationships she had established appeared to provide her with multiple opportunities to gather informational support and encouragement for her ongoing attempts at implementing SRLPPs. For example, although some students exhibited challenging learning and behavioural characteristics, observational evidence indicates they liked and respected Catherine. Therefore, when challenging issues did arise (e.g., maintaining students’ interest in tasks), Catherine was able to connect with students and redirect their behaviour as needed. It appeared that the
relationships she had formed with students were also secure enough for her to push the boundaries of their comfort zones as they engaged in unfamiliar learning tasks associated with SRLPPs.

As Catherine’s confidence and skill grew, her learning focus appeared to shift away from the immediate concerns of classroom management towards the integration of SRLPPs. The value of SRLPPs was indicated in observations and comments throughout Catherine’s practicum experience (“I have been exploring SRL though the projects. So that’s been helpful for me there in just like seeing how that affects [students’] productivity and how it affects their motivation to keep working”; third debriefing interview, May 26, 2015, p. 15). It appeared that through her own success implementing SRLPPs, combined with the positive impact of SRLPPs she witnessed in students, these practices embedded themselves firmly within Catherine’s teaching philosophy. When asked in her post-practicum interview if she intended to continue to learn about and implement SRLPPs in the future she stated she could see herself “continuing to implement them and improving on them.” (post-practicum interview, July 9, 2015, p. 33).

Summary

For Catherine, the relationships she formed and the support she received from her school associate and peers seems to have been fundamental in shaping her developing practices. Although her school associate was not an SRL specialist, he was open to learning about SRL. Importantly, given the diverse learning and management needs of students within Catherine’s practicum setting, her school associate was able to demonstrate and support Catherine’s development of positive, relationship-based management practices and participation structures that were aligned with SRL theory. In this way, he provided Catherine with the freedom and
support she needed to implement SRLPPs throughout her practicum. This support appeared to sustain her engagement with and development of SRLPPs over the course of her practicum.

**Marika**

Marika, age 29, decided to become a teacher because of her experiences working as a volunteer in elementary and high schools and as a residential caregiver in detox and addiction treatment settings. During her pre-practicum interview, she described how her experiences working in treatment settings led her to wonder what events were implicated in people’s development of addiction (e.g., “What happened? Where along the way did they just give up … did they stop caring?”; pre-practicum interview, November 29, 2014, p. 2). In her role as a detox and addiction support worker, she felt she had few opportunities to support people to avoid the negative life outcomes associated with addiction. She believed teaching, particularly in middle school settings, would allow her to support youth by modelling healthy behaviours and “ways of thinking and learning”. Marika felt it was important to work with middle years youth because she believed youth at this time “really start to realize there’s a world around them” and try “to figure out how they fit into it”. She believed the choices youth made about their “fit” within the world at this time greatly impacted the trajectory of their lives. Marika’s also believed that effective teaching was best founded within positive, authentic teacher-student relationships. This sentiment was conveyed during her pre-practicum interview when she said “All anybody really wants, is just food, shelter, and love—just to know someone cares” (pre-practicum interview, November 29, 2014, p. 4).

**Marika’s Practicum Placements**
Marika’s first practicum context. Marika was placed in two different practicum settings during her TEP year. She spent the first three months of the TEP at a middle school (grades six to eight) located in an urban, average SES neighborhood in western Canada. In this placement, Marika experienced many challenges (described below). After Marika’s short, two-week practicum experience in November, she requested and was granted permission to move to another practicum setting at the start of the new term in January. Marika’s pre-practicum interview was conducted in her first setting. All observations and debriefing interviews were conducted in Marika’s second practicum setting. Marika’s post-practicum interview took place on campus.

Marika’s second practicum placement. Marika’s second practicum placement was at a middle school in the same district and in a similar SES neighbourhood as her first placement. In this setting, she had the support of a school associate who had previously been a FA with the MY/SRL Cohort. During her extended practicum, Marika taught two classes (groups of students) in the subject areas of math, science, and health and career education (grades six and seven; 58 students in total) and four classes of physical education (120 students in total). Across the two classes in which she taught academic subjects, five students were identified as having special needs, and two students were English language learners. Classes met for 50 minutes in Marika’s school associate’s classroom. Desks were arranged in groups of four. The teacher’s desk was positioned in the back corner of the room. Marika did not have an educational assistant in the room for either class.
What forms of motivational and structural affordances and constraints for developing
general teaching practices and SRLPPs did Marika perceive in her first practicum setting?

Marika’s perception of affordances and constraints and my interpretation of affordances
and constraints are drawn from observations and interview comments. These are presented in the
Table 4.5. Constraints and affordances that arose within Marika’s first practicum setting are
marked with asterixes. A description of these affordances and constraints and a discussion of
them is provided below for each practicum placement in turn.

Table 4.5

*Motivational and Structural Affordances (A) and Constraints (C) For Marika’s Development
of SRLPPs*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories and Codes</th>
<th>Pre-Practicum</th>
<th>Debrief 1</th>
<th>Debrief 2</th>
<th>Debrief 3</th>
<th>Post-Practicum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs About the Utility of SRLPPs</td>
<td>A*</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>C*</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of SRLPPs</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Behaviour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>C*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationships</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with FA</td>
<td>A*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with School Associate/Teachers</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships with TC Peers</td>
<td>A*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with Students</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structural Supports</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment Between University and Practicum Settings</td>
<td>C*</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Associate Support</td>
<td>C*</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom to Try SRLPP</td>
<td>C*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note: Asterix indicates affordances and constraints Marika expressed in her first practicum setting.

**Marika’s personal characteristics.** Although Marika expressed that she knew little about SRL during her pre-practicum interview (October 24, 2014), she felt the Cohort was “absolutely” a good fit with her beliefs about learning and teaching. She believed teachers had an obligation to help students “learn how to learn” and discover their strengths through the provision of activities that gave them the tools to recognize and respond appropriately to diverse learning situations. Grounded within her initial understandings of SRL, she believed the promotion of SRL supported all students to develop the knowledge they needed to cope successfully with learning, social, and behavioural challenges. She explained that she viewed SRL as “the missing piece” in most classrooms, and felt its promotion had the potential to “…solve many [learning and behavioural] problems” (pre-practicum interview, November 29, 2014, p. 2). Specifically, she believed it was important for students to have opportunities to learn for themselves “…what it is that triggers them … to approach tasks … to ask for help?” (pre-practicum interview, November 29, 2014, p. 15).

Like Kendra and Catherine, Marika was autonomously motivated towards academic and professional tasks. Specifically, her responses on the GCOS indicated that she felt competent within social and academic situations and enjoyed challenges. It was also apparent from her responses that she sought and valued collaboration with others, especially when making decisions.

**Student characteristics.** One of the constraints Marika indicated for her development of SRLPPs within her first practicum setting was students’ lack of experience engaging in SRL. When asked in her pre-practicum interview if she had seen students engage in SRL in her
practicum classroom she responded with “No.” Similarly, Marika remarked that she had not seen SRLPPs modelled within her practicum setting. Therefore, Marika felt students had not had opportunities to develop abilities to self-regulate within learning contexts (e.g., using SRL for completing assignments). During her pre-practicum interview, she voiced concerns that students’ lack of experience engaging in SRL might constrain her efforts to implement SRLPPs.

**Relationships.** Marika’s interview comments indicated that she had few relational supports within her first practicum setting. Although during her pre-practicum interview, Marika remarked that she had regular email contact with FA (2) and anticipated they would likely have a positive relationship, she commented that she had few opportunities to connect face to face with her FA. Furthermore, in her pre-practicum interview, Marika described her struggles to socially integrate herself within her practicum classroom. She expressed that she felt detached from her school associate and the other teachers in the school. At the time of her pre-practicum interview, she had not yet been introduced to staff in the school. When I asked if she might try to communicate her needs to her school associate (via email) and advocate for more support integrating into the classroom and school, she stated, “I don’t get the feeling my school associate would gladly fill me in on everything that happened during the week” (pre-practicum interview, November 28, 2014, p. 24). After completing a member check of her case (email communication, October 24, 2018), Marika provided further insight into her sense of detachment. Specifically, she noted that her school associate was often absent and when she did approach her school associate for assistance, she felt her requests for assistance were ignored.

**Structural supports.** In terms of structural supports within her first practicum placement, Marika struggled to identify alignments across her learning contexts (between her coursework, Cohort, and practicum experiences). At the time of her pre-practicum interview, she
described how she viewed coursework as overly focused on theory and not directly applicable to her current situation, remarking that: “I feel like all the front loading that we’ve had is not very helpful” (pre-practicum interview, November 28, 2014, p. 32). While she acknowledged that some of her on-campus classes were “practical” in terms of modelling teaching strategies (e.g., developing and implementing lesson plans, modelling lessons), she felt she needed more instruction about “…how to navigate the classroom … how to become familiar with the dynamics in the classroom and the dynamics in the school and with the staff” (e.g., “This is how you get over yourself and say hello and be really friendly …”; pre-practicum interview, November 28, 2014, p. 35). Most importantly (in Marika’s view), she noted that her coursework was not focused on classroom management and how to manage the diverse behavioural needs of students. To this end, she felt she had been left on her own to develop strategies to support students’ motivation and behaviour: “I’ve been relying on my own experience that I’ve had working with people to be able to navigate the classroom” (pre-practicum interview, November 28, 2014, p. 35). Marika also expressed that she had insufficient school associate support. She noted that she had few opportunities to collaborate and plan with her school associate. This lack of support left Marika feeling unsure of what to do during her weekly visits to the classroom in the first term. In her words, she felt like a bystander in the classroom rather than an active member of the classroom community.

The sense of isolation Marika experienced in her practicum setting, along with a school and classroom culture that Marika felt was incongruent with the focus of the Cohort, caused her to worry that she would not receive the support (time, mentoring, resources, freedom) she needed to be successful in her extended practicum. She explained that her school associate, staff, and students at the school were not familiar with SRL. Therefore, she had few opportunities to have
SRLPPs explained and/or modelled. When staff within the TEP became aware of the extent of Marika’s difficulties in her first practicum setting, an alternate practicum placement was arranged. At the beginning of January, Marika switched practicum settings.

What forms of motivational and structural affordances and constraints for developing general teaching practices and SRLPPs did Marika perceive in her second practicum setting?

**Personal characteristics.** Although Marika entered her second practicum setting with concerns regarding her knowledge of SRLPPs, her confidence to cope with this and other challenges was notably improved by the time of her first debriefing interview. While still aware that she would face many challenges within her practicum, Marika felt she would have the support she required to cope successfully with challenges.

**Relationships.** In contrast to her first practicum setting, in Marika’s second setting, she identified many relational supports for her learning. In all of her debriefing and post-practicum interviews, Marika expressed she felt included, supported, and respected. During her post-practicum interview, Marika described how, upon her arrival into her second practicum setting, her school associate made her feel welcome by providing a warm introduction. When she entered the room, there was a greeting on the board that said, “Welcome Ms. [TC’s last name].” After being introduced to the class, Marika recounted how her school associate told the class, “… in honour of [Marika] being here today we are going to have a talking circle [a time for everyone to introduce themselves and provide a little bit of information about themselves]” (post-practicum interview, July 7, 2015, p. 27). Reflecting on this experience in her post-practicum interview, Marika said she immediately “felt welcome, like I was part of the team” (post-practicum interview, July 7, 2015, p. 27).
This sense of acceptance appeared to foster Marika’s development of relationships. She quickly formed positive connections with her school associate, other staff members, students and another TC from the MY/SRL Cohort placed in the school. From my observer’s stance, the constructive nature of these relationships was apparent. During all my observations of Marika in this context, I saw her frequently interacting with others. For example, she engaged in conversations with her school associate before and after all her observed lessons, she shared information and accepted feedback from other teachers in the school, and she conversed with students before and after class. Even the custodians stopped me in the hall to remark on how much they enjoyed having Marika in the school.

The positive nature of these relationships extended to Marika’s interactions with students. Although initially Marika expressed that she felt challenged to address students’ behavioural, motivational, and learning needs (first debriefing interview, April 9, 2015), she felt capable of actively approaching these challenges. She set goals for her own learning (to form respectful, positive relationships with students; to learn about students as individuals; and to become aware of their individual learning needs and strengths; first debriefing interview, April 9, 2015). As she came to know students, it appeared that she was increasingly able to support their engagement in learning and SRL by responding to their learning needs through the provision of appropriately challenging tasks, as well as lessons that were directly related to students’ interests.

**Structural supports.** Within Marika’s second practicum setting, she began to note alignments between her on-campus and practicum experiences. Specifically, she expressed that “the same language” was spoken across these settings, and teachers in her practicum school were “on the same page around SRL and Social Emotional Learning” (first debriefing interview, April 9, 2015, p. 20) as the material she had learned in her Cohort.
Despite this emerging sense of cohesion between her on- and off-campus learning experiences (e.g., connections between her university, Cohort, and practicum experiences), Marika felt the need for these links to be much more apparent. For example, in her post-practicum interview she described feeling “really let down” by the lack of connections across her learning environments. She expressed that alignments between her learning contexts were “super important” and that if “every class had a hands-on component piece to it” (post-practicum interview, July 7, 2015, p. 18), her development of practices and sense of teaching confidence would have benefited. Specifically, she felt there needed to be more collaboration between FAs, course instructors, TEP administration, and the SRL academic leads to ensure all experiences were streamlined and geared towards similar goals (“[they] should all be meeting up and discussing how you’re going to plan out your year for us”; post-practicum interview, July 7, 2015, p. 29). Furthermore, she noted that her concerns as a new TC in the TEP were mainly centered around the practical aspects of teaching (e.g., differentiated instruction, classroom management); therefore, she felt her sense of teaching confidence would have benefited from the TEP beginning with courses focused on these areas of teaching rather than the more theoretical aspects of teaching and education.

It is possible that the difficulties Marika had making connections between her learning environments may have been linked to the tense relationship with her FA (2). During her post-practicum interview Marika indicated that her relationship with her FA quickly deteriorated in the first phase of the TEP. She described her FA as critical of her developing practice, noting that “he’d just come in, ask me questions, tell me what to do or tell me what I was doing wrong, and then leave … I don’t really feel supported by him” (third debriefing interview, May 27, 2015, p. 12). To manage and minimize what she described as a negative relationship, she limited contact
with her FA. Therefore, her FA was unable to act as a source of support to help her link her on- and off-campus experiences. Despite this constraint, Marika was able to gather support to align the theoretical and practical aspects of the TEP from her school associate. She considered herself fortunate to be placed with a school associate that could provide connections across her learning experiences: “I feel like I lucked out. Now, if I had a different school associate, I could see how classroom content would be really valuable, right?” (post-practicum interview, July 7, 2015, p. 13).

The relationship that Marika developed with her second school associate stood in sharp contrast to her relationship with her first school associate and appeared central to her developing teaching practices. Although Marika admittedly still struggled with her teaching confidence in the initial stages of her second placement, she was in an environment in which she felt able to ask for help, accept guidance, and attempt new strategies. Her school associate was skilled at supporting adult learners and promoting SRL. In all of her debriefing interviews and post-practicum interviews, Marika noted how her school associate had continually provided her with constructive, specific, non-threatening feedback and instructional support. For example, during her second debrief, she remarked how her school associate had helped her “… pinpoint a couple of areas that were weaknesses … [areas that she] needed to improve upon” (e.g., using wait time, quiet signals, eye contact, cooperative learning strategies, and decreasing teacher talk; second debriefing interview, May 5, 2015, p. 16).

Upon identification of these points of learning, Marika recounted how her school associate thoughtfully scaffolded her learning. Specifically, she remarked that her school associate provided her with the freedom to experiment with practices, modelled practices (e.g., the use of rubrics and criteria to support students’ understanding of tasks and their engagement),
and provided informational support and ongoing feedback regarding her implementation of lessons. In her second debriefing interview, Marika also noted that her school associate had established routines and expectations in the classroom that supported students’ engagement in SRL: “[School associate’s name] has done a lot of work with them to get them aware of that and what they need to do for themselves” (first debriefing interview, April 9, 2015, p. 17).

Along with these tangible supports for her development of SRLPPs, Marika’s school associate modelled and explained how SRLPPs encompassed management strategies. Marika recalled a time in her practicum classroom when several students were off task and her school associate demonstrated how teacher discourse, feedback, and metacognitive questions could promote SRL and aid in classroom management. Rather than reprimand the students, her school associate approached them and stated calmly what he was observing. He said to students: “I’m noticing that at this table, you’re not able to support each other’s learning right now” (first debriefing interview, April 9, 2015, pp. 17-18). He then provided the students with a question and a choice (“What do you think we can do to make this work better?”; first debriefing Interview, April 9, 2015, p. 18). Students remained at the same table but refocused their attention to the task.

**How did Marika implement SRLPPs throughout her practicum experiences?**

Marika’s openness towards incorporating SRLPPs in her teaching experiences was apparent in her lesson and unit plans, as well as in her observed lessons. Marika submitted two unit plans (math and chemistry) at the beginning of her second practicum (March 25, 2015). These included evidence that Marika was thinking about how to integrate SRLPPs into her teaching plans. For example, in Marika’s math unit, she had structured lessons in a way that provided students with opportunities to engage in SRL. Generally, lessons began with a question
to stimulate students’ thinking (e.g. What are polygons?). After considering the questions, students would then work in pairs or small groups to discuss their answers and share the knowledge of concepts. This activity was then followed by a short teacher-led mini lesson during which Marika would provide information about the topic, strategies to engage with tasks (e.g. providing students with strategies to identify different polygons). Students were provided with the choice to work individually or in small groups to complete the task. During the task, they were free to ask and receive support from their peers. Lessons concluded with students responding to reflection questions in their math journals (e.g., What are 5 words that you would use to describe quadrilaterals?).

Here, multiple opportunities for students to work with and receive support from peers were embedded within lessons (e.g., working together to identify shapes). Additionally, Marika scheduled opportunities during her lessons to work with individuals or small groups of students and provide accommodations for students who needed them (e.g., Marika had arranged for 1:1 peer support for some students; she also noted in her lesson plans to prepare handouts of concepts for some students).

Lessons in Marika's chemistry unit (Identifying and Classifying Matter) were similarly formatted. However, this unit provided many more opportunities for students to participate in hands-on learning experiences during the activity phase of lessons (e.g., students visited three stations that presented opportunities for them to work with different states of matter [liquid, solid, gas] and use the particle model to explain how particles react in each state). As in her previous unit, collaborative working conditions provided students with opportunities to access peer support. At the end of each lesson, Marika had scheduled time for and included questions for reflection (e.g., list what you do and do not understand about the states of matter and
Throughout the unit, students’ metacognition was supported through opportunities to consider what they did and did not know/understand, generate criteria for assignments, and self-assess their work and progress.

Marika’s actual implementation of these practices was demonstrated during observations. Over the course of Marika’s extended practicum, I conducted three observations of her teaching practices in her second practicum setting. Each of these observations was followed by a post-observational (debriefing) interview. Table 4.6 indicates SRLPPs and management practices evident in Marika’s practice during observed lessons.

**Table 4.6**

*Observational Evidence of Marika’s Implementation of SRLPPs*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Observation and Debrief 1</th>
<th>Observation and Debrief 2</th>
<th>Observation and Debrief 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Choice</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Partners</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scaffold Choice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control Over Challenge</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Work</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Understanding</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension Task</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>µ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher Support</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>µ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewing</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructions/Task</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>µ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Depth Questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>µ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summarizing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>µ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>µ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Scaffolding Independence | ✓  
| Monitoring Progress | ✓  

**Support for Individual Differences**

| Time | ✓  
| Small Group Support | ✓  
| Individual Support | ✓  
| Monitoring Understanding | ✓  
| Breaking Up Tasks | ✓  
| Adapting Tasks | ✓  
| Knowledge of Student Needs | ✓  

**Embedded Assessment**

| Observational | ✓  
| Responding to Feedback | ✓  
| Assigned Questions | ✓  
| Multiple Levels of Assessment | ✓  

**Task**

| Extended | ✓  
| Real Applications | ✓  
| High Interest | ✓  

**Self-Assessment**

| Questions for Reflection | ✓  
| Clear Expectations | ✓  
| Criteria | ✓  
| Model Provided | ✓  

**Peer Support**

| Working Together | ✓  
| Peer Assessment | ✓  
| Discussion | ✓  

**Management**

| Humour | ✓  
| Proximity | ✓  
| Stating Expectations | ✓  
| Wait Time | ✓  
| Cues | ✓  
| Active Involvement | ✓  
| Empathy | ✓  
| Calm Demeanour | ✓  
| Individualized Redirection | ✓  
| Classroom Routines | ✓  
| Working with Colleagues | ✓  
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During my first observation (April 9, 2015), Marika taught a grade six lesson on mass and density. The lesson was part of a science unit Marika had created, entitled “How Matter Matters” (the unit consisted of 18, 40-80 minute lessons). The overarching goals for the unit were to have students conduct investigations into the properties of matter and to both classify and measure substances. Marika’s teaching goals at the time of her first debriefing session were to develop positive relationships with students, increase student engagement, and develop respectful classroom management strategies.

Throughout the observation, it was evident that Marika tried to incorporate her school associate’s approach to classroom management in regard to the promotion of pre-emptive, relationship-based management strategies. At all times, Marika remained calm and interacted with interest and respect towards students. To support students’ engagement, she created an entertaining lesson that incorporated props and humour to demonstrate how salt and fresh water differed in density—she dressed up in a white coat, wore large goggles and used oversized tongs for the experiment. During the demonstration, students had opportunities to volunteer for a variety of roles (e.g., recorder, assistant, mathematician). Furthermore, Marika was aware and mindful of several students in the class who required individual behavioural and academic supports and made an effort to position herself in close proximity to these students.

At the start of the lesson, Marika handed out a prediction worksheet. As Marika worked through the demonstration, she facilitated students’ development of prediction strategies by modelling and cueing students at different points in her demonstration to predict what might happen next. For example, she paused during the presentation and stated:
“This is the point in the demonstration where we stop and we are going to fill out the sheet … I’ll go over it on the overhead … make a prediction what will happen if the candles are switched in beaker A and B” (observational notes, April 9, 2015).

Marika supported metacognitive thought by asking the students to provide “two reasons for why they [chose particular prediction].” Upon completion of the demonstration, Marika clearly communicated learning expectations both visually (on screen) and orally, “I’d like you to calculate the weight of two objects from the lab … to calculate density” (observational notes, April 9, 2015). Students then worked individually and in pairs to conduct their own experiments at a location of their choice. In addition to having choices in regards to their working partners and location, they also could choose how to structure their observations (e.g., “… If you want to write out your predictions differently than I did on the overhead, that is okay”; observational notes, April 9, 2015, p. 2). As students worked, Marika circulated and frequently scanned the room. When behavioural problems arose (e.g., off-task behaviour and discussion), she calmly and privately described the off-task behaviour to students, stated her expectations, and then provided opportunities for students to revise their actions.

Marika’s actions during the observation along with comments she made in her first debriefing interview indicated she was cognizant of students’ individual learning and motivational needs while planning and implementing her lesson. She noted the connections between students’ learning needs and their motivation to engage in tasks: “I don’t want kids that don’t write a lot [to have to write a lot] because … they just get too overwhelmed, and they’re just like, ‘Oh, I can’t do it!’ … they don’t want to try” (first debriefing interview, April 9, 2015, p. 15). Aligned with this reasoning, she created learning conditions that allowed students to be successful. When needed, she reviewed concepts and formulas with individuals and small groups
of students, and provided opportunities for students to make any necessary adaptations to control challenge. Students with written output difficulties had the option to limit their written responses and had the choice as to whether or not they recorded class notes. In addition to teacher support, students also had the option to obtain support from peers while working in partners.

Throughout the lesson, Marika circulated, monitored the students’ progress, and paced the lesson according to their needs (e.g., “It looks like most people are ready … maybe 30 more seconds to finish writing your explanation”; observational notes, April 9, 2015, p. 3). She noted at the end of the lesson (during her debriefing interview) that midway through the lesson she decided to limit the amount of content based on her observations about students’ ongoing understanding and progress (e.g., “There were other things I wanted them to learn about today too, but we just couldn’t get to it”; first debriefing interview, April 9, 2015, p. 13).

During the second observation and debriefing interview (May 5, 2015), Marika continued to direct her attention toward developing classroom management strategies and increasing student engagement. She stated in her second debriefing interview that she wanted to focus on what she considered to be the “fundamentals” of classroom management (e.g., wait time, eye contact, using different types of cues). Additionally, feeling that she had established good working relationships with students, Marika remarked in her second debriefing interview that her focus was now on increasing student engagement through SRLPPs. Specifically, she wanted to “promote self-regulation” through supporting students’ motivation by incorporating cooperative learning activities into her lessons.

The observed lesson was part of a larger health and career education unit consisting of six, 40-minute lessons. The unit’s objectives were to support students to identify trusted adults within school and community settings, develop personal safety strategies that could be used to
avoid potentially abusive or exploitative situations, increase their understanding of safe behaviours (e.g., assertive communication skills), and provide them with strategies to respond to emergencies. Before the observation, Marika provided me with a lesson plan. The objectives of the lesson included students understanding: what abusive or exploitative situations were, how and where to identify sources of support, and strategies for personal protection when confronted with these situations. The observed lesson was designed to present students with the information they needed to write a pamphlet about safety issues relevant to youth (e.g., students were asked to identify and consider traits of trusted adults, as well as the dangers of substance abuse). Once completed, the intent was to have the pamphlets displayed in the counselling office. In the lesson plan, Marika had included opportunities for teacher modelling (e.g., what the content of pamphlets should be and how to construct the pamphlets); opportunities for students to co-construct criteria for the assessment of their pamphlets; opportunities for peer feedback; and adaptations for students (e.g., English language learners were paired with helpful peers).

Throughout the lesson, Marika presented scenarios about appropriate and inappropriate boundaries (e.g., strangers on the Internet asking for personal information, inappropriate and appropriate physical boundaries with coaches and neighbours). After each scenario was presented, the students discussed in their table groups (three to four students) how and why the situations were safe or unsafe. After small group discussion, all students then shared their ideas with the class.

Evidence of Marika’s ongoing focus on classroom management was apparent throughout the lesson. As Marika read the scenarios, she circulated throughout the room and used cues to gain the attention of the class when necessary (e.g., a bell, wait time, eye contact). If required, she provided students with discrete reminders to focus on the task. At all times, she maintained a
calm, relaxed demeanour, speaking to students with a tone of empathy when guiding them back toward a task. For example, realizing the length of the class discussion was challenging for some students she remarked:

“I know we have been talking a bit and we are going to carry on. And for those doodling, you need to put down your pens because this is about your personal safety … I know it might seem silly now, but you never know” (observational notes, May 5, 2015).

The activity offered many occasions for students to engage in SRL, and they appeared both comfortable sharing with one another and highly engaged throughout the lesson. Throughout the discussions, students extended each other’s ideas and offered one another informational support. For example, while the class was discussing unwanted online contact from a stranger a student suggested that they would “block the call.” Another student expanded on this thought by commenting that they “… would save the number because you want to give it to the police … you don’t want to just delete them if you want to report them …” (observational notes, May 5 2015). Marika facilitated the discussion by summarizing and clarifying students’ comments and ensuring all students had a chance to share.

Her use of embedded assessment to guide her teaching was also apparent. As students spoke, she listened intently and supported them to extend their learning by self-assessing their responses through the use of in-depth questions that required them to reflect on their responses (e.g., “What can a person do to get out of the situation? … Is this an example of healthy boundaries?”; observational notes, May 5, 2015, p. 3). As students discussed their thoughts and responded to questions, Marika actively integrated this feedback throughout her lesson, veering from her prepared lesson plan to meet students’ ongoing learning needs (e.g., she spent additional
time on scenarios students struggled to understand, such as acceptable boundaries between coaches and students).

Marika’s promotion of SRL inclusive of positive management strategies continued into the final stages of her practicum. During my third observation (May 27, 2015), Marika’s lesson was based on her own area of inquiry, promoting SRL (particularly student motivation) through the use of literature in mathematics. The lesson was part of Marika’s geometry unit. A review of the unit plan indicated that the goals for this section of the unit (approximately four to five lessons) were for students to develop strategies to create and read maps to demonstrate their understanding of coordinates. To reach these objectives, students had been introduced to the idea of coordinates in a previous lesson. The objectives of the observed lesson were to provide students with an opportunity to plot and interpret coordinates. In a future lesson, students would prepare their own maps of the school and school grounds. When the maps were completed, the intent was for students to exchange maps and attempt to read and follow them. This intent provided a social purpose for the activity, a purpose that most middle years students would likely find motivating. Opportunities for peer support and reflection were also evident within the task. Once maps were exchanged, students would provide feedback to their peers about the strengths of the maps and how they might be improved.

At the start of the lesson students were provided with graph paper. Marika then read aloud a book entitled, *Sir Conference and The Viking’s Map*. The story is about two Viking cousins who became lost in a forest. Desperately wanting to get home, they searched the forest for a map. Eventually, the Viking cousins find a map; however, they find it challenging to decipher. As Marika read to students, she modelled how to plot the coordinates embedded within the story text. Throughout the lesson, Marika supported students behaviourally and academically,
circulating throughout the class, monitoring their understanding, and providing instructional support (step by step and/or reviewing instructions about how to plot coordinates). Upon completion of the story, each student was given a Cartesian Plane to draw their own map and plot their own coordinates. Marika explained to the class that, when finished, each student would exchange their map with their peers; classmates would then decipher and provide feedback about the clarity of the maps. Marika then visually presented and verbally reviewed criteria for the task on the overhead (e.g., minimum of three coordinates, maximum of five, include legend and compass).

Throughout the lesson, Marika thoughtfully released responsibility to students (e.g., allowing them to decide where and with whom they would work as they demonstrated understanding of the task and on-task behaviour). Comments from her third debriefing interview indicated the intentionality of this gradual release of responsibility:

“I didn’t release them right away …, ‘Show me what you’re actually going to be working on first and start doing something, and then I’ll see where you’re at and then you can go work out in the hall … those of you that went to the hallway need to have this, this and this done when you come back, and … that we all know, okay, you work well together,’ and I would let them work together in the future” (third debriefing interview, May 27, 2015, p. 2).

As evident in Table 4.6, Marika used fewer forms of behavioural support (e.g., wait time, cues) as she utilized more in-depth forms of SRLPPs, particularly in the areas of accommodating students’ individual learning differences and providing students with opportunities for self-assessment and choice. Marika created opportunities for students to engage in metacognitive thought through opportunities for self-assessment (e.g., students were able to assess their
progress by referring to task criteria and Marika’s model of the final product). Marika supported students’ metacognitive thinking by referring them to the criteria, and encouraging them to make their own decisions. For example, while discussing the task with a student she asked, “How many coordinates would you like to have … the minimum is three.” Affordances for students’ motivation were also apparent in the choices that were offered to them (e.g., choosing whether or not to work with a partner, a work location, the type of map). It appeared that the gradual release of responsibility, along with Marika’s ongoing focus on SRL, as well as her establishment of routines in the classroom, decreased the need to provide students with behavioural supports directly.

**Pulling it all together: How were Marika’s implementations of SRLPPs connected to her learning contexts and personal characteristics?**

Throughout the year, Marika’s positive beliefs about SRL remained stable. In her first debriefing interview, she noted that her focus on SRL helped her to support students’ engagement in learning and provided a framework for her development of positive classroom management strategies. At the time of her second debriefing, she also commented on how SRLPPs, particularly the creation of opportunities for students to access peer support, enriched students’ learning. During her third debriefing interview, having developed a wide range of SRLPPs, she stated: “Once teachers understand how to facilitate [SRL] … it is amazing” (third debriefing interview, May 27, 2015, p. 10). Post-practicum interview comments suggest that, with time, Marika’s positive beliefs about the value of SRL began to integrate with her teaching identity. At this time, she noted that SRL was “something that can be subtly woven into daily practices, but it’s not always this explicit, like, we’re doing this SRL thing now. It’s more like a way of being” (post-practicum interview, July 7, 2015, p. 35).
Early in Marika’s TEP year, it was evident that the formation of positive, respectful relationships with others was important to her. During her pre-practicum interview, she emphasized the need for teachers, as well as students, to feel comfortable sharing their strengths and challenges with one another: “I like to often tell [students] when I don’t know something. Just because I’m an adult doesn’t mean I know more than you … You know, to show them that they have value and I respect them” (pre-practicum interview, November 29, 2014, p. 5). To facilitate the development of trusting relationships and, in turn, student learning, Marika voiced in her pre-practicum interview that it was important to create safe, inclusive, and supportive classrooms (i.e., everyone is safe to show their strengths and challenges). This authoritative style of interaction and valuing of open collaboration was also indicated in Marika’s responses to items on the GCOS.

Lacking relational support in her first practicum setting, Marika struggled to engage in the TEP. The absence of these supports was likely particularly detrimental for Marika, who greatly valued connections with others and admittedly struggled with her teaching confidence at the beginning of her TEP. In her pre-practicum interview, she worried that her greatest barrier to learning centered around her “own self-doubt and confidence” (pre-practicum interview, November 28, 2014, p. 51). Given Marika’s need for relational and informational support in becoming familiar, comfortable, and confident in her role as a teacher, it appears her first placement was not a good fit for her learning needs, thereby impacting her learning, confidence, and sense of well-being. In an informal conversation with Marika (before her first observation), she expressed that her experiences in her first practicum classroom were “draining” her energy. She had visible signs of stress (eczema), which she attributed to her anxiety about the TEP. In her post-practicum interview, she elaborated on her feelings in her first practicum setting, noting that
it was a time when she felt alone in her learning experiences—a time when she felt “like [she] was drowning … every day” (post-practicum interview, July 7, 2015, p. 4).

A turning point occurred for Marika upon her entry into her second practicum setting. During her post-practicum interview, Marika noted that she felt “100%” supported by her school associate and by “the whole team” (referring to the school administrator and the other teachers at the school; [post-practicum interview, July 7, 2015, p. 4]) in her second practicum setting. Being embedded in a positive, secure learning environment appeared to bolster Marika’s teaching confidence and sense of agency. Over time, she began to feel that she was capable of taking more ownership of her day-to-day experience in her practicum setting. She attributed this to the care her school associate had taken in scaffolding her learning experiences. Marika described how her school associate had gradually released teaching responsibilities to her. In Marika’s words: “He slowly started to incorporate me into things and then eventually sent me off … I didn’t even know it was going on” (post-practicum interview, July 7, 2015, p. 29). In her second debrief, Marika noted with wonder that she felt “surprised that being almost 100% teaching is not … it’s not tiring … I’m tired but the transition’s been nice … I like how they’ve scaffolded it … right now, I’ve taught pretty much all day and I’m fine” (second debriefing interview, May 5, 2015, p. 15). This sense of accomplishment appears to have further fueled Marika's sense of personal agency and decreased her feelings of stress. She expressed in her post-practicum interview that, with time and support, she had begun to feel more “relaxed and prepared” and better equipped to create effective learning contexts that would promote SRL (e.g., setting expectations for work completion, cooperation, and individual accountability).

Marika’s development of management practices and SRLPPs also seems to have been impacted by the relationships she established with students in her second practicum setting. In
her second debriefing interview, Marika noted how her focus on the development of positive relationships with students supported her ability to manage the classroom effectively. She described how, as her knowledge and understanding about students grew through these relationships, she became better able to anticipate their learning and behavioural needs (e.g., she was aware of students’ learning interests and strengths, and recognized antecedents related to off-task behaviour). Therefore, she felt increasingly able to plan and implement lessons that included SRLPPs, as well as adjust her instruction during classes, to meet individual learning and behavioural needs. These positive relational experiences with students appeared to have provided Marika with many opportunities to feel successful in her practice. At the time of her post-practicum interview, she felt she had successfully met her goal of establishing positive relationships with students and staff in her practicum setting. In fact, in her practicum information summary (a 2-page summary submitted to her FA at the end of her practicum, describing her perceived strengths and identifying areas of future growth), Marika identified her ability to form connections with students as her strongest professional quality.

Reflecting back on her practicum, Marika had come to view the development of SRLPPs as a slow, gradual process. She noted the development and implementation of SRLPPs had been difficult initially due to its nuanced nature: “The implementation can be really difficult” (post-practicum interview, July 7, 2015, p. 35). Furthermore, in her post-practicum interview, she remarked that implementing SRLPPs within classroom settings required extended, thoughtful planning and practice (e.g., “… it’s just foresight … you have to rehearse … you just have to put that time in and rehearse it. And then eventually your foresight just becomes intuitive”; post-practicum interview, July 7, 2015, p. 38). This realization was a turning point in her
understanding of SRL. She realized that routines and well-founded expectations and explanations were central to the promotion of SRL:

“It went so well because I took the time and I explained … [T]he second time I had them in the lab for this one class, it was so bad because I had just assumed … they’re going to know … as a result, like, you know, a couple of them were like rough-housing … It sucked” (post-practicum interview, July 7, 2015, p. 38).

Once in place, Marika recognized that SRL supportive structures afforded teachers opportunities to attend to students’ individual learning needs. In Marika’s words: “It frees you up so much when you kind of can structure your lessons in that manner [promoting SRL].” (post-practicum interview, July 7, 2015, p. 19).

Summary

In Marika’s case, relationships appeared to be essential to her success within the TEP. As described above, relationships facilitated her development and successful implementation of teaching practices. In turn, Marika gained a greater sense of confidence and well-being. These feelings appeared to permeate beyond the bounds of Marika’s TEP experiences. In Marika’s words, her practicum experiences were “transformative.” She described herself as feeling like a “totally different person because of [her practicum experience],” feeling “way more outgoing and confident” (post-practicum interview, July 7, 2015, p. 36).

Oriale

Oriale’s (age 26) decision to enter teaching was shaped by her volunteer and professional activities as a youth and young adult. As a high school student, she volunteered as an educational assistant with the Society for the Protection of Cruelty to Animals, acted as a counsellor at environmental summer camps, and coached children’s field hockey. Upon graduating from high
school, Oriale completed a degree in neuroscience and obtained a position working as a research
and teaching assistant in an international neuroscience research center in Australia. As she settled
into her position, she realized that teaching was the most enjoyable aspect of her job. To begin
exploring the possibility of a teaching career, she obtained employment as a teacher (grades four,
five, and six) in a school located in Rwanda. After teaching for two years in a highly structured
educational system, she decided to return to Canada to work towards professional teacher
certification.

**Oriale’s Practicum Placements**

**Oriale’s first practicum placement.** As in Marika’s case, Oriale’s TEP year took place
across two practicum settings. Her first placement was at a middle school (grades six to eight),
located in a high SES, suburban neighbourhood in western Canada. Her assigned class consisted
of 29 students (23 students in grade eight and six students in grade seven). Oriale identified one
student as having a full-time educational assistant and one student with designated behavioural
difficulties. Three students in the class were identified as gifted. There were no identified English
language learners in the class. Oriale’s pre-practicum interview and first observation and
debriefing took place within this setting.

**Oriale’s second practicum placement.** Oriale’s second practicum setting was in a low
SES neighbourhood located in a western Canadian suburb. In this context, she taught 30 grade
eight students across all subject areas. Additionally, Oriale worked occasionally (three blocks per
week) with another class of grade eight students. In her main teaching assignment, three students
were identified as having special needs (one student had a learning disability and two students
were designated as gifted). Although not formally designated, Oriale identified several other
students in the class as requiring high levels of academic and behavioural support. There were no
identified English language learners and no educational assistants assigned to the class. Oriale did not provide any information regarding the composition of the class she worked with for an additional three blocks per week.

**What forms of motivational and structural affordances and constraints for developing general teaching practices and SRLPPs did Oriale perceive in her university and practicum settings in her first practicum setting?**

Across her teaching experiences, Oriale noted and I interpreted a number of affordances and constraints for her development of general teaching and SRLPPs. These are listed in Table 4.7 with a more detailed description below. In this section, I start by describing her experiences within her first practicum experience, followed by a discussion of affordances and constraints within Oriale’s second practicum setting.
Table 4.7

**Motivational and Structural Affordances (A) and Constraints (C) For Oriale’s Development of SRLPPs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories and Codes</th>
<th>Pre-Practicum</th>
<th>Debrief 1</th>
<th>Debrief 2</th>
<th>Debrief 3</th>
<th>Post-Practicum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs about the utility of SRLPPs</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C*</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence and Motivation</td>
<td>A*</td>
<td>C*</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of SRLPPs</td>
<td>C*</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling Overwhelmed</td>
<td>C*</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour</td>
<td>A*</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>A*</td>
<td>A*</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience and Knowledge of SRL</td>
<td>A*</td>
<td>C*</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationships</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with school associate and Teachers</td>
<td>A*</td>
<td>A**</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with FA</td>
<td>A*</td>
<td>A*</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with Students</td>
<td>A*</td>
<td>A*</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structural Supports</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment Between University and Practicum Settings</td>
<td>A*</td>
<td>C*</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Associate Support</td>
<td>A*</td>
<td>C*</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA Support</td>
<td>A*</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support from TC Peers</td>
<td>C*</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom to try SRLPPs</td>
<td>A*</td>
<td>A<em>C</em></td>
<td>C*</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of Resources</td>
<td>C*</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Single Asterix indicates Oriale’s reporting of affordances and constraints in her first practicum setting. Double Asterix indicates this relationship was with another teacher in the school, not with Oriale’s school associate.
**Personal characteristics.** As in the cases of Kendra, Catherine, and Marika, at the time of registration, Oriale was unaware of the Cohort’s SRL focus. She selected the Cohort because of its middle years focus, believing that this focus would provide her with more opportunities to teach science and increase her employment opportunities upon graduation. She described herself as having limited knowledge of SRL when she first entered the Cohort, noting in her pre-practicum interview that she “didn’t really understand what it [SRL] was …” (pre-practicum interview, November 13, 2014, p. 8). However, based on her initial experiences, she valued the Cohort’s SRL focus and believed it was aligned with her learning goals. She described the Cohort as “a good starting point” for her to begin to develop her teaching practice. She expressed that she was eager to learn about SRL.

At the time of her pre-practicum interview, Oriale was confident in her ability to successfully implement SRLPPs. This confidence was evident in her responses to items on the GCOS. Specific findings from the GCOS suggested that Oriale felt confident in social situations, valued open and honest communication, collaborated with others when making decisions, and was reflective about her involvement in professional tasks, examining self, rather than external reasons for failure and success. Several of Oriale’s responses indicated a preference for financial rewards and status rather that intrinsic interest in tasks. However, overall Oriale presented an autonomous orientation to professional, academic, and social situations.

**Student characteristics.** Remarks from Oriale’s first debriefing interview indicated that she held students in her first practicum placement in high regard. Oriale viewed students in her class as “mature,” “brilliant,” and “motivated.” She also commented that students were open and eager to engage in SRL. Furthermore, her comments indicate that their prior learning experiences and knowledge of SRL helped facilitate her implementation of SRLPPs.
**Relationships.** Oriale noted many relational affordances for her learning in her first practicum. For example, she described her school associate as “collaborative,” noting that her school associate worked with her to develop and review units and lessons (e.g., “I’ve actually planned an entire unit and have presented it to him. And we’ve worked together in terms of what we want to do over the next ten weeks”; pre-practicum interview, November 13, 2014, p. 16). Additionally, at this time, Oriale also expressed that she had formed a positive relationship with her FA (1), whom she described as “incredibly caring” and “nurturing.” In regards to student relationships, Oriale indicated that she had successfully established positive connections with students during her weekly visits.

**Structural supports.** Throughout her pre-practicum interview, Oriale expressed how FA (1) provided her with feedback and informational support that enhanced her learning experiences. Specifically, she described how her FA provided thoughtful, ongoing consultation via emails and post-lesson meetings. During this correspondence, Oriale’s FA encouraged her to take the lead with regards to her learning by identifying her own teaching strengths and weaknesses. Oriale remarked that discussions with her FA were “very self-directed … [her FA would say] tell me three things that you think you did really [well]. And then let’s discuss that. And then three things you think you could work on …” (pre-practicum interview, November 13, 2014, p. 58). Oriale felt her FA “really respected [her] opinions”. This self-directed approach supported Oriale’s sense of autonomy and provoked her to think about and set future teaching goals:

“If I give her a lesson, she will respond to it in all of these questions—how could you make this better? How could you do this? How could you do that? It really gets me to think about it” (pre-practicum interview, November 13, 2014, p. 57).
Furthermore, in her pre-practicum interview, Oriale described how her school associate additionally supported her learning. Oriale remarked that her school associate was able to model forms of positive classroom management by demonstrating how to establish “rapport” with students. She expressed that her school associate was able to convey to students that he was open to and valued their opinions. In regards to SRLPPs, Oriale also recognized ways that her school associate supported the promotion of SRL in the class. She spoke about how her school associate provided students with choice, which promoted student engagement because “[students] actually have ownership in what they’re doing” (pre-practicum interview, November 13, 2014, p. 18). Additionally, she remarked that her school associate involved students in the development of grading criteria. For example, he would ask students, “What do you think should be the criteria for this? Or how much do you think I should weight this?” (pre-practicum interview, November 13, 2014, p. 18). She expressed that seeing SRLPPs in action helped her to understand the connections between positive teacher and student relationships, the creation of well-managed learning environments, and the promotion of SRL (e.g., “… at first I didn’t actually think that teacher relationships with students had anything to do with self-regulation, but I now feel like it really does … in terms of creating an environment in which the students have a say”; pre-practicum interview, November 13, 2014, p. 17).

In terms of her own implementation of practices, during her pre-practicum interview, Oriale indicated that she had freedom in her practicum context to attempt teaching practices of her choice, commenting that she was “given the freedom to do whatever I want” (pre-practicum interview, November 13, 2014, p. 31). She also shared that her school associate was willing to provide feedback: “He’ll talk to me afterwards … If it fails, let’s talk about it. If it’s successful, let’s talk about it” (pre-practicum interview, November 13, 2014, p. 32). While grateful for these
learning opportunities, Oriale described feeling lost at times because of this latitude. She wished her school associate provided more directed, scaffolded support prior to her implementing lessons as a means of guiding her development of practices (“I’ll ask very specific questions … [school associate] doesn’t give me an answer … I have to figure it out myself”; pre-practicum interview, November 13, 2014, p. 32).

Other structural constraints Oriale felt involved her perception of limited connections between the MY/SRL Cohort and her practicum experiences. Specifically, she noted that, while she had been introduced to many educational theories in her coursework (e.g., “inquiry-based learning,” “personalized learning,” “social-emotional learning,” “social justice,” “cooperative learning”), few explicit connections between these theories and the promotion of SRL had been made, or SRLPPs been explicitly modelled. Oriale indicated her courses were “very separate in terms of what it is they’re teaching,” noting that they seemed to be conducted in “their own little bubbles” (pre-practicum interview, November 13, 2014, p. 43). She felt strongly that time and opportunities needed to be provided in the TEP for TCs to “weave” theories together and begin to form a “schema” or “framework” for SRL. Without these links, Oriale predicted that her uptake and implementation of SRLPPs would be limited. For example, she stated:

“We have no framework for it. It’s just what’s been written … I could interpret this [theory] in a couple of different ways, and yet I have no way of knowing which way is intended because there’s no visual representation of it” (pre-practicum interview, November 13, 2014, p. 41).

With time, it appeared that Oriale’s perceptions of how her school associate was supporting SRL changed. As her understandings of SRLPPs deepened she began to view her school associate’s implementations of SRLPPs as limited and questioned whether her school
associate was able to model SRLPPs and support her in making connections between her on- and off-campus experiences. For example, she described how students’ opportunities to engage in metacognitive thought through forms of self-assessment were limited in the class. While she expressed that her school associate provided students with time to self-assess their work, students were only required to give themselves a mark on assignments and projects rather than given criteria that would have guided them to think more deeply about their assessments. At the time of her first debriefing interview she remarked that her school associate’s teaching style was “traditional” and “utterly different” than her objectives of promoting SRL through collaborative projects.

Evidence of a growing chasm between Oriale and her school associate was also found in comments Oriale shared during her post-practicum interview. Having successfully completed the practicum portion of the TEP, Oriale appeared to be more comfortable describing the challenges she experienced in her first practicum setting. She explained that the initial freedom she had in her practicum context to explore new practices began to dissipate as she assumed greater teaching responsibilities during her extended practicum. She indicated that her first school associate had grown increasingly restrictive in terms of what and how she taught (e.g., “If I offered suggestions on how we could incorporate or integrate subjects, he said ‘no’”; post-practicum interview, July 17, 2015, p. 10). These experiences left Oriale feeling as if her school associate did not welcome or value her input and ideas. She commented that her school associate “treated what I was teaching as completely irrelevant and not necessary” (post-practicum interview, July 17, 2015, p. 10). Not wanting to abandon her goal of promoting SRL through cooperative learning experiences, Oriale tried to form another mentorship in the school with a teacher she viewed as having a similar focus to her. However, she reported that her school
associate was not comfortable with this connection or with her receiving feedback from an alternate mentor.

It is important to note that the perspective of Oriale’s school associate is unknown (no school associates participated in this study). Oriale’s request to work with another teacher in her practicum setting may have been denied by her school associate for many valid reasons (e.g., need for university approval of school associates, years of teaching experience, wanting to maintain consistency in learning experiences). Although evidence as to why the professional relationship between Oriale and her school associate deteriorated over the course of the year is limited, it is clear Oriale struggled to align her own learning and teaching objectives with the expectations of her school associate.

At the time of her second debriefing interview, Oriale was in her second practicum placement. She explained that she had requested this transfer and, with the support of FA 1, a new practicum placement was arranged. Oriale’s final two observations and debriefing interviews were completed in the new setting. Table 4.7 indicates Oriale’s perceptions of affordances and constraints for her learning within her second practicum experiences.

**What forms of motivational and structural affordances and constraints for developing general teaching practices and SRLPPs did Oriale perceive in her university and practicum settings in her second practicum setting?**

**Oriale’s personal characteristics and perception of student characteristics.** Upon transitioning to her new placement, Oriale faced many unexpected challenges. She entered her second practicum setting at a time when she was expected to assume 60-80% of all teaching responsibilities. Oriale indicated that upon her entry into her second practicum setting, she had no previous knowledge of the students or their capabilities: “I came in and I had no idea what
they were capable of. No idea what they knew before. Like I knew nothing … I didn’t know anything about them” (second debriefing interview, May 15, 2015, p. 36).

Unlike her first placement, where she had described her class as “homogenous” (e.g., she viewed all students as coming from upper middle-class households and being highly motivated to learn), she described students in her new placement as coming from “all walks of life”. Specifically, she noted that students were diverse in terms of their economic backgrounds as well as their learning, behavioural, and motivational strengths and needs, remarking that: “Some kids were in foster care. [Some k]ids were wealthy. [Some] were on ridiculous sports scholarships and didn’t care about school” (post-practicum interview, July 17, 2015, p. 20). It was also apparent from Oriale’s comments and my observations of the class that student behaviour and motivation created barriers for Oriale’s implementation of lessons.

In her new placement, the class had experienced multiple teacher transitions. During the first term, two temporary teachers had been placed in the class. Her new school associate had recently returned from maternity leave (in January) and shared her position with a newly placed job share partner. Thus, unlike her first practicum placement, routines for entering and leaving the class, areas for group and individual work, and expectations for student behaviour (e.g., voice level, appropriate language) appeared to have not yet been established. The absence of these structures and expectations, along with Oriale’s lack of experience supporting students with behavioural needs appeared to contribute to management issues in the class. On numerous occasions, Oriale described (and I observed) students demonstrating severe behavioural challenges (e.g., students being disrespectful towards Oriale and others, behaving aggressively [throwing a chair], making inappropriate comments and sounds, demonstrating unsafe
behaviours [leaving supervised areas]). The general tone of the class was chaotic and students appeared particularly adversarial towards Oriale.

The impact of these challenges was apparent during my second debriefing interview with Oriale. At this time, Oriale appeared overwhelmed and expressed that she felt unable to successfully design instruction to meet students’ needs. For example, she stated:

“I can’t prepare lessons for every possible situation … half the kids have already done Pythagorean Theorem, and they already know all of this stuff … then there’s kids who don’t even know what a triangle is in the same classroom”; second debriefing interview, May 15, 2015, p. 2).

Furthermore, as Oriale pointed out, and I observed, she had a limited repertoire of management strategies. She had not taken coursework focused explicitly on classroom management, and had experienced few management challenges in her previous setting. Although the Cohort met for one after school session, during which behavioural issues were discussed, she felt she needed “something more” from her instructors, FA, and school associate to help her develop effective management strategies.

**Relationships.** Oriale indicated in her second debriefing that she had established a positive relationship with her new school associate and continued to experience a good relationship with her FA. However, she struggled to form connections with students. This lack of connection with students combined with a lack of familiarity about their learning needs likely contributed to the severity of management issues in the room and Oriale’s ability to experiment with SRLPPs (further described below).

**Structural supports.** Unfortunately, few structural supports appeared to be available for Oriale’s development of relationships with students, or for her understanding and
implementation of management and SRLPPs. As Oriale described her challenges, it was apparent she felt alone in her attempts to cope with them. While she acknowledged that her school associate was supportive in terms of giving her freedom to experiment with SRLPPs and providing feedback (“[She] is amazing at giving constructive feedback”; second debriefing interview, May 15, 2015, p. 32). However, she noted her school associate was often busy with extracurricular activities and “rarely around.” Therefore, there were limited opportunities for ongoing collaboration with her school associate and for Oriale to see her school associated model teaching and management practices. In fact, at the time of her second debriefing interview, Oriale reported that she had “never actually observed her [school associate] teaching.”

Oriale’s FA seemed to be the only constant form of support for Oriale over the course of her TEP year. In her second debriefing interview, Oriale commented that her FA had provided her with extensive assistance that enabled her to cope in her new context. She stated:

“[FA’s name] has my back like no one else … I know that she doesn’t do this for everybody, but she’ll take my weekly reflections and she will go through them in extreme detail with feedback and suggestions and all of this because she knows that I’m having a hard time, and I know that she spends more time than she probably should, given how many people that she has to do this with” (second debriefing interview, May 14, 2015, p. 32 & 34).

Despite her close relationship with her FA, Oriale was hesitant to share the extent of her challenges with her FA. She feared that her struggles with her assigned class might reflect negatively on her final assessment, so she kept her FA from knowing the difficulties she was facing by scheduling all of her observations with the class that she taught for just three blocks per week.
Furthermore, interview data indicated that Oriale did not have access to TC peer support. For instance, in her pre-practicum interview, Oriale described with disappointment how she had set up a Google Drive page for TCs to share ideas, but only one TC in the Cohort had done so (e.g., “Unfortunately, I would love to say that everyone’s been participating in it, but it’s really just me and like one other person”; pre-practicum interview, November 14, 2019, p. 78). Also, in terms of emotional support, her comments suggested that she felt detached from the group. She remarked: “I don’t necessarily relate myself with this group of people” (pre-practicum interview, November 14, 2019, p. 79). Over time, it appeared Oriale developed some connections with peers. During Oriale’s member check of her case, she indicated that she had established several close and lasting relationships with peers in the Cohort, and that these relationships did provide her with emotional support throughout the TEP. However, she acknowledged they did not afford her informational support to address the challenges she was facing during the extended practicum (email communication, April 20, 2019).

As in Marika’s case, these mounting constraints appeared to impact Oriale’s overall sense of well-being. In an attempt to meet the various needs of students, Oriale revised all her units and lesson plans (e.g., “I had to scratch everything”; second debriefing interview, May 15, 2015, p. 36). These revisions placed unexpected and extensive demands upon Oriale’s time. Additionally, Oriale worried that even after revising her plans, management issues would prevent her from successfully implementing lessons and covering required content, commenting that she was “super stressed about that” (second debriefing interview, May 15, 2015, p. 32). She feared that if this was the case, parents and her school associate would hold her solely responsible: “The fact [is] that that’s going to fall on me, right? If a parent comes back and says, well, my kid doesn’t know this – this is your fault” (second debriefing interview, May 15, 2015, p. 13). During her
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second debrief, she described feeling “defeated” and “drowning”. She wept at times as she questioned her abilities to succeed in the TEP: “I can’t do it. I don’t know how to do it” (second debriefing interview, May 15, 2015, p. 10) and her choice of careers: “I’m seriously considering not being a teacher unless it’s in a different way. I don’t want to be in a job that I feel like this” (second debriefing interview, May 15, 2015, p. 10). These concerns weighed heavily upon Oriale and interfered with her sleep, which, in turn, left her feeling “tired all the time”.

**How did Oriale implement SRLPPs throughout her practicum experiences?**

Before beginning her extended practicum, Oriale shared her inquiry project and one documented unit plan, titled “Genius Hour,” with me. These documents, along with debriefing interviews, observations, and a detailed oral description of a French unit, provided information about Oriale’s teaching intentions and priorities. In her inquiry project, Oriale examined the role of productive failure in the learning process. She investigated how opportunities for students to engage in cycles of inquiry provided room for students to experience productive failure (i.e., to make mistakes, reflect on their learning, and then adjust their goals and accomplish their task). To facilitate student engagement in this process, Oriale indicated that it was important for teachers to build strong, trusting relationships with students, so they felt safe learning to take risks. In addition to her inquiry project, Oriale also submitted a unit consisting of a series of lessons designed to facilitate students’ own inquiry projects exploring possible career choices. The specific objectives of the unit were to provide students with strategies to find information; check the reliability and prevalence of information; and extract, organize, synthesize, and present information.

Oriale’s focus on developing positive relationships with students, highlighted in her inquiry project, was evident in the first lesson of the unit that centred on students’ creation of
learner profiles. The lesson prompted students to engage in metacognitive thinking. Using a graphic organizer, students thought and wrote about how their learning was best supported (e.g., they identified environments they work well in and considered which of their learning styles and strategies were effective). Subsequent lessons supported students to develop strategies to find resources, judge the relevance and reliability of sources and information, paraphrase, and manage their time. Additionally, opportunities were embedded within the unit for students to reflect upon their learning and set new learning goals (e.g., at the start of all lessons, students were provided with time to write in their journals and set learning goals for the day).

Motivational supports were also present throughout the unit. The final task in the unit was an extended project that offered students their choice of research and presentation method.

Throughout the unit, Oriale included opportunities for students to work collaboratively and receive peer feedback (e.g., students worked together to complete a mock peer assessment in order to develop skills for peer editing).

While Oriale’s prepared lesson and unit plans focused on deepening her relationships with students and incorporated many SRLPPs, upon changing practicum settings, her teaching intentions shifted as she revised all of her units and lessons. She abandoned her initial teaching goal of creating opportunities for SRL through student collaboration, and instead opted to plan and implement lessons that were focused on teacher-directed, individual work (use of texts, summative assessment, individual projects). She expressed this change was due to students’ reluctance to engage in SRL, management challenges, and pressure to cover content: “[given] the dynamic of the class, collaborative work wasn’t optimal … for the time frame. So, I actually had to focus a lot more on individual work just to ensure that they actually did what they needed to do” (post-practicum interview, July 17, 2015, p. 2).
This change in foci was evident during observations. I visited Oriale’s practicum setting to conduct observations of her actual teaching practices on three occasions. During these visits, information was gathered about her implementation of general teaching practices and SRLPPs. This data is displayed in Table 4.8.

**Table 4.8**

*Observational Evidence of Oriale’s Implementation of SRLPPs*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Observation and Debrief 1</th>
<th>Observation and Debrief 2</th>
<th>Observation and Debrief 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Choice</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Partners</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scaffold Choice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control Over</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Work</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Understanding</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension Task</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher Support</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewing</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructions/Tasks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Depth Questions</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summarizing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing Resources</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scaffolding</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monitoring Progress</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checking Students Have</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing a Model</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support for Individual</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Differences</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Group Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Support</td>
<td>✓*</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring Understanding</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breaking Up Tasks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapting Tasks</td>
<td>✓*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of Student</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs/Strengths</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Embedded Assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observational</td>
<td>✓*</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responding to Feedback</td>
<td>✓*</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Levels of Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended</td>
<td>✓*</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real-Life Applications</td>
<td>✓*</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Interest</td>
<td>✓*</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-Assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions for Reflection</td>
<td>✓*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Expectations</td>
<td>✓*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>✓*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model Provided</td>
<td>✓*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Peer Support</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Together</td>
<td>✓*</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Assessment</td>
<td>✓*</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>✓*</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Management</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humour</td>
<td>✓*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity</td>
<td>✓*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stating Expectations</td>
<td>✓*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
My first observation took place in Oriale’s original practicum placement, on April 10, 2015, during the last class of the day (1:55-2:45pm). The observed lesson was part of Oriale’s “Genius Hour” unit (described above). The objectives of the observed lesson were to prepare students to select and evaluate online resources for projects and to establish class-generated criteria (a strategy Oriale had seen modelled by her school associate) to assess the appropriateness of websites.

During the observation, it was apparent expectations for behaviour had been well-established in the classroom. When I entered the room, students were seated in table groups of three or four. Oriale was facilitating a class discussion about strategies to check the reliability of online sources (e.g., Googling authors, cross checking, checking affiliations and publishers). Students listened respectfully to each other’s ideas and raised their hands when they wished to contribute to the discussion. All students were attentive and most were actively engaged in the discussion.

As the lesson progressed, students worked together in their table groups to check the reliability of different online resources and develop criteria for gauging the credibility of resources. During their group work, all students were respectful toward one another (e.g., providing each other with space to share their thoughts, considering others’ point-of-view). All

Note. Asterix indicates observations of Oriale’s teaching practices in her first practicum setting.
students remained on task, and if they needed help, they raised their hands. When necessary, Oriale was quickly able to gain the attention of students by raising her hand and requesting students direct their attention toward her (“eyes on me”). Throughout the lesson I observed no management issues.

During the lesson, Oriale’s focus on promoting SRL through collaborative activities was apparent. Students were encouraged to participate and supported in contributing to the group discussion. To this end, Oriale used questioning to stimulate students’ thinking and to help students expand their comments (e.g., Who is monitoring [sites]?). Upon completion of the discussion, Oriale modelled how to check the relevance and reliability of sources and provided scaffolded support for students to develop strategies for finding relevant, reliable resources. She posed the following question to the class: “Which foods contain a lot of fiber?” She then handed each table group a web address of a potential source and asked students to gauge its relevance to the topic. Students worked in small groups to assess the validity of sources. As students worked, Oriale circulated, promoting metacognition by asking questions to help them monitor and reflect on their learning (“How did you find your source relevant?” “How do you know?”). Oriale took the opportunity to support individuals and small groups as they discussed criteria and posted their ideas to a class webpage (e.g., she provided procedural support for students to log on to the web page). Toward the end of the lesson, Oriale allowed time for groups and individuals to share their findings and opinions with the class. She supported this process by gathering students’ ideas and by posting comments for those students who were unable to access the class web page [due to a poor internet connection]. As she posted their comments, she projected the class web page onto a screen and pointed out the page’s different categories (i.e., referencing, author,
purpose, date, affiliation). She used this opportunity to help students develop strategies to categorize information (“What do we put that under?”).

At the end of the lesson, Oriale involved students in decision making about when homework for the class was due. She asked students to inform her of other assignments they had received. After a student reviewed their assignments, Oriale asked if they would like to vote to extend the timeline for their assigned homework from her class. After the vote, Oriale extended the due date for their assignment.

My next visit occurred on May 4, 2015 in Oriale’s second placement. She had been in her new placement for two weeks. The lesson was a review of a previously taught science concept on light refraction. The room held 30 students, sitting in groups of three and four. As opposed to my first observation session, Oriale’s focus did not appear to be on providing students with opportunities to work collaboratively, but rather on traditional forms of teaching and classroom management. As students entered the class, she reminded them to turn off electronics and sit in their assigned seats (“Where do you sit?”; observational notes, May 4, 2015). Once students were seated, she waited at the front of the room for their attention.

During the lesson, Oriale reviewed previously taught concepts about light reflection and refraction. Throughout the lesson, she posed questions to the class (“Is the refraction of light dependent upon the density of materials?”; observational notes, May 4, 2015) and then reviewed the answers to questions. Oriale also used the projector to show definitions of constructs and asked students to write down the definitions in their science duotangs. Throughout the lesson, several students continually called out and spoke over Oriale, asking if the lesson was a review, or if they would be adding more information to their notes. Oriale answered students’ questions and then continued the lesson. At the midpoint of the lesson, she attempted to have students
discuss a question with their desk partners (e.g., “If I had a red duotang with only the blue wavelength, what would I see?”; observational notes, May 4, 2015). During this time, much of the conversation was off task and the room became very noisy. After several minutes, Oriale stopped the discussion and asked two students to share their thoughts with the class. Neither student volunteered any information. In response, Oriale again reviewed the concept of light refraction. Students were becoming increasingly inattentive and disruptive as the lesson continued (e.g., students were playing with electronics, chatting, calling out, making noises, such as banging on their desks, a cell phone rang). Oriale stopped the lesson several times and asked students what they were doing and/or if their behaviour was appropriate. She tried to direct their attention toward her (“Eyes up front”) and waited for their attention (for up to 5 minutes). Clearly frustrated, she informed students who were not attending that they would be staying for a minute after school and began to write students’ names on the board.

From an observer’s stance, it appeared one student in particular seemed to be intent on challenging Oriale. This student made sound effects (e.g., hooting, banging) throughout the lesson, and appeared to be able to get and hold the class’s attention. Although Oriale attempted to curb this behaviour by writing the students’ name on the board and adding check marks next to the student’s name (to indicate extra minutes after school), rather than stop the behaviour, the behaviour escalated. As Oriale added a third check mark next to the student’s name, the student stood up and yelled loudly “I’m out” and walked towards the door. When the student reached the doorway, they turned and told Oriale, “I’m just getting a drink” (observational notes, May 4, 2015).

Despite these challenges, Oriale continued the lesson and moved on to an activity that sparked students’ interest and allowed for active engagement. She asked for volunteers to
demonstrate light refraction. Students in the class were eager to volunteer with most raising their hands to participate. Six students were chosen to come to the front of the room. Four students linked arms and faced two other students two metres away who also linked arms. The linked group of two students moved quickly toward the group of four, bending forward to create a visual of how light travels when it hits a surface (i.e., it bounces off of the surface). After the demonstration, Oriale gathered a cursory assessment of students’ understanding of light refraction by asking them to indicate their understanding on a scale of one to five. Referring to a diagram of light refraction in the textbook, she asked, “… on a scale of one to five, now do we understand what this image is depicting?” Students then indicated with their fingers their level of understanding. With the exception of one student, all students indicated they understood.

For the last seven minutes of the class, students explored light refraction by using glass prisms and light (flashlights, cell phone light). During this time, students had the option of working with partners of their choice and were free to work anywhere in the room. As students explored how light traveled through the prisms, Oriale circulated the room and demonstrated to students how to shine the light through the prism to create a spectrum. All students were engaged and on task. After 5 minutes, several students strayed from the activity (e.g., waving lights around the room); however, most remained engaged, and many even chose to extend the task by putting their prisms together and using different light sources (e.g., projector).

As students were working, the bell rang to end the class. Oriale asked students to hand in the prisms and return to their seats. When students were seated, she tried to connect the day’s lesson with concepts students were learning about in math (e.g., “… we have been talking about angles a lot … and the types of angles shapes have”; observational notes, Oriale, May 4, 2015). As she began to draw a diagram of how angles were represented in light refraction, students
became notably anxious to get to their next class. Oriale discontinued the diagram and dismissed class.

My final observation of Oriale took place on May 28, 2015. She requested the observation be scheduled with the grade eight class she taught three times per week for one block, rather than with her regular class. When I arrived, students were entering the room quietly with their notebooks in hand. There were 26 students in the room, sitting in horizontal (to the white board) rows of three to four desks. Oriale’s school associate remained seated in a desk in the front corner of the room to complete an observation.

Similar to the second observation, Oriale focused on classroom management. However, during this lesson, it was apparent she was attempting to use pre-emptive strategies to mitigate management issues. Specifically, she had created a highly structured lesson. The class began with a French quiz. Oriale requested that students separate their desks and “keep their eyes on their own paper.” As students finished the quiz, they were instructed to raise their hands, so Oriale could collect their quizzes.

After everyone finished, Oriale reminded students that during the previous lesson, they had selected a profession and learned French terms related to that profession. Oriale then told the class she would name a profession in English, and if it was the profession students had selected, they would stand and say their occupation in French. Afterward, the class would repeat the name of the profession in French. This routine was completed with 23 students and took 25 minutes. Throughout this activity several students became off task and/or called out. In response to these occurrences, Oriale stopped the activity, raised her hand to indicate she wanted the class’s attention, waited for silence, and/or reminded students that the task would take longer if they continued to chat. Once asked, most students redirected their behaviour.
Oriale then informed students they would be using the remainder of the lesson to work in pairs and prepare a French conversation about the professional roles they had assumed (e.g., “What would a conversation between a police officer and a baker be about?”; observational notes, May 28, 2015). One student in the class appeared to be very excited about the activity and called out several ideas for conversations. The first time this occurred, Oriale reminded the student to “stop calling out”; during the second interruption, she responded that the student’s behaviour was “not okay.” After the third interruption, she asked the student to leave the room. The student complied and Oriale continued the lesson. Shortly after the student left the room, Oriale noticed that the student (who was standing outside the classroom in the hallway) began to raise their hand in response to questions she was posing to the class. She invited the student to re-enter the room after five minutes. The student agreed to come in if they could “share their idea.”

After students had shared their ideas with the class, Oriale chose one of the examples offered to model how a conversation might develop. She wrote on the board, “A baker arrives at shop in bad neighbourhood in Vegas … he sees a broken window, blood, and all cupcakes are eaten … What happened? … He sees a police officer and explains what he saw” (observational notes, May 28, 2015). Oriale provided students with strategies for the development of this conversation. She demonstrated how such conversations should be mapped out onto a handout she had given students. These expectations were also summarized at the end of the example: “So, you are going to write four French verbs that you use in your conversation … and then you are going to write a common phrase you would use in French. For example, ‘What happened?’ ‘Why did they do this?’ … The next column says what supplies you would need.” (observational notes, Oriale, May 28, 2015).
Oriale told students that it was now quiet individual work time. When finished summarizing the task and expectations, she assessed students’ understanding by asking the class if they understood the task. All students indicated they understood. She then asked a student who indicated they understood to summarize the task as a way of review. As students began to work on their templates, several students got up to share their ideas with others. Oriale asked students to return to their desks, reminding them that there would be another time to for them to share their ideas.

Several minutes before the end of the class, Oriale redirected the class’s attention to the front of the room where she stood. She mentioned to students that she had heard a lot of great ideas and told students the due date for the templates. She then instructed them to pack up their things and line up at the door.

As Oriale reflected on the lesson during our debriefing, she commented that it was highly teacher directed, which caused some students to become off task (e.g., “I realized they’re just listening—they’re not doing anything. So that’s why some of them got off task”; third debrief, May 28, 2015). However, portions of the lesson (students working together to craft conversations) appeared to be well aligned with her goals of increasing student engagement through high interest, cooperative activities. She was particularly pleased that she had been successful in this regard, noting that students, “seemed super engaged in the activity, which was awesome … Couldn’t stop them from talking because they were so engaged” (third debrief, May 28, 2015, p. 1). Oriale commented that the lesson did provide some opportunities for students to engage in SRL. For example, she felt students had opportunities to: “… regulate their time, …[develop] plans of action … [and] utilize their resources [to meet the] deadline” (third debriefing interview, May 28, 2015). Furthermore, Oriale remarked in her third debriefing
interview that she was supporting students’ SRL by “giving them strategies” to cope with their “panic” about assignments. To this end, she explained that she tried to pre-emptively provide students to with strategies to engage in challenging tasks to reduce their “anxiety”. For example, she would remind students that:

“When you get stuck on something … wait, move onto the next one, wait for me, or you can use resources. You can look in your textbook. You can try it – see if it works, see if it doesn’t work. You can think back to what we know. You know, what do you already know about this stuff. What are you looking for?” (observational notes, May 28, 2015).

She expressed that her provision of these strategies helped students to engage in tasks successfully, thereby decreasing their off-task behaviour.

Although it was limited in terms of SRLPPs, Oriale felt the lesson acted as foundation for future lessons that would more thoroughly support students’ development of SRL. In upcoming lessons, she intended to support students’ development of strategies to engage in conversational French by setting up an in-class bakery. Students would use common French phrases to “purchase” bakery items. She indicated that students would have time “to practice their conversations with each other,” which might create opportunities for peer support. Oriale planned on embedding assessment in this activity by “taking notes” during her verbal interactions with students.

**Pulling it all together: How were Oriale’s implementations of SRLPPs connected to her learning contexts, beliefs and other personal characteristics?**

It is evident that Oriale’s beliefs about the utility of SRLPPs and sense of competence were impacted by the teaching contexts in which she was placed. Within her first practicum setting, Oriale held positive beliefs about the utility of SRLPPs and incorporated these practices
into her planning and teaching. However, upon entering her second practicum setting a turning point in her beliefs and practices occurred. Confronted with exceptional classroom management challenges and limited support for coping with them, her beliefs about the utility of SRL began to shift. While she still valued the idea of SRLPP (“SRL is great”) she questioned the use of SRLPPs in her second placement. It was at this point in her TEP that she came to view the context of classrooms as impacting the utility of SRLPPs. Oriale remarked:

I think it just seemed like, you know, this would work if all these other factors lined up, right? If, you know, the environment was really safe for all the kids. If all the kids came to school and they were fed. And all the kids came to school and all of these things lined up, then I believe a lot of the practices we were learning about would have gone a lot more smoothly (post-practicum interview, July 17, 2015, p. 30).

Lacking these antecedents, she felt some SRLPPs contributed to off-task behaviour within her second practicum setting (“I value it but I can’t” … “I’m finding SRL, inquiry … and anything exploratory because they just go off … And you can’t bring them back”; second debriefing interview, May 14, 2015, p. 30).

However, when Oriale experienced success implementing lessons with a less challenging class (for three blocks a week), her confidence re-emerged. These successful teaching experiences, while limited, appeared pivotal in helping her retain some focus on her initial values and goals (e.g., “I have better relationships with [these students] … I have amazing lessons with them … Great lessons. They participate. They’re really interested in [the lessons]”; second debriefing interview, May 14, 2015, p. 29). Having the opportunity to successfully implement lessons in an alternative class, without the ongoing distraction of management issues, Oriale started to once again incorporate SRLPPs with her assigned class. Although still focused on
implementing more traditional forms of instruction in the classroom, she began to view the Cohort’s focus on SRLPPs (e.g., reflecting on learning, monitoring progress, goal setting) as valuable in regards to her own development of general teaching practices and those that promoted SRL. She stated:

“…reflecting on my practice and making mini goals to improve. If I’m seeing a problem area, I’ll think back on it … [if I feel] [students] weren’t really paying attention during the modelling … [I think], ‘Okay, how can I improve that?’ … I’ll make a goal for next time to do this, this and this” [third debriefing interview, May 28, 2015, p. 6]).

There was a distinct change in Oriale's demeanour at the time of our third debriefing interview. While during our second debriefing interview, Oriale appeared drained and preoccupied with the challenges she perceived as being beyond her control, in our third debriefing interview she was confident and optimistic about her development in the TEP. She noted that, “Things are a lot better than the last time you were here” (third debriefing interview, May 28, 2015, p. 10). Throughout the interview, she calmly reflected on her practice in a constructive way (e.g., recognizing her strengths and areas for future growth). With her confidence buoyed, she began to think beyond management issues toward larger conceptual aspects of the Cohort (e.g., connections between SRL, positive teacher/student relationships and classroom management). As she developed relationships with students, the frustration that she had felt regarding their behaviour in her assigned class had morphed into a sense of empathy as she came to understand their learning, emotional, and behavioural needs. For example, during her post-practicum interview, she described how she formed “a really solid relationship” with one of her initially most challenging students (the student who was making noises and behaving disrespectfully toward Oriale throughout my second observation). As this relationship developed,
she began to understand the student and her management concerns regarding this student dissipated (“I kept working with him, and I kept talking to him, and I found out all of these things that I didn’t know before … he ended up being one of my favourite students”; post-practicum interview, July 17, 2015, p. 8).

The success Oriale experienced towards the end of her practicum in establishing classroom routines and expectations also contributed to her implementation of SRLPPs. My third observation reveals how she began to embed scheduled times for students to work independently, with peers, and one-on-one with her to plan lessons. The development of these pre-emptive, organizational structures provided students with a framework to engage in cycles of SRL and appeared to give Oriale space and time to work with individual students. She said:

“I get really overwhelmed when suddenly I get swarmed by 20 kids … so giving them those resources to like set their own goals, to work through it – I feel like that’s helping me a lot more than maybe them right now; front-loading and giving them the resources to do it on their own is beneficial for both of us” (third debriefing interview, May 28, 2015, p. 20).

Summary

Throughout the TEP, Oriale struggled to form and access relationships that provided her with structural supports for her learning. The only constant form of support for Oriale within the TEP was that of her FA. This relationship seemed pivotal in maintaining Oriale’s participation in the TEP. Lacking consistent relationships across her TEP, it appears that Oriale’s development of SRLPPs was impacted, particularly in her second practicum placement. However, with time, Oriale was able to develop positive connections with students which allowed her to begin to
experiment successfully with SRLPPs and to recognize ways that SRL could support students’ learning and her own.
Chapter Five - Cross-Case Analysis

This chapter presents a cross-case analysis of Kendra’s, Catherine’s, Marika’s, and Oriale’s experiences throughout their TEP. This analysis examines how TCs’ personal characteristics (beliefs, motivations, histories and perceived knowledge of SRLPPs) along with contextual features of their environments, may have had an impact upon their self-determined motivation to develop and implement SRLPPs. To this end, below I interpret and discuss themes (the integration of categories) across TC cases.

TCs’ Personal Characteristics

Table 5.1 and the discussion that follows highlight similarities and differences in the TCs’ personal characteristics across their TEP. Results from the GCOS and pre-practicum interviews provided information about the TCs’ personal characteristics early in their TEP year (i.e., beliefs, motivations, histories and perceived knowledge of SRLPPs). Data from the debriefing and post practicum interviews revealed how these characteristics remained stable or changed over the course of the year and how they were implicated in the TCs’ self-determined motivation and development of SRLPPs.
Table 5.1

**Personal Characteristics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Knowledge of SRLPPs</th>
<th>Utility Beliefs About SRLPPs</th>
<th>Confidence</th>
<th>Understanding of Classroom Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre     D1 D2 D3 PP</td>
<td>Pre     D1 D2 D3 PP</td>
<td>Pre     D1 D2 D3 PP</td>
<td>Pre     D1 D2 D3 PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendra</td>
<td>C       C C       C</td>
<td>A       A A       A</td>
<td>C       C C       C</td>
<td>C       C C       C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cath</td>
<td>C       C C       C</td>
<td>A       A A       A</td>
<td>C       C C       C</td>
<td>C       A A       A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marika</td>
<td>C       C C       C</td>
<td>A       A A       A</td>
<td>C       A A       A</td>
<td>A       A A       A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oriale</td>
<td>C       C C       C</td>
<td>C       C A       C</td>
<td>C       C A       C</td>
<td>C       C A       C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Pre refers to pre-practicum interview. D1, D2, D3 refers to debriefing interviews 1, 2 and 3. PP refers to post-practicum interview. A refers to affordances identified by TCs. C refers to constraints identified by TCs.
**Motivational orientations.** Although all four of the TCs were generally autonomously motivated, the reasons each gave during their pre-practicum interviews as motivations for entering the TEP differed. Similarly, their responses to specific questions on the GCOS also indicated variation amongst their approaches to learning situations. Marika and Catherine’s reasons (pre-practicum interview) for entering the TEP were deeply integrated in their sense of self and intertwined with the challenges they faced in their educational and work experiences. Marika wanted to position herself in a role where she could help youth avoid becoming immersed in lifestyles of addiction. Catherine, who had been designated with a learning disability in high school, wanted to enter a role where she could assist students who were academically vulnerable be successful in school and beyond. In turn, Oriale and Kendra, who held previous degrees in science, indicated during their pre-practicum interviews that they had entered the teaching field because of their enjoyment working with youth and children and their desire to integrate their scientific backgrounds into their teaching interests. These data suggest that Oriale and Kendra paired their academic strengths and interests with their chosen profession, whereas Marika and Catherine seemed driven to counter their socially and emotionally sourced difficulties in school for students they perceive are similarly situated.

Examination of specific questions on the GCOS also provides evidence that Oriale and Kendra’s motivations for entering the TEP were perhaps more external than those of Catherine and Marika. On the GCOS, Marika and Catherine both identified personal interest as their main priority in career selection. In contrast, Oriale and Kendra’s responses on the GCOS indicated that they tended to be motivated to engage in professional tasks for external rewards (e.g., financial rewards and status).
While the TCs’ reasons for entering the TEP may have indicated differing motives, examination of their orientation towards supports for their learning over their TEP year suggests that Kendra and Catherine shared similar motivational characteristics. This similarity is most apparent in the ways in which Catherine and Kendra coped with challenges throughout their TEP. When they encountered constraints for their learning (e.g., teaching responsibilities, students’ behavioural needs), they actively sought and took advantage of available structural supports. For example, at the mid-point of Kendra’s practicum, she indicated that she felt overwhelmed by the freedom she had been given in her practicum context. To cope with this challenge, she voiced to her school associate and FA her need for more structured support. Upon realizing her needs, her school associate and teachers in her pod provided Kendra with the support she needed to reduce her feelings of anxiety (e.g., “Now they are trying to check in with me more … on Fridays we sit down and try to plan a sketch for the following week … it makes me feel more at ease” (email communication, May 23, 2015). Likewise, Catherine’s orientation toward structural supports was demonstrated throughout her interviews. She described how she turned to her school associate for advice about management skills, consulted with her peers about teaching practices, and attended the afterschool workshop the researchers organized for the SRL Cohort. Through these connections, Catherine and Kendra proactively garnered support for their sense of relatedness and their competence.

For Oriale and Marika, the ways in which they were autonomously motivated throughout their TEP experiences were less well-defined than those of Catherine and Kendra. Oriale and Marika did not appear to take full advantage of the structural supports provided for them. Although they both attended the SRL workshop (mentioned above) and formed relationships with their peers, they did not work with their peers to share and access knowledge. Nor did they
indicate ways in which their peers could act as supports for their learning. Furthermore, they both initially struggled to form relationships with key members in their learning teams (e.g., school associates). There is little doubt that Marika and Oriale experienced exceptional challenges in the TEP (according to an administrator within the TEP, changes in practicum placements occur rarely and reflect exceptional circumstances), it is possible that their learning experiences were impacted by their limited connections to critical people resources.

**TCs’ Beliefs, Perceived Knowledge, and Self-Determined Motivation**

In this study, all four TCs indicated in the early stages of the TEP that they had limited knowledge of SRLPPs. However, they initially held positive beliefs about the utility of SRLPPs for middle-years learners and, with the exception of Oriale, maintained these beliefs throughout the year. Examination of the supports that were available for the TCs’ sense of competence helps to interpret this finding. Kendra and Catherine shared and accessed similar motivational affordances for their learning over the course of their TEP year (e.g., positive relationships with FAs, school associates, students, and peers; support from school associates and peers). Although Kendra and Catherine faced challenges, their orientation towards these motivational supports appeared to fulfil their need for relatedness, protect their developing sense of competence and instill positive beliefs about SRLPPs. For example, both TCs initially encountered challenges with classroom management. However, throughout the course of their interviews, they continued to value the focus of the Cohort as an approach to coping with these challenges (e.g., attending to students’ needs and interests by giving them choice and control over challenge helps students feel in control of learning—autonomous—, leading to productive, versus maladaptive, engagement in learning).
Conversely, at varying times in their TEP year, Marika and Oriale experienced limited supports for their competence and relatedness. In Marika’s first practicum setting, she felt detached from her school associate and staff. Furthermore, she indicated that she had few opportunities to see SRL modelled in her classroom or to receive support from her school associate. The absence of these supports coincided with Marika’s expressed difficulties aligning her university and practicum learning experiences, thereby potentially limiting her view of the relevance of SRL and curtailing her motivation to develop SRLPPs.

Similarly, Oriale’s sense of relatedness and competence were challenged during her practicum experiences. Upon entry into her second practicum, she was confronted with exceptional classroom management issues. These challenges, paired with limited in-situ support, appeared to cause a shift in Oriale’s teaching practices and beliefs about SRLPPs toward less autonomy supportive practices, and away from SRLPPs.

For both Marika and Oriale, these limited affordances for their development of SRLPPs seemed to hinder their sense of competence and, in turn, their appraisals of success in the TEP (e.g., both TCs questioned their abilities to be successful in the program). In Marika’s case, the absence of supports was rectified when she changed her practicum placement. Her second school associate was sensitive to her learning needs and able to provide the supports she required. This support appeared to protect Marika’s sense of competence and positive beliefs about SRLPPs.

In contrast, Oriale’s experience was seemingly more difficult. Oriale’s first practicum setting offered several affordances for her self-determined motivation. SRL was a focus within this setting, and classroom routines and expectations for student engagement had been previously established. Oriale described students as receptive and engaged. During her time in this placement, Oriale valued SRLPPs and expressed her intentions to integrate SRLPPs throughout
her planning and implementation of lessons. Her units, lessons, and first classroom observation indicated that she was integrating in-depth opportunities for students’ development of SRL. However, upon entering her second practicum setting, she was faced with many unexpected challenges (e.g., classroom management, lack of in-situ support, and her own confidence). These challenges coincided with a shift in Oriale’s beliefs about the utility of SRLPPs. It was at this turning point that Oriale questioned the value of SRLPPs; specifically, she began to wonder if SRLPPs were appropriate for all students. Coinciding with her changing beliefs she reverted to traditional teaching structures and practices that she felt allowed her to cover required content and regain some sense of competence. With time and success implementing lessons in an alternative class, Oriale’s sense of competence improved, and she once again began to experiment with SRLPPs (albeit in a less in-depth manner). Despite this shift, her beliefs about the utility of SRLPPs did not recover. During her post-practicum interview, she indicated that she viewed the successful promotion of SRLPPs as dependent upon student characteristics (e.g., learning and behavioural needs) and continued to question the benefits of SRLPPs for students with behavioural challenges.

Oriale’s and Marika’s cases serve to highlight the impact of TCs’ sense of relatedness and competence on their developing beliefs about SRL and their implementation of SRLPPs. In Marika’s case, while she initially lacked supports for her sense of relatedness and competence, this situation was short-lived. In contrast, Oriale encountered multiple and continual affronts to her sense of competence and relatedness. With few affordances to counter these challenges, her competence, beliefs about SRL, and curiosity about SRLPPs faltered. This evidence suggests that short-term challenges to TCs’ sense of competence likely can be tolerated; however, prolonged struggles can be difficult to overcome within the timeframe of the TEP.
TCs’ Perceptions of Affordances and Constraints for their Learning

**Student characteristics.** Table 5.2 below provides an overview of how students’ characteristics may have acted as affordances and constraints for TCs’ learning, specifically their development of SRLPPs, across their practicum experiences. All four TCs expressed encountering difficulties with aspects of student behaviour and motivation. With the exception of Oriale, concerns about student behaviour were expressed early on in TCs’ practicum experiences, while concerns about students’ motivation arose gradually throughout the TCs’ experiences. As their practicums progressed and they developed SRLPPs, TCs appeared to gather an appreciation of how students’ motivation and diverse learning needs were implicated in their behaviour and could be addressed within an SRL framework.

**Table 5.2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TC</th>
<th>Student Behaviour</th>
<th>Student Motivation</th>
<th>Students Diverse Learning Needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td>D2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendra</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine</td>
<td>A/C</td>
<td>A/C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marika</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oriale</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For Oriale, evidence drawn from classroom observations and interviews indicates that her appraisals of students’ characteristics considerably shaped her own feelings of relatedness and competence. In her first practicum setting, Oriale remarked that she had no difficulties with student behaviour or classroom management. However, in her second practicum setting, she encountered exceptional challenges in regard to student behaviour and motivation. In her new setting, her sense of competence wavered as she became increasingly concerned about her ability to meet the behavioural and academic needs of her students. During this time, her focus on
developing and exploring SRLPPs appeared to shift towards external indicators of her performance (e.g., her FA’s assessments of her teaching). In an effort to gain some sense of control over her situation, thereby protecting her sense of competence, she adopted traditional management and teaching practices. These decisions, seemingly based on self-protection, appeared to limit opportunities for Oriale to form relationships with students and receive feedback from her FA—opportunities that may have facilitated more positive perceptions of students and supported her development of SRLPPs inclusive of positive management strategies in this context.

**Relationships.** Individual questions on the GCOS indicated all TCs valued open, honest relationships with advisors, peers, and colleagues. Evidence gathered from interviews across the TCs’ TEP year provides further insight into their perceptions, and my interpretations, of the quality of their relationships with others (See Table 5.3). Below, I describe how the TCs’ relationships with their school associate, FA, peers, and students may have shaped their self-determined motivation and use of SRLPPs.
### Table 5.3

**Relational Supports For TCs’ Development of SRLPPs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TC</th>
<th>With Students</th>
<th>With School Associate</th>
<th>With FA</th>
<th>With Peers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>D3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendra</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marika</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oriale</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TCs’ relationships with students.** During their pre-practicum interviews, all four TCs in this study recognized the importance of establishing positive relationships with students. To this end, TCs expressed that forming relationships with students was central to their understanding of each student’s learning needs. What differed among the TCs was the extent to which positive teacher/student relationships remained in the forefront of their emerging practice throughout the TEP. Kendra, Catherine, and Marika all maintained a focus on fostering positive relationships and interactions with students throughout their TEP. Early on in their practicum experiences (pre-practicum, first debriefing interviews), they recognized that establishing positive teacher/student relationships would aid effective classroom management, thereby creating a positive classroom environment. At all times during observations, Kendra, Catherine, and Marika demonstrated calm, positive, and respectful communications with students. Additionally, as they gained knowledge about students, their lesson plans, observations, and interviews reflected on students’ interests and needs (i.e., they included adaptations to teaching practices, tasks, and expectations to address students’ diverse interests and abilities). These student-centred practices aligned with SRL, supported positive connections with students, and created respectful classroom environments.

In her first practicum setting, Oriale also focused on developing relationships with students. In this context, she spent time getting to know students through the creation of activities such as student learning maps (students identified their personal characteristics along with learning needs and strengths). However, moving to her second, more challenging practicum placement - midway through her extended practicum and assuming 60-80% of teaching responsibilities immediately – Oriale felt pressure to cover required content. It appears that given the exceptionally challenging environment in which she had been placed, Oriale did not have
sufficient resources (e.g., knowledge and skills) or support to structure tasks that would both meet the requirements of the curriculum and foster positive student relationships. Observational and interview evidence indicated that limited relationships with students contributed to Oriale’s constrained implementation of SRLPPs. Unfortunately, Oriale had not developed the necessary classroom management skills in her first practicum placement to cope with the challenges presented in the second setting. Relying on her own resources without adequate knowledge and support to weave relationship building activities and positive management practices associated with SRL into her teaching, Oriale shifted her focus from developing relationships with students towards authoritarian forms of classroom management (e.g., management techniques associated with punishment as a means of gaining control: tone of voice [frustrated], removal of students from classroom, names on board with checks to indicate detention time). In turn, these practices appeared to further alienate students, thereby creating and sustaining ongoing difficulties in establishing relationships with students. As comments reveal in her second debriefing and post-practicum interviews, the difficulties that Oriale encountered in forming positive relationships with students hindered her sense of relatedness and competence, thereby undermining her self-determined motivation to implement SRLPPs.

**TCs’ relationships with their school associates.** Throughout the study, Kendra, Catherine, and Marika all identified the formation of positive relationships with their school associates as central to their learning experiences. The positive nature of the TCs’ relationships with their school associates acted to support their feelings of competence, relatedness, and sense of autonomy. Kendra, Catherine, and Marika all expressed that establishing trusting, secure relationships with their school associates helped foster their development of teaching practices. These TCs felt free to voice their needs as learners and ask for support when needed. In turn, this
open communication provided their school associate with insight into each TC’s individual learning needs, which enabled them to provide targeted support, even when it was unsolicited. It also seems (particularly in the case of Marika) that the TCs’ positive relationships with their school associates acted to help them become increasingly open to receiving and implementing feedback. For example, as Marika settled into her second practicum setting and built her relationship with her school associate, her interview comments indicated she considered her school associate’s instructions more deeply and attempted to mirror practices that she admired in his teaching.

Oriale’s experiences with her school associates stand in contrast to those of Kendra, Catherine, and Marika. Although Oriale began her practicum with positive perceptions of her school associate, these feelings quickly dissipated as her sense of autonomy was challenged and she began to feel increasingly constrained in her attempts to experiment with teaching practices. In a bid to find an environment in which she could implement SRLPPs through collaborative learning, she requested and was granted a transfer to another practicum setting. In her new placement, Oriale established and maintained a positive relationship with her school associate. She was also granted the freedom to teach the way she wanted. However, although Oriale’s needs for relatedness with her school associate and her sense of autonomy were fostered, with regard to SRLPPs, she lacked sufficient in-situ support to guide her in the development of these practices and sustain her sense of competence (discussed below).

**TCs’ relationships with FAs.** Over the course of the TEP year, Kendra, Oriale, and (at times) Catherine gravitated towards their FAs (FA 1 and FA 2) for relational and informational (e.g., planning units, lessons, feedback, SRLPPs) support. While the support they received from their FAs was helpful for Kendra and Catherine, ties with their FAs did not appear to be the main
source of support for their sense of relatedness or competence. These needs were also met through relationships with students, school associates, and TC peers. In contrast, the relationship Oriale shared with her FA was central to her learning and self-determined motivation. As described by Oriale, this relationship was exceptionally supportive. Oriale’s FA provided her with extensive support throughout her TEP. Given the extreme nature of the challenges Oriale faced in her second practicum setting and her access to limited in-situ support for her learning, her relationship with her FA was pivotal in supporting her learning experiences throughout her practicum.

**TCs’ relationships with peers.** Kendra, Catherine, Marika, and Oriale (in her member check) all identified peers as a source of relational support throughout their TEP year. Peer relationships provided all four TCs with opportunities to share their experiences with others who had insight into the TEP and MY/SRL. Early on in their TEP, Kendra and Catherine indicated that they were aware of the importance of establishing connections with peers. This awareness led them to put effort into creating multiple relationships with their peers. These relationships in turn provided Kendra and Catherine with access to relational and informational support (e.g., support for their planning and understanding TEP content). This sense of connection was not as apparent in Marika or Oriale’s experiences. Although Marika mentioned she had developed an amicable relationship with a peer placed in her practicum school and Oriale indicated in her member check that she had formed several friendships during her time in the TEP, both TCs expressed feeling detached from their peers; neither appeared to gravitate towards their peers for informational or relational support.

**Structural Supports**
Table 5.4 below presents a summary of TCs’ perceptions and my interpretations of structural supports for their learning found in the TEP and MY/SRL Cohort, respectively, across their TEP year. Through the examination of supports and constraints for TCs’ learning, five themes emerged as important aspects of TCs’ learning experiences. These themes included: (a) opportunities for TC to see their school associate’s formation of classroom participation structures prior to TC entering their extended practicum; (b) the provision of freedom for TC to experiment with practices along with in-situ scaffolded support; (c) adequate support for TC to integrate SRL content into their practice; (d) TC’s perceptions of alignment across their learning experiences; and (e) adequate time and support for TC to establish relationships in their practicum settings.
Table 5.4

**Structural Supports For TCs’ Development of SRLPPs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>School Associate Support</th>
<th>FA Support</th>
<th>Peer Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td>D2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendra</td>
<td>A/C</td>
<td>A/C</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine</td>
<td>A/C</td>
<td>A/C</td>
<td>A/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marika</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oriale</td>
<td>A/C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.4 continued

**Structural Supports For TCs’ Development of SRLPPs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Alignment</th>
<th>Freedom</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td>D2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendra</td>
<td>A/C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine</td>
<td>A/C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marika</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oriale</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The prior establishment of participatory structures. Evidence suggests that the school associates’ pre-establishment of management routines/structures/expectations (hereafter referred to as participation structures) had a direct impact on the TCs’ successful integration into their practicum settings and, thereby, their developing sense of competence. Kendra, Catherine, and Marika were all placed in classrooms with well-established participation structures for their extended practicums. Despite their school associates’ varying degrees of knowledge about SRL, most of the participation structures they had established were closely aligned to SRLPPs. For example, although Catherine’s school associate had little knowledge of SRL, Catherine felt his teaching style supported students to become increasingly autonomous in their learning. For example, he valued students’ opinions and provided them with opportunities to voice their learning needs. By inviting student participation in classroom decision-making, he modeled respect for diversity, created a cohesive community, and accommodated students’ individual differences. The school associates working with Kendra and Marika also appeared to be able to model how they created participation structures in their classrooms. Therefore, although Kendra, Catherine, and Marika all encountered challenges with classroom management early in their practicums, they all had access to models and on-going support to guide their understanding of how SRLPPs were implicated in the development and maintenance of participation structures. The maintenance of participatory structures helped ensure the continuation of respectful and orderly learning environments, thereby supporting TCs’ developing sense of competence as they began to experiment with SRLPPs.

Unlike the placements of the other three TCs, Oriale’s second practicum placement was chaotic. During my observations, it appeared that no visible participation structures had been established. As was apparent in Oriale’s second debriefing interview and observation, the lack of
these structures hindered her integration into her practicum setting as well as her implementation of SRLPPs. With time and the support of her FA, Oriale was able to create some participatory structures that provided her with some opportunities to experiment with SRLPPs. However, from her interview comments and observations, it seems Oriale’s sense of the utility of SRLPPs, as well as her sense of competence to implement them, was challenged in this context, seemingly leading to her implementation of other approaches that compromised her relationships with students.

**Autonomy with in-situ support.** When the TCs in this study were provided with autonomy to implement SRLPPs of their choosing, *along with the provision of in-situ support*, they were more likely to continue to hold positive beliefs about the utility of SRLPPs and implement them in their practicum settings. Across their extended practicum experiences, Kendra, Catherine, and Marika (second placement) were provided with *both* freedom *and* in-situ support to explore new practices. They expressed that their school associates were open to new ideas. For example, Kendra stated:

“I think definitely with the school being so new and open to ideas … I knew for sure I’d be able to discuss whatever ideas I could come up with and they’d be excited about it and try to help me with implementation of it” (Kendra pre-practicum interview, November 10, 2014, p. 30).

Furthermore, they all indicated that they were able to try new practices freely and received the feedback and guidance required to shape their development of practices. This freedom, along with scaffolded support, provided them with a sense of autonomy and created supports for their competence and relatedness. Therefore, while their concerns about student behaviour and
motivation remained throughout their TEP, they were given the resources they needed to feel successful and secure in their attempts to try new practices.

In contrast, Oriale’s lack of autonomy in her first practicum setting, followed by lack of in-situ support in her second placement hindered her sense of autonomy, competence, and relatedness. In her first practicum setting, she described feeling constrained in her attempts to develop SRLPPs. Her sense of autonomy was thwarted and her relationship with her school associate faltered as she struggled to implement practices in a way that was congruent with her own beliefs and learning focus of promoting SRL through student collaboration. Upon moving to her second setting, her school associate provided her with the freedom to implement practices of her choice; however, she lacked sufficient in-situ support for her successful implementation of SRLPPs. This lack of support, in turn, thwarted Oriale’s sense of competence and hindered her sense of relatedness with students. As a result, her practices shifted away from her initial goal of implementing SRLPPs through collaborative learning experiences and toward structured, teacher-directed practices, thereby limiting her opportunities to experiment and become competent with SRLPPs.

**Adequate support.**

**School associate support.** According to the TCs in this study, school associate informational affordances for developing SRLPPs included support for planning, developing lessons and units, opportunities to see SRLPPs modelled, and opportunities to receive feedback about teaching practices, specifically SRLPPs. Kendra and Marika were placed with school associates who were already knowledgeable about SRL and how to support it. They benefitted from having many opportunities to see SRLPPs modeled in their practicum classrooms and, therefore, were able to directly observe how SRLPPs supported students to think deeply about
their learning, engage in learning tasks, and develop a wide range of learning strategies.

Additionally, their school associates provided them with support in terms of integrating SRLPPs into their lesson and unit plans, implementing SRLPPs in their practicum settings through direct instruction and feedback, as well as opportunities to revise their practices.

In Catherine’s case, although her school associate admittedly knew little about SRLPPs, she felt he was open to learning about SRL and provided her with tacit support through modelling teaching practices that were supportive of student autonomy and SRLPPs (e.g., he gave students opportunities to be involved in procedural and organizational decisions in the classroom). While Catherine may not have had the same level of support for SRLPPs as Kendra and Marika, many of her school associate’s practices closely aligned with SRL. For example, Catherine described how her school associate modelled the importance of developing positive relationships with students through respectful interactions that allowed for students to voice their needs and perspectives. Furthermore, similar to Kendra and Marika’s school associates, Catherine’s school associate ensured that she was included in all aspects of teaching throughout her practicum. She planned lessons with the input of her school associate, attended parent and school-based meetings, took part in lesson planning and scheduling, and participated in referral processes (e.g., completing forms for psycho-educational assessments). Like Kendra and Marika, Catherine was also had the freedom to implement teaching practices of her choice with the support of her school associate’s detailed and ongoing feedback.

Again, Oriale’s experiences stand in sharp contrast to those of Kendra, Catherine, and Marika. In her first practicum placement, although Oriale initially felt her school associate promoted SRL, as her knowledge of SRL grew, she expressed that the differences encountered with her school associate limited her promotion of SRL in her practicum setting. Specifically,
she felt that overly controlling conditions within her practicum setting hindered her own learning and provided students with few opportunities to engage in self-assessment. As a result of these challenges, she requested to be moved to another practicum placement. At the time of her second debriefing interview, during her second practicum placement, Oriale indicated that she had not seen her second school associate teach; therefore, she was unable to see SRLPPs modelled. Furthermore, comments Oriale made during her second and third debriefing interviews suggest that her school associate was not available or able to help Oriale cope with the management challenges she faced in her practicum setting; as noted in Chapter Four, Oriale’s school associate was rarely in the classroom. Instead, Oriale’s school associate was often elsewhere, working on projects unrelated to Oriale’s practicum.

**FA support.** To mitigate a lack of in-situ support, Oriale gravitated toward her FA for informational support and/or relied on her own resources. However, although Oriale’s FA was able to provide her with relational and informational support, due to time constraints and Oriale’s decision to have her FA observe her teaching in an alternative class, she was unable to provide in-situ support. The lack of these forms of support hindered opportunities for Oriale to see the usefulness of or successfully implement SRLPPs, which, in turn, appeared to contribute to Oriale’s declining sense of competence.

The potential impact of FA support on TCs’ development of SRLPPs was evident in this study. FA1 had worked with the MY/SRL Cohort for three years prior to the study and was well-versed in SRLPPs. Kendra and Oriale indicated that they received support for their development of SRLPPs from FA1 in the form of post-observational feedback and suggestions about how SRLPPs could be implemented into their teaching practices. Additionally, there is evidence that FA1 used strategies associated with SRL (e.g., strategies to promote metacognition) to support
TCs’ development of SRLPPs. Oriale’s case study describes how FA1 used metacognitive questions to probe Oriale to think deeply about her teaching practices and understanding of SRLPPs. Furthermore, during my interview with FA1, she indicated that she included a direct prompt about SRLPPs in TCs’ written reflections every week (e.g., she would ask TCs to reflect on SRLPPs they had observed or personally used in their practicum classrooms). This support helped to keep SRLPPs in the forefront of TCs’ thinking and learning across their experiences. Specifically, it fostered Kendra and Oriale’s sense of competence by providing opportunities for them to deepen their understanding of SRL.

FA2, while an experienced teacher, administrator, and mentor, was new to the MY/SRL theme. FA2 noted during our interview that he had little knowledge of SRL and was, therefore, less able to prompt SRLPPs. While FA2 was available to support TCs in their development of many general teaching practices (e.g., practices related to middle years learners, formative assessment), many of which closely related to SRLPPs, his focus did not appear to be on TCs’ development of SRLPPs.

**Peer support.** Kendra and Catherine, who both experienced seemingly less situationally challenging journeys through the TEP, realized the importance of peer support for their learning early in their TEP. As previously described, they both actively sought and maintained connections with their peers throughout their TEP year. Comments from their pre-practicum interviews show the formation of peer relationships was both intentional and effortful on the part of Kendra and Catherine. Kendra, although admittedly shy, set a goal for herself at the beginning of her practicum year to bond and connect with peers in the Cohort. Likewise, Catherine discussed her efforts to build and maintain bonds with her peers by participating in study groups and exchanging information via the Facebook page that the TCs in the Cohort had established.
Throughout the TEP, they both considered their peers to be important resources for their learning. In her post-practicum interview, Catherine indicated that the presence of another TC in her practicum setting was fundamental to her success in the TEP. Kendra, too, expressed similar sentiments in her post-practicum interview: “I think [what] a lot of us learned in our practicum is just how important it is having that support network, because you’re not just alone in your classroom” (Kendra, post-practicum interview, July 7, 2015, p. 21).

In contrast, it seemed neither Marika nor Oriale considered their TC peers as a source of informational support. Neither TC mentioned participating in study groups or consulting the Facebook page set up by other members of the Cohort. Additionally, Marika noted that she had little in common with her peers while Oriale stated in her member check that peers in the MY/SRL Cohort were not a source of support for her developing practices. Despite the obvious connections between Marika and Oriale’s limited relationships with peers and their sense of relatedness, it also appears that limited connections with their peers may have hindered their sense of competence by limiting their access to learning resources and supports (e.g., access to shared lessons and units).

**Alignments across TCs’ learning experiences.** The importance of creating explicit, intentional alignments between their learning contexts and experiences emerged from data across the experiences of all four TCs. All TCs in the study indicated that they greatly valued alignments between their on- and off-campus experiences. In Kendra’s words, these alignments were necessary “to have that congruency so that [TCs could] take the theory to practice” (post-practicum interview, July 7, 2015, p. 23).

Although all TCs recognized some alignments between their on- and off-campus experiences at the beginning of their TEP, their estimation of these connections eroded over the
course of the TEP year. At the time of their post-practicum interviews, each TC voiced a need to increase and make more explicit the alignments between their on-campus and practicum experiences. Specifically, they each expressed a need to see and discuss specific examples of SRLPPs, and recommended several strategies to make that happen (e.g., to practice teaching techniques in coursework, to watch videos of the successful implementation of SRL, to discuss teacher practices). They felt such opportunities would help TCs identify and attend to SRLPPs in their practicum settings. For example, Oriale suggested that course instructors needed to demonstrate “top bar SRL” and discuss SRLPPs. With this support she felt students would be better able to recognize SRLPPs. She said:

“…if you go into your classroom and you see something that sort of looks like that, then we at least have a framework to say, “Okay … it was maybe missing this. This is how I could improve it” (Oriale, pre-practicum interview, November 13, 2014, p. 40).

Catherine also highlighted how increased opportunities to see and discuss SRLPPs in coursework would be beneficial for TCs like herself, who had limited opportunities to see SRLPPs explicitly modelled in their practicum settings by stating: “I’m just not seeing it done. There’s no example” (post-practicum interview, July 9, 2015, p. 21).

In terms of coursework, Marika and Oriale’s interview remarks highlight the importance of alignments between TEP courses and practicum experiences. Both TCs frequently described their courses and their on- and off-campus experiences as detached from one another and separate from their practicum experiences. Marika indicated that she would have benefited from more courses focused on the practical strategies to engage students successfully in learning (e.g., “differentiated learning”) prior to entering her practicum context. Additionally, she questioned the content of individual courses, noting there was overlap among the concepts being taught. She
felt that instructors and professors needed to “meet up and discuss” how to “plan out the year for us” (post-practicum interview, July 7, 2015, p. 25). Marika felt this collaboration would streamline courses and provide more targeted, relevant instruction throughout the year. In regards to alignment between coursework and TCs’ practicum experiences, Oriale voiced that she felt “… they [course instructors; Teacher Education Office] didn’t exist while I was on practicum … when I was on practicum, I was kind of more of an isolated unit.” (Oriale, post-practicum interview, July 17, 2015, p. 26).

In the TCs’ comments across their interviews, evidence emerged that suggested alignments between the school-wide learning goals of TCs’ practicum schools with the MY/SRL Cohort had an impact upon TCs’ learning experiences. Kendra, Catherine, and Marika were all placed in schools that had already established school-wide goals aligned with the promotion of SRL. Although a school-wide focus on SRL did not ensure school associates would be knowledgeable about SRLPPs and able to provide TCs with modelling and informational support for these practices, this focus did seem to foster an openness among school associates to learn about and incorporate SRL into their own practice. For example, in Catherine’s school, the promotion of SRL was a new focus; teachers (including Catherine’s school associate) were just developing an understanding of SRLPPs. While Catherine’s school associate may have been limited in his ability to provide instructional support about SRLPPs, he was open to learning about SRL and supportive of Catherine’s attempts to integrate SRLPPs into her lesson plans. In Kendra and Marika’s cases, the school associates’ prior knowledge about SRLPPs supported the TCs’ sense of competence. Their school associates’ use and knowledge of SRLPPs reinforced to the two TCs that the practices they were learning about during their on-campus experiences were valued and useful in practice. Conversely, lacking this focus in her second practicum setting,
Oriale remarked that increased alignments between her learning contexts would have supported her competence, noting these connections would have “validated what we were learning” (Oriale, post-practicum interview, July 17, 2015, p. 30).

**Time.** As is evident in the experiences of Kendra, Catherine, Marika, and Oriale, developing SRLPPs is a complex process. It takes time for TCs to learn and integrate multiple educational theories that can support their developing understanding and implementation of SRLPPs. The TCs in this study all expressed that they needed more time to see teaching practices modelled, including those associated with SRL, and to receive feedback on their implementation of such practices in order to feel confident and competent to continue implementing them in and beyond the TEP. Specifically, Kendra voiced that while she believed SRLPPs promoted “deeper learning,” it was a “slower process”—a process that took time for TCs to foster and for students to orientate toward. According to Kendra, Catherine, and Oriale, learning and implementing SRLPPs in their practicum settings took more time than they were afforded in their TEP. Catherine and Kendra’s comments during their post-practicum interviews provides evidence of this fact: “I think it’s super beneficial, but in a practical sense, it’s still hard to implement … it was hard getting [students] to a place where they could do that” (Catherine, post-practicum interview, July 9, 2015, p. 31). Likewise, Kendra noted that development of SRLPPs was “a slow process but an important one,” and supporting SRL “took up a lot of curriculum time,” thereby limiting the amount of content she was able to cover. To this end Kenda stated:

“The length of time it took for some of the students to even start realizing that they’re not working well, and that we didn’t cover all the content that we needed to this year, I think that’s a limitation there. If we had provincials, for instance, I think we would have had to
let go of some of the SRL, because it would be like, whoa, we have to get through this content whether you’re kind of getting it or not” (post-practicum interview, July 7, 2015, p. 29).

Reflecting back on her experiences, Kendra pondered whether the TEP provided sufficient time for TCs to develop SRLPPs: “I just need more practice.”.

The impact of time on the TCs’ sense of relatedness and, ultimately, their senses of competence and autonomy, also surfaced in this study. Prior to beginning their extended practicums, Kendra and Catherine visited their practicum classrooms weekly for six months and completed their short practicum in the same context. During this time, they were able to establish relationships with students, school staff, and their school associates, as well as actively participate in the establishment of learning and behavioural expectations and routines. Similarly, Marika entered her second practicum setting in January, giving her three months to establish relationships with students and her school associate before beginning her extended practicum. Time to form relationships likely helped the TCs feel ready when it came time to immerse themselves in their practicum, helping them feel in control, confident, and competent.

Contrasting these experiences, Oriale’s time to create relationships with students, her school associate, and the broader school community was seriously truncated in her second practicum placement. The absence of time in her new setting to establish relationships, particularly with students, appeared to exact a heavy toll on Oriale’s self-determined motivation for teaching. As described in Oriale’s case study, difficulties establishing positive relationships with students thwarted her sense of relatedness. It appears that the initial disconnect between Oriale and students undermined her sense of competence as she tried to engage students with SRLPPs. With time and the gradual development of relationships with students, Oriale’s
confidence improved and she once again began to experiment with SRLPPs in her practicum setting. However, within the time constraints of the TEP, her beliefs about the value and utility of SRLPPs and the extent that she implemented SRLPPs were diminished in comparison to those of her peers.

Summary

The analysis above highlights how the personal characteristics of TCs in this study, along with contextual features of their TEP as a learning environment, acted in tandem to shape their self-determined motivation and their valuing, development, and implementation of SRLPPs. These results suggest the formation of positive relationships with school associates, students, FAs, and peers provided a foundation for these TCs to develop and implement SRLPPs. Through the formation of positive relationships with knowledgeable others they were able to gather emotional support, information about teaching practices, and knowledge about students, which in turn appeared to support their development of SRLPPs.

In particular, the relationships these TCs shared with their school associates appeared central to their learning experiences. Through the formation of secure, working relationships with their school associate, each TC was able to access models for classroom practices and have continual, in-situ guidance and support for their development of SRLPPs in addition to general teaching practices. This support, coupled with their school associates’ abilities to establish and model effective participatory structures, provided the TCs with favourable contextual conditions to experiment and expand their emerging teaching practices. It appears that with a growing sense of competence, they became increasingly autonomous in their implementation of SRLPPs. In summary, affordances for the TCs’ sense of relatedness provided them with access to supports
for their learning, which in turn fostered their self-determined motivation with respect to supporting SRL.
Chapter Six – Discussion

This study examined the experiences of four TCs, Catherine, Kendra, Marika and Oriale, enrolled in the MY/SRL Cohort in a TEP in western Canada. The objective of this study was to investigate how TCs’ personal characteristics, along with features of their learning environments, shaped their beliefs about, motivation toward, and development and implementation of SRLPPs. To this end, the following research questions were examined:

1. What personal characteristics did the TCs in this study bring to the TEP?
   - What were TCs’ work and educational histories?
   - What were TCs’ motivational orientations?
   - What were TCs’ emergent beliefs about SRL?

2. What forms of motivational and structural affordances/constraints for developing general teaching practices and SRLPPs did the TCs in this study perceive in their university and practicum settings?

3. How did the TCs in this study implement SRLPPs throughout their practicum experiences?

4. How were the TCs’ implementations of SRLPPs connected to their learning contexts, beliefs, and other personal characteristics?

Answers to these research questions were first addressed through detailed documenting (case studies) of individual TC experiences in a TEP (Chapter Four) and then a thematic analysis to reflect common patterns of experience across TCs (Chapter Five). This chapter reviews these key themes/findings in relation to previous research, which indicates that these themes are pervasive issues in teacher education. Research in the fields of self-determination, SRL, and
teacher/TC beliefs can inform and be informed by my findings. After I discuss key findings, I summarize the contributions of my research to knowledge/theory, present limitations and considerations for future research, and articulate implications for practice.

**Linking Key Findings to Existing Research**

**Personal Characteristics.** TCs come to the TEPs with personal characteristics that shape their perceptions of learning experiences, yet are open to change. TCs come to TEPs with unique personal characteristics (Thurlings & Brok, 2017). They bring with them their own histories (e.g., past learning and teaching experiences), motivations (e.g., reasons for entering teaching) and beliefs (e.g., beliefs about teaching and learning). These personal characteristics shape their beliefs and values concerning particular teaching practices (e.g., Farrell & Ives, 2014; Pajares, 1992; Lofstrom & Poom-Valickis, 2013) and predict their motivation towards and likely adoption/implementation of practices (e.g., Barnard et al., 2008; Farrell & Ives 2014; Milner, 2005; Tsai & Chuang, 2005). TCs in my study entered the MY/SRL Cohort with limited understandings of SRL. They chose this Cohort because they were interested in teaching MY learners and, while data from interviews and the GCOS indicated they all held autonomous motivational orientations and valued ideas associated with SRL early in their TEP, it was unknown whether and to what extent these attributes would hold firm over the course of the program.

Findings from my study and related research indicate TCs’ beliefs about teaching practices are malleable, so TEPs can be formative contexts for TCs (e.g., Di Santo, Timmons, & Lenis, 2017; Simmons et al., 1999 in Vartuli & Rohs, 2009). Contexts that support TCs’ self-determined motivation can foster their openness to consider for themselves the value of new teaching practices and prompt them to experiment with and critically evaluate practices in
relation to their beliefs (e.g. Pajares, 1992; Kagan, 1992; Korthangen, 2014; Mattheoudakis, 2007). TCs benefit when TEPs provide opportunities for them to surface and examine their beliefs and motivations (regardless of the cohort’s focus; Pajares; Kagan; Korthangen; Mattheoudakis). These opportunities allow TCs to gain greater insight into their own learning biases, which may reflect their histories, and the need to open themselves to new experiences in order to assess for themselves the value of teaching and learning practices (Cabaroglu & Roberts 2000; Dignath, 2017).

Furthermore, TEPs that demonstrate the value of particular teaching/learning practices (in this case SRL) and provide consistent support for TCs’ self-determined motivation to try those practices, significantly impact TCs’ beliefs about the value of those practices (see Cabaroglu & Roberts; 2000; Kleickmann, Trobst, Jonen, Vehmeyer, & Moller, 2016; Korthangen, 2004; Kramarski & Michalsky, 2009), and enhance TCs’ sense of competence to use those practices (Dignath & Büttner, 2018; Kramarski & Michalsky, 2010; Lui et al, 2019). Liu et al. found that TCs’ sense of competence was supported when they had opportunities to see theory successfully implemented in practice. These experiences led TCs to believe that they were capable of implementing new teaching practices and that practices were useful within classroom contexts. So, attending to TCs’ need for competence should help them to see the efficacy of SRLPPs.

In my study, Kendra, Catherine, and Marika received support that boosted their sense of autonomy and competence to engage in on-going spirals of development – they had multiple opportunities to choose, plan, implement, reflect upon and revisit teaching practices that were the focus of the MY/SRL Cohort. These TCs all expressed a sense of self-determined motivation and appeared more willing to attempt to implement practices that supported their students’ self-determined motivation and SRL. Conversely, Oriale had limited affordances for her self-
determined motivation within her practicum settings. Despite her initial affinity for SRL, opportunities for her to implement teaching practices of her choosing were constrained within her first practicum setting. Then, although she had autonomy in her second practicum placement, she did not receive support in this context to make her feel competent to experiment with SRLPPs and, consequently, became doubtful about the efficacy of these practices, particularly in contexts where students were exhibiting challenging behaviour. Subsequently, her teaching practices became increasingly controlling, potentially (albeit unintentionally) undermining her students’ self-determined motivation and SRL (e.g., Taylor & Ntoumanis, 2007). This finding suggests that contextual supports are implicated in TCs’ developing sense of autonomy and competence and in their valuing and implementation of teaching practices, such as SRLPPs.

**Relationships matter.** **TCs’ relationships with mentors, students and peers support their sense of competence, relatedness and autonomy.** The ability to develop multiple relationships and effectively collaborate with others are recognized as essential for success in teaching in 21st century classrooms (Cleaves, 2015). Evidence from my study highlights the importance of TCs’ development of relationships with others, particularly with their TEP mentors (i.e., school associates, FAs), students and peers. These relationships appeared to support TCs’ self-determined motivation through the fulfillment of TCs’ needs for relatedness and competency, in turn facilitating their abilities to develop teaching practices and function autonomously within their practicum settings.

**TC’s relationships with school associates.** In my study, TCs’ relationships with their school associates emerged as a central source of support for their self-determined motivation and developing teaching practices (SRLPPs). This finding is consistent with previous research, which indicates school associates act as role models for TCs (Agudo, 2016; Calderhead & Shorrock,
2003; Glenn, 2006; Sandvik, Solhhaug, Lejonberg, Elstad, & Christophersen, 2018). They demonstrate lessons and help TCs to plan lessons, observe TCs’ implementation of teaching practices, and provide feedback along with emotional and motivational support. Ideally, school associates foster TCs’ understandings of specific teaching practices (in this case SRLPPs) through discussion and by providing TCs with direction about how to utilize feedback and self-observation to set goals to improve their implementation of teaching practices (Loukomies, Petersen & Lavonen, 2018).

In my study, regardless of TCs’ perceptions of their school associates’ understandings of the Cohorts’ focus, TCs who experienced positive relationships with their school associates (e.g., Catherine, Kendra, and Marika in her second placement) also appeared to have more opportunities to develop autonomy (e.g., space to experiment with teaching practices of their choice) and competence (school associates’ support with management strategies, lesson planning, feedback). Conversely, TCs who, at varying points in their practicums, were unable to secure connections with their school associates (e.g., Oriale in both placements and Marika in her first placement) appeared to lack these opportunities. In this way, TCs’ fulfilment of their sense of relatedness appeared to be implicated in their access to motivational supports for their competence and autonomy.

School associate support seems particularly instrumental for TCs’ developing sense of competence (Ekiz 2006). Often, however, school associates are not knowledgeable about how to support/mentor TCs’ understandings of theory and practice, which is an impediment to TCs’ developing competence (Agudo, 2016). In my study, as with many TEPs, school associates were recruited on a volunteer basis – they self-nominated for the position of school associate; consequently, it was difficult to ensure that they were knowledgeable about mentorship practices,
generally, and the Cohort’s SRL focus, in particular. Formal opportunities for school associates to learn about SRL (e.g., workshops) were limited to one after-school, voluntary session, which was poorly attended by the school associates.

Researchers and teacher educators need to understand the challenges school associates face in fulfilling their mentoring roles. Ulvic and Sunde (2013) posit that many school associates lack the confidence and/or information to demonstrate how the theory embedded in TEPs is mirrored in practice. In regard to SRL, in particular, Dignath and Büttner’s (2018) study found that school associates are often have limited strategies and knowledge to help TCs explicitly align SRL theory with observed classroom practices; specifically, how it relates to and supports students’ metacognitive development. Furthermore, multiple researchers (Korthagen, 2004; Darling-Hammond, 2016; Sandvik et al., 2018) acknowledge that school associates need guidance to understand their roles as mentors as well as to engage in reflection of their own practices in relation to theory presented in TEPs. It is through these experiences that school associates are able to build their own understandings of theories embedded within TEPs, thereby facilitating their competence and enabling them to model and explain teaching practices aligned with the foci of TEPs (Korthangen, 2014). Therefore, when examining conditions that support the development of TCs’ teaching practices, careful consideration also needs to be given to how school associates are supported in developing their mentorship practices.

**TCs’ relationships with FAs.** FAs can mediate some lost opportunities for learning in the school associate/TC relationship (Perry et al.’s 2008). This is demonstrated in Oriale’s experiences across her practicum settings. In her first practicum setting, over the course of the first two semesters of the TEP, Oriale’s relationship with her school associate deteriorated. During her first debriefing interview she indicated that within this setting her sense of autonomy
and competence was challenged. Specifically, she expressed feeling constrained in her implementation of SRLPPs and unsupported in her development of SRLPPs. Her FA helped her to cope with these challenges by providing emotional and instrumental support for her development of SRLPPs, and eventually made arrangements for Oriale to move to a second practicum placement. However, her second placement was also lacking in support for her developing sense of competence. Her school associate was rarely in the classroom, students’ behaviour was challenging, and she had little in-situ support for her development of SRLPPs. Again, her FA helped Oriale to cope with these challenges by providing sufficient support for her competence (strategies for lesson planning, implementation, and management strategies) to sustain her engagement in the TEP. Although there is little doubt that Oriale’s learning experiences were hindered by exceptional circumstances in her second practicum setting, her comments indicate that the relationship she had with her FA supported her self-determined motivation. With this support Oriale began to regain her sense of competence, and was able to return to her original focus of implementing SRLPPs.

**TCs’ relationships with students.** Teachers’ sense of relatedness is closely tied to their connections with students; when teachers report positive connections with students, they are more likely to perceive that their own needs for relatedness are fulfilled (Klassen et al., 2012a). To some extend these findings are mirrored in TCs’ experiences. Within my study, all TCs were initially focused on establishing positive relationships with students. Although TCs also acknowledged other key contributors to their sense of relatedness (e.g., school associates, FAs) most TCs (Kendra, Catherine, Marika) attended to their development of positive connections with students throughout their TEP year.
TCs’ comments indicate that classroom management concerns at times interfered with their formation of relationships with students, which is consistent with previous research (Evelein et al., 2008), thereby constraining their sense of relatedness. In this way, TCs’ sense of relatedness is closely tied to their sense of competence. Kendra, Catherine, Marika and Oriale (in her first practicum setting) had in-situ support for their development of positive management strategies. Their school associates had established participatory structures (routines and expectations) and modelled relationship based management strategies aligned with SRL theory (providing students with choice; awareness of students’ learning needs and motivations; Sierens, 2009). These structures helped to create an ethos of mutual respect within classrooms that in turn created an orderly environment within which students and TCs could learn and function. Therefore, TCs in these classrooms were able to connect with students and focus on their development of SRLPPs without overwhelming classroom management concerns. In this way TCs’ connections with students facilitated their development of SRLPPs and sense of competence. Conversely, Oriale’s second practicum placement lacked these forms of support. Within this context, her abilities to form connections was hindered as was her development of SRLPPs. Feeling overwhelmed and with little in-situ support available, she attempted to gain a sense of control by implementing more controlling teaching practices – practices that likely impeded both her development of positive relations with students and SRLPPs (Martine & Sass, 2010; Woolfolk & Hoy, 1990).

**Relationships with peers.** Research examining peer (TC to TC) mentorship within TEPs is limited (Giles, 2019). However, available evidence suggests that peer connections support TCs to develop positive attitudes toward the teaching practices they are tasked with learning (Giles; Marshall, 2005). Furthermore, connections with peers are known to provide TCs with additional
access to feedback, opportunities for reflection, and instrumental support for, e.g., planning units and lessons (Jenkins, Hamrick, & Todorovich, 2002; Takemae, Dobbins, Kurts, 2018). Evidence also suggests peer connections help early career teachers cope with challenging teaching and workplace situations (e.g., work place relations; Mercieca & Kelly, 2018). In my study, Kendra, Catherine, Marika, and Oriale all identified peers as a source of relational support throughout their TEP year. What differed amongst TCs in my study was their understandings of the role that peer connections had within their learning experiences. In early stages of the TEP, Kendra and Catherine were aware of the importance of establishing connections with their peers – they recognized that their peers were important sources of support for their developing teaching practices. These TCs put effort into creating multiple relationships with their peers to support their learning. Conversely, although Marika and Oriale developed amicable relationships with a few of their peers, they both initially expressed feeling detached from their peers and did not view their peers as sources for informational support. This likely limited their access to informational and relational support over the course of their practicum experiences.

**Autonomy and support.** TCs benefit from autonomy with in-situ support to experiment with teaching practices. Learners who are provided with autonomy to pursue their own interests and access to supports for their competence (e.g. detailed directions, guidance, and feedback) are more likely to engage and persist in tasks (Jang, Reeves, & Deci; 2010). Similarly, teachers’ self-determined motivation to implement and develop new practices is supported if they are provided with autonomy to choose instructional techniques that they believe best meet the needs of their students (see Hardre, 2007; Ryan & Brown, 2005; Ryan & Weinstein, 2009). These findings align well with Halbert and Kaser’s (2013) and Butler and Schnellert’s (2012) views of teacher inquiry – teachers and TCs, benefit from learning experiences that allow them to explore
teaching practices of their choosing, with ongoing support to engage in spirals of inquiry – to plan, implement, reflect upon and revise practices and make their own decisions about whether or not to incorporate practices into their teaching repertoires.

Ideally, school associates and FAs recognize TCs’ needs for autonomy in the practicum context and provide them with space to experiment with teaching practices of their choosing, but also scaffold/co-regulate TCs’ professional growth by offering information, feedback, and encouragement (Elliot et al., 2002; Michalsky, 2014; Pelletier & Sharp, 2009). The impact of these forms of support was demonstrated in my study. Kendra, Catherine, and Marika (in her second placement) had autonomy to implement teaching practices of their choosing with the provision of in-situ support for their competence. Their school associates provided them with space to experiment with practices, modelled practices aligned with the focus of their cohort (e.g., SRLPPs), and provided regular feedback on their teaching practices, thereby supporting their self-determined motivation (Elliot et al.; Pelletier & Sharp). These supports helped these TCs to develop and implement teaching practices associated with SRL and maintain positive beliefs regarding the utility of those practices (Ryan & Brown, 2005; Ryan & Weinstein, 2009).

Conversely, Oriale lacked the presence of autonomy support with in-situ supports for her competence in both of her practicum settings. In her first practicum setting, her sense of autonomy was thwarted as she felt constrained in her attempts to experiment with teaching practices of her choice. Seeking greater autonomy, she transferred to her second placement, a context in which she was provided with abundant autonomy, but insufficient in-situ support for her competence, thereby limiting her opportunities to successfully experiment with teaching practices associated with SRL.
Alignments between learning contexts.Congruency between learning contexts shapes

TCs’ self-determined motivation and implementation of SRLPPs. Concerns about alignments between TCs’ university and practice contexts are widespread and compelling. Thurling and Brok (2017) note the need for TCs to have access to explicit instruction about theory with concurrent expert modeling and opportunities to practice throughout their TEP. Darling-Hammond, Hyler and Gardner (2017) and Michalsky (2014) concluded that TCs’ development of teaching practices is dependent upon multiple, prolonged opportunities for them to: see theory modelled in practice by experts; engage in specific conversations about teaching practices; and implement, reflect upon, and refine practices within classroom settings. Through these recursive learning experiences, teaching practices are made explicit, are adapted to fit TCs’ learning needs and beliefs, and provide opportunities for TCs to make connections between theory and practice. Specifically, Michalsky found that TCs who received scaffolded instruction about how to recognize SRLPPs, observed the implementation of SRLPPs (via video) on multiple occasions for extended amounts of time, and discussed SRLPPs with peers were more able to recognize and explicitly explain theoretical concepts that underlie SRLPPs. Furthermore, TCs who received these forms of support were more likely to include SRLPPs in their lesson planning.

Although alignments between TCs’ on-campus and in-school (i.e., practicum) learning experiences are beneficial for TCs, TEPs are often found to be lacking in this regard (Dillon, 2017; Grossman & McDonald, 2008; Ulvik & Smith, 2011). The structure of TEPs frequently focuses on first exposing TCs’ to theory, followed by a focus on practice (Dillon). Often, the majority of TCs’ exposure to practice occurs in the later part of their TEP experiences (e.g., during their extended practicums) when TCs are separated from their university contexts and have limited access to individuals (e.g., FAs, course instructors) who are equipped to help them
translate theory into practice (Grossman & McDonald). Within such structures, a good deal of support for TCs’ translation of theory to practice depends upon their recognition of alignments of their school associates’ practices with the theory they have been exposed to within university settings (DaFonte & Barton-Arwood, 2015).

In the field of SRL, evidence (albeit limited) exists that explicit alignments between SRL coursework and in-situ support for TCs’ implementation of SRLPPs increases TCs’ application of SRLPPs (Michalsky, 2014). However, regardless of the specific foci, in most TEPs, there are few built in assurances that school associates’ practices are reflective of TEPs’ goals (e.g., in the current study, to have TCs consider teaching through the lens of SRL). This incongruence is somewhat problematic given that extended practicums are a time when TCs are immersed in practice and, ideally, “testing” the utility of theory and making judgments about its relevance (Wæge & Haugaløkken, 2013).

The importance of providing TCs with alignments across their learning contexts was demonstrated in my study. Marika and Kendra were both placed in practicum contexts where their school associates were knowledgeable about SRL and able to help them bridge what they learned within their university experiences to practice. Similarly, Catherine’s school associate, although unable to articulate SRLPPs, implemented many practices associated with SRL. The provision of these supports likely fostered Marika’s, Kendra’s and Catherine’s sense of autonomy and competence by modeling how SRLPPs were implemented and by demonstrating the utility of SRLPPs in relation to TCs’ own learning foci (e.g., their development of SRLPPs, management practices). Through these means their motivation was sustained as they persisted to engage in challenging teaching practices based upon their own needs as learners as well as the needs of their students in their practicum classrooms (Wæge & Haugaløkken, 2013).
Despite links between Kendra’s, Catherine’s, and Marika’s university and practicum settings, all TCs in my study had difficulty recognizing alignments between SRL theory and positive, relationship-based management strategies. Core features of SRLPPs, such as autonomy support and participation structures that support students’ understandings of what they are expected to do and how they can be successful, are mirrored in positive classroom management (Sierens et al., 2009). Although TCs were exposed to these theoretical links in their first and second inquiry seminars, when immersed within their practicum settings, with limited university contact, TCs’ appeared to lose sight of these connections (Grossman & McDonald, 2008). As described earlier, the impact of this disconnect was particularly problematic for Oriale in terms of her continuing to value and focus upon implementing SRLPPs. It seems keeping these connections in the forefront of TCs’ minds during their practicums seems especially important. If, for example, TCs do not view theories and practices presented within their TEPs as aligned with their learning and teaching needs within their practicum settings (e.g., viewing SRLPPs as useful in promoting positive forms of classroom management), they may not persist with their development of these practices when they enter their practicum contexts.

**Time.** *TCs benefit from extended, quality practicum placements.* Within this study, all TCs voiced a desire to spend more time in their practicum settings. Some researchers recognize this need (e.g., Sulistiyo, Mukminin, Abdurrahman, & Haryanto, 2017; Yan & He, 2010) and advocate for TEPs to extend TCs’ practicums to span multiple semesters. For example, Yan and He posit that extended practicums are necessary to equip TCs with adequate exposure to the day-to-day responsibilities of teaching (e.g. setting up routines and management structures, planning lessons, conducting assessments). Likewise, Sulistiyo et al. suggest TCs need extended time in
their practicum settings to familiarize themselves with the structure of schools, develop relationships with staff and students, and begin to translate theory to practices.

While research examining the impact of practicum length on TCs’ development of teaching practices is limited, recent studies suggest extended practicums are beneficial for TCs’ development of skills associated with 21st century learning (Allen, Coble, & Crowe, 2014; Arnett, Mandy, & Muilenburg, 2014; Grudnoff & Haigh 2017). For example, Arnett et al.’s findings indicate that TCs who spend longer times in teaching practicums are more likely to integrate strategies to support students with learning disabilities in comparison to TCs who complete shorter practicums. Additionally, Grudnoff and Haigh (2017) found that TCs who completed extended practicums throughout their TEP (defined as a three-week full-time practicum at the start of a TEP, two days a week in practicum settings throughout the year, and a six week full-time practicum at the end of the TEP year) were more prone to understand the emotional, social, and educational needs of students in high needs schools (e.g. low SES; high population of students with specialized learning needs). Together, these findings suggest that extended practicums support TCs to expand their notions of teaching and learning, develop specialized teaching skills, and understand diverse student populations.

Research in the field of SRL also points to benefits of extended practicums for TCs. Brown and Campione’s (1994) early efforts to mobilize SRL theory in practice emphasized that SRLPPs are complex; they require a substantial amount of time to recognize, learn, and integrate into practice – to align SRL theory with practice. Similarly, findings from Pino-Pasternak, Basilio and Whitebread’s (2014) and from my study demonstrate TCs need for extended time in their practicum settings to: learn how to support SRL, implement SRLPPs, foster relationships, and establish routines that are necessary to support SRLPPs in classrooms.
While there appears to be many benefits associated with extended practicums, as Grudnoff and Haigh (2017) and Wright and Allen (2014) point out lengthening TCs’ practicum experiences will not necessarily add to the quality of their learning experiences or detract from their need to acquire theoretical knowledge. Rather, the introduction of extended practicums presents an opportunity to infuse theory into practice and practice into theory (Randi & Corno 2007). This perspective of TCs’ learning experiences aligns well with the findings of my study and the work of others (e.g., Darling-Hammond, Hyler & Gardner, 2017) that indicate TCs’ require extended, in-situ support for their development of theoretical understandings and teaching practices.

**Contributions**

My study contributes to current research in a number of ways. Firstly, my study is conducted within authentic settings, foregrounds TCs’ voices and their perceptions of learning experiences and offers in-depth interview data and observational evidence of TCs’ personal characteristics, self-determined motivation and implementation of SRLPPs. This approach expands SDT methodology and theory. Past research in the field of SDT has relied heavily upon quantitative studies that have focused mainly on students and teachers. My study provides an in depth, qualitative account of TCs’ perceptions of supports and constraints for their self-determined motivation. This approach allowed for the identification of unique supports for TCs’ self-determined motivation (e.g., school associates and FAs are important sources of support for TCs’ motivation; Klassen et al., (2002a) Glenn, 2006, and Sandvik et al., 2018). Secondly, my study contributes to the growing body of research about how teachers’, including TCs’, personal histories, beliefs, and professional learning contexts influence whether and how they implement SRLPPs (see Lombaerts, Engels, & van Braak, 2009; Spruce & Bol, 2015; Steinback & Stoeger,
Findings from my study extend Lui et al’s findings by providing evidence that TCs’ beliefs about their competence regarding their abilities to implement SRLPPs are interwoven with their developing beliefs about teaching practices. Within the field of SRL, these findings address a dearth of research that examines links between TCs’ beliefs about SRL and their implementation of SRLPPs. My findings suggest that in order for TCs to think metacognitively and to be motivated to explore SRLPPs, they need exposure, practice and support utilizing a wide range of SRLPPs throughout their TEPs. Through these opportunities TCs’ are able to build their sense of competence, which provides a foundation for their motivation to engage in SRLPPs and think deeply about them. Thirdly, and specific to TEPs focused on SRL, despite the known links between SRLPPs and positive forms of classroom management (see Sierens 2009), TCs in my study did not readily make these connections. This finding contributes to our understanding of TCs’ development of teaching practices by substantiating findings of others by indicating that: TCs’ need on-going support from knowledgeable others to articulate how theory aligns with practice within their specific practicum contexts (Randi & Corno, 2007; Wæge & Haugaløkken, 2013) and that this support should be concurrent with opportunities for TCs to view and implement teaching practices over extended periods of time (Darling-Hammond, Hyler & Gardner, 2017; Hammerness, 2018; Michalsky, 2014; Thurling & Brok, 2017).

Limitations and Considerations for Future Research

As discussed above, findings from this study contribute to the advancement of SDT, SRL theory, and teacher belief theory in multiple ways. Looking forward, researchers may wish to expand upon this study in at least four ways: including the perspectives of multiple stakeholders, expanding the breadth and depth of the study through the examination of other aspects of TCs’
learning experiences (e.g., courses, initial practica), examining the impact of changes to the MY/SRL Cohort, and involving larger samples, mixed methods designs.

Although school associates were invited to participate in this study, no school associates volunteered to do so. Given their central role in TCs’ development of teaching practices, much more research is needed to investigate how school associates can be both recruited and supported for their mentorship roles. Specifically, school associates’ motives for becoming mentors requires exploration, along with structures within TEPs that provide school associates with ongoing support in terms of mentorship practices. Similarly, it would be beneficial to gain or elaborate the perspectives of other stakeholders in the teacher education process (e.g., FAs, academic leads, course instructors). While FAs were interviewed and information about the MY/SRL Cohort was gathered informally from one of the academic leads, the inclusion of the perspectives of those supervising and designing the TCs’ experiences was limited. These perspectives would expand the breadth of the study and strengthen the triangulation of data by providing additional perspectives about the availability of supports and constraints for TCs across their learning settings.

Future researchers may also wish to further the depth and breadth of this study by examining more thoroughly TCs’ experiences within the TEP (courses, initial practica). This information would likely yield evidence that would extend our understandings of TCs’ perceptions of alignment across their learning contexts. Such investigations also have the potential to provide valuable information about how and if courses within TEPs could be merged and embedded within alternative, perhaps more authentic, contexts (further discussed in following section).
In regards to MY/SRL Cohort, since this study began, significant changes have occurred in the structure of TCs’ on- and off- campus learning experiences. At the time this study was conducted there were few opportunities within the MY/SRL Cohort to integrate SRL into TCs’ on-going experiences in the TEP. The only place SRL content could consistently be integrated into TCs’ learning experiences was during the inquiry seminars. Therefore, TCs’ exposure to SRLPPs relied heavily upon TCs’ practicum placements and the knowledge of their school associates and FAs. In the past several years the MY/SRL Cohort has evolved to include a more integrative approach to TCs’ coursework and practicum experiences. Inquiry seminars and some courses are now completed in situ, with support from district personnel (e.g., co-teaching and offering place-based learning opportunities). Efforts have been made to provide more opportunities for TCs’ to see and experiment with SRLPPs within school settings. As discussed in detail in the following section, these in-situ learning opportunities have increased TCs’ opportunities to make links between theory and practice. Therefore, future studies may seek to explore the impact of these changes on TCs’ self-determined motivation and development of SRLPPs.

Furthermore, while qualitative, case study methodology allowed for the in-depth examination of TCs’ experiences and the inclusion of TCs’ voices, the nature of this methodology limits the number of participants and program sites (i.e., four TCs experiences in one cohort, within one TEP). Future research might consider scaling up this study to include more participants and multiple research sites. Also, the utilization of mixed methods and more diverse samples of participants would help to corroborate the findings of this study across communities and contexts.
Lastly, larger scale studies are needed to investigate systemic issues within TEPs that limit or support TCs’ learning experiences. To this end, the impact of school district and government policies, as well as university and professional credentialing systems need to be explored. These may hinder or support how TEPs and cohorts can shape themselves to achieve specific goals (e.g., teaching with a focus on SRL). Through the examination of these structures, information may be obtained about their impact on academic leads’ abilities to shape learning experiences in ways that they believe best meets the needs of TCs.

**Implications for Practice**

Findings from my study have important implications within practice. Given the potential impact of contextual supports on TCs’ beliefs about, motivation toward, and development of teaching practices (e.g., SRLPPs), careful consideration of TCs’ learning environments is warranted. Below I discuss how structures within TEPs might be developed to help to facilitate the creation of rich learning contexts for TCs. I begin by examining how creating opportunities within TEPs for TCs to meet and discuss their beliefs and practices may foster their professional growth. Then suggestions are made in regards to how TEPs might recruit school associates and build their sense of competence. I conclude with reasons why TEPs may wish to consider alternate frameworks (e.g., professional development schools) to support TCs and school associates in their development of educational practices.

TCs benefit from structured opportunities to surface their developing beliefs about practices. Thurlings and Brok (2017) offer guidance for TEPs to attend to TCs’ beliefs, regardless of a cohort’s focus. These authors posit that TCs need opportunities to build their sense of autonomy, relatedness, and competence through on-going connections with others and self-reflections – scheduled times throughout their TEPs to share and consider their perspectives.
on various teaching practices and theories. Ideally these times would provide opportunities for TCs to: voice their concerns; reflect on new practices they have observed and tried in their practicum classrooms; evaluate new knowledge and the utility of practices; and examine changes, or stability, in their beliefs (Cabaroglu & Roberts, 2000; Dignath, 2017). In this way, TCs have time to thoughtfully develop and integrate new practices and ideas about teaching into their belief systems, providing them with autonomy to determine for themselves the value of specific teaching practices and educational philosophies. These meetings would also provide opportunities for those supporting TCs to become aware of the personal characteristics that form TCs’ views of teaching thereby providing them with insight into how TCs interpret and experience learning opportunities. With this knowledge, teacher educators would have a better understanding of how contextual conditions might act to shape TCs’ self-determined motivation and, in turn, their beliefs and development of teaching practices. Therefore, they would be better equipped to tailor TCs’ individual learning experiences to encourage the exploration of new theory and practices and challenging of assumptions (Tillema, 2000; Vartuli & Rohs, 2009).

**Recruitment and support for school associates have implications for TCs’ developing practices.** Findings from my study indicate that the relationship between school associates and TCs is key in TCs’ development of self-determined motivation and teaching practices. Therefore, TEPs need to consider: (a) how to attract school associates to that are knowledgeable about mentorship and teaching practices, and (b) how to support school associates within their mentorship roles.

In terms of attracting knowledgeable school associates, TEPs may wish to consider the possibility of early recruitment of school associates. For example, in regards to the MY/SRL Cohort, program coordinators could connect with TCs who have demonstrated a propensity for
teaching toward SRL and discuss the possibility of them acting as school associates in the future. To this end, efforts could be made to engage them in informal mentoring opportunities during their early career years. Selected TCs could visit the Cohort to share their experiences and inquiry projects. They could also discuss what they are doing currently in their practices, and invite TCs into their classrooms to observe. Such opportunities for newly graduated TCs would be useful for preparing teachers to be school associates in the future.

It may also be beneficial for TEPs to investigate ways in which they can support school associates’ development of knowledge and practices aligned with relationship-based mentorship strategies and the specific goals of TEPs (e.g., the TCs in my study were tasked with learning about SRL and how to support it). To this end, TEPs in Canada may wish to look toward countries such as Norway for models of school associate support. In Norway, all school associates receive instruction that promotes their understanding of educational theories and mentorship skills prior to working with TCs (Sandvik et al., 2018). School associates are provided with time and guidance to understand their roles as mentors as well as to engage in reflection of their own practices in relation to theory presented in TEPs (Korthagen, 2004; Darling-Hammond, 2016; Sandvik et al.). These experiences help school associates build their own understandings of theories embedded within TEPs, thereby enabling them to model and explain teaching practices aligned with the foci of TEPs (Korthagen, 2014). In Canadian TEPs these experiences could be accommodated by structuring times for TCs to learn about teaching practices (in this case SRL) with their school associates throughout the year (Nillson & van Driel, 2010). Perhaps these learning opportunities could be embedded within scheduled times for TCs to surface their beliefs (as discussed above) thereby providing school associates with similar opportunities for their learning. Given the focus is on school associates’ on-going professional
development, school districts and provincial teaching associations might cover the costs of releasing teachers to attend scheduled sessions throughout the year. This approach could serve to strengthen partnerships between TEPs and school districts, as they invest together in supporting evidenced based practices within school settings.

**Situating theory within practice and practice within theory supports TCs’ development of teaching practices.** Findings from my study consistently highlighted the need to increase alignments between TCs’ learning experiences – to provide TCs with opportunities to learn about theory and practice concurrently within their practicum experiences. In Finland, TEPs are structured with this in mind (Jenset, Klette, & Hammerness, 2018). In these programs, TCs learn about teaching and learning theory within their practicum settings. This structural parallelism enables TCs to be involved in planning, enacting, “testing”, and revising theoretical constructs in classroom contexts where they have access to knowledgeable others who are able to provide them with feedback on their interpretations of theory and implementation of practices. In this way, TCs’ lived experiences in practicum settings provides them with opportunities to adapt theory based on their judgements, their learning, and students’ learning needs within their teaching contexts.

Since the study was conducted, the structure of the MY/SRL Cohort has changed and now incorporates many more opportunities for TCs to enact, reflect, and revise practices they learn about during initial experiences within the TEP. These new iterations of the MY/SRL Cohort serve as a framework for how TEPs in Canada might address the contextual divide between TCs’ theoretical and practical learning experiences. For example, the MY/SRL Cohort has recently begun to re-examine the scheduling of TCs’ courses and practicum experiences, with the intent of merging and integrating these experiences. To this end, the MY/SRL Cohort
has increased its emphasis on in-situ learning experiences for TCs by forming multiple partnerships with schools and school districts. In addition to learning from school associates, TCs have access to master SRL mentors. These teachers invite TCs to their schools and into their classrooms in small groups to watch them teach toward SRL. Furthermore, TCs’ inquiry seminars and some courses are now situated within schools for 1-2 days each week. The SRL mentor teachers visit the seminars and courses to debrief what TCs observe in their classrooms and, along with FAs and course instructors, help TCs to connect theory and practice. These experiences support TCs’ on-going integration of theoretical and practical learning experiences by situating school associates within closer proximity to university faculty and TCs’ learning school associates.

**Designated professional development schools promote alignment between TCs’ learning contexts.** One means of scaling up current efforts to align TCs’ learning experiences may be to consider how to strengthen partnerships between TEPs and school districts by designating specific schools within districts to serve as professional development schools. Such sites would be beneficial to both districts and TEPs. They would provide conduit for knowledge sharing between districts and universities and increase in-situ learning experiences for TCs.

Within some Canadian provinces, schools with a special designation/focus are allowed to create specific hiring criteria. The hiring criteria unique for professional development schools could include: (a) willingness to learn about mentorships skills and theory associated with current specific teacher education goals, and (b) openness to working with researchers and desire to engage in their own lines of inquiry. Optimally, these schools might set limited teacher terms (e.g., to three to five years) so that teachers throughout a district could access this teaching experience and then return to their schools to share the knowledge they gained.
Within this framework, FAs and course instructors could be based within school sites and/or districts, thereby increasing opportunities for them to support TCs’ and school associates’ understandings of theory and practices aligned with specific cohorts. For example, FAs and course instructors could support school associates to develop language associated with particular teaching foci. With this knowledge, school associates would be able to talk explicitly to TCs about how classroom practices are linked to theory. In turn, school associates could help FAs and university-based faculty become familiar with terms and language that TCs may encounter in their practicum experiences, thereby supporting faculty to link theory and research to practices found within schools.

Logistically, this model would likely be cost effective for both school districts and universities. Districts would benefit financially from having “in-house” opportunities for teachers to engage in ongoing professional development and universities would have facilities provided by districts for TCs’ classes and seminars. More importantly, this model situates TCs in environments where learning, teaching and research goals are a shared, on-going pursuit amongst all participants.

Concluding Thoughts

Results from my study suggest TCs beliefs about teaching practices when they arrive in TEPs are malleable and may change (for better or worse) based on their experiences in the TEPs. Supporting TCs’ development of beliefs and knowledge about SRL and SRLPPs seems an important goal for educators in the 21st century. Evidence suggest TEPs can foster TCs’ development of these teaching practices by embedding opportunities within their programming for TCs to: surface and share their past and on-going teaching learning experiences and by
creating supportive motivational contexts for TCs to learn, experiment with and adjust teaching practices to meet their learning needs and the needs of their students.

As noted in Chapter Three, philosophically, my beliefs and values align with social perspectives on teaching and learning, with learnings from social cognitive, social constructivist, and sociocultural theories. This philosophical stance is mirrored in the theoretical frameworks I used in my study: TC/teacher beliefs, SRL and self-determination. Through these theoretical lenses, social and contextual influences upon TCs’ motivation and development of teaching beliefs and practices were highlighted throughout my study. Results emphasize the importance of acknowledging that all students, whether they be TCs or grade school students, continually learn within and through their environments and interactions with others. I believe that it is through this social interactional lens that the global objectives of preparing individuals who are well-functioning and able to contribute and thrive in 21\textsuperscript{st} century society will be met.

\textit{“Development, as often happens, proceeds here not in a circle but in a spiral, passing through the same point at each new revolution while advancing to a higher level.”} 

Lev Vygotsky (1978)
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Appendix A: Teacher Candidate Information Letter and Consent Form

The Role of Beliefs and Self-Determined Motivation in Teacher Candidates’ Development of Practices that Promote Self-Regulated Learning

[Date]

Dear Teacher Candidate,

My name is Charlotte Brenner. I am a doctoral candidate in the department of Human Development, Learning and Culture at the University of British Columbia. The purpose of this letter is to describe my dissertation research and invite you to participate in it.

Contact Phone Number: [redacted]. Contact email:

Invitation and Study Purpose

Across diverse academic and employment contexts, supports for people’s feelings of autonomy/independence, competence, and relatedness with others have been demonstrated to improve motivation and performance. In November 2013 you participated in a study entitled, “Examining Causality Orientations of Teacher Candidates in the Self-Regulated Learning Cohort.” That study’s aim was to gather information about the forms of support TCs are most likely to seek within their learning and social environments. The current study is an extension of that research. Specifically this study will investigate how TCs’ motivation and experiences within their teacher education programs act together to shape TCs’ valuing and use of teaching practices promoted in their teacher education program (TEP).

Study Procedures

If you agree to participate in this study, you will be involved in three kinds of activities.

Interviews: You will be asked to complete two interviews. One interview will take place within the first two weeks of your practicum. The other interview will occur within a month of the
completion of your practicum. Each interview will take approximately 45-60 minutes. During interviews you will be asked questions about your: (a) beliefs about the value of practices advocated within your Cohort and TEP, and (b) experiences within the Teacher Education Program, the MY/SRL Cohort and your practicum setting.

**Observations:** During your practicum I would like to visit you in your practicum placements three times. During these visits I would observe you teaching. You don’t need to teach anything different or do anything you would not already do to prepare for teaching for these observations. Each observation will take approximately 45 minutes (or the length of an activity within your classroom). After each observation I will invite you to participate in a short debriefing/check in session (approximately 15 minutes). The purpose of these short interviews is for us to discuss what was happening during your lesson—for me to get clarification, as needed, about the activity and gather ongoing information about your experiences in the TEP and your practicum setting. These observation and debriefing sessions will be completely confidential. No information will be shared with your FA or SA. To the best of my ability I will try to schedule observations at a time of your choosing.

**Document Sharing:** I will ask you to share documents you have created during your TEP (e.g., lesson/unit plans, inquiry projects, and written reflections). These documents will add to my understanding about how you are thinking about and incorporating various teaching practices into your teaching. **As was true for the other research activities, any documentation you share with me will be kept in the strictest confidence and none of these research activities will be used for evaluative purposes.**

**Other Participants:** With your permission, I will invite your School Advisor to participate in an interview about his/her beliefs about teaching and learning and how s/he thinks TCs might best
be supported to develop their teaching practices. Similarly, I will speak to your Faculty Advisor to learn about general features of the TEP and how they are intended to support your development as an educator. At the end of your practicum your Faculty Advisor will be asked to submit a developmental rating of your implementation of SRL and other practices you will work on over the course of your practicum (e.g., assessing student learning and managing problem behaviour). This rating will be completely confidential. This rating will not be used for evaluative purposes that could threaten your standing in the program and does not require you to do anything you are not already doing in your program.

**Time Commitment**

Interviews will take between 45-60mins. Observations will occur during your teaching experiences within your practicum classroom and won’t require you to do anything you would not already be doing in the course of teaching your class(es). Debriefing after observations will take approximately 10-15 minutes.

**Potential Benefits**

Participation in interviews, observations and debriefing sessions will provide a confidential, non-evaluative environment for you to discuss and reflect upon your practices and experiences within university and practicum settings. Information from this study may also benefit future TCs by identifying ways in which universities and schools can better support them during their practicum and university experiences.

**Participation is Voluntary**

Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary and you may choose not to participate in any of the research activities or to withdraw your participation at any time without penalty. Also,
participation in this study will have no bearing on the evaluation of your performance in the TEP.

Compensation

In recognition of and remuneration for your time you will receive a $10 Starbucks gift certificate for each interview and a $10 Amazon gift card for each observation you participate in.

Confidentiality

Every effort will be made to keep your identity and data confidential. In publications and presentations that result from this study pseudonyms will be created for individual cases and identifying information will be removed. No data will be published before you complete your TEP. All data will be stored in a secure location and destroyed when it is no longer being used for the research purposes.

Contact Information About the Study

If you have any questions or would like more information about this study before agreeing to participate, please contact Charlotte Brenner (cb21289@gmail.com; 604-831-4064).

Contact for Concerns About the Rights of Research Participants

If you have any concerns about your treatment or rights as a research participant you can contact the Research Subject Information Line in the UBC Office of Research Services or, if long distance, email RSIL@ors.ubc.ca.

Sincerely,

Charlotte Brenner
**Please return this page. Keep the study information letter (pages 1 and 2) and a copy of this consent form for your own records**

**Consent**

- I have read the letter describing Charlotte Brenner’s research project, “The Role of Beliefs and Self-Determined Motivation in Teacher Candidates’ Development of Practices that Promote Self-Regulated Learning.” I understand the nature of my participation in it. I understand that my participation is voluntary and any information I provide will be kept confidential. I understand I may withdraw from the project at any time with no negative consequences.

**My signature indicates my desire to participate in this study.**

Signature: ______________________

Date: ______________________

**Email Address: ______________________**

**I do not wish to participate in this study.**

Signature: ______________________

Date: ______________________

I would like to receive a summary of the results of this study when it is complete.

Name: ______________________

Address: ______________________

Email: ______________________
Appendix B: The General Causality Orientations Scale (GCOS)

Name________________________________________

On these pages you will find a series of vignettes. Each one describes an incident and lists three ways of responding to it. Please read each vignette and then consider the responses in turn. Think of each response option in terms of how likely it is that you would respond in that way. We all respond in a variety of ways to situations, and probably each response is at least slightly likely for you. If it is very unlikely that you would respond in the way described in a given response, you would select numbers 1 or 2. If it is moderately likely you would respond in the midrange of numbers and if it is very likely that you would respond as described you would select the 6 or 7.

Please select one number for each of the three responses on the answer sheet for each vignette.

➢ You have been offered a new position in a company where you have worked for some time. The first question that is likely to come to mind is:

➢ What if I can’t live up to the new responsibility?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
very unlikely moderately likely very likely

➢ Will I make more at this position?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
very unlikely moderately likely very likely

➢ I wonder if the new work will be interesting?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
very unlikely moderately likely very likely
➢ You had a job interview several weeks ago. In the mail you received a form letter which states the position has been filled. It is likely that you might think:

1. It’s not what you know, but who you know. 
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   very unlikely moderately likely very likely

2. I’m probably not good enough for the job?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   very unlikely moderately likely very likely

3. Somehow they didn’t see my qualifications as matching their needs.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   very unlikely moderately likely very likely

➢ You are a supervisor at work and have been charged with the task of allotting coffee breaks to three employees who cannot all break at once. You would likely handle this by:

   a) Telling the three workers the situation and having them work with you on the schedule.
      1 2 3 4 5 6 7
      very unlikely moderately likely very likely

   b) Simply assigning times that each can break to avoid any problems.
      1 2 3 4 5 6 7
      very unlikely moderately likely very likely

   c) Find out from someone in authority what to do or do what was done in the past.
      1 2 3 4 5 6 7
You have just received the results of a test you took, and you discovered that you did very poorly. Your initial reaction is likely to be:

a) “I can’t do anything right” and feel sad.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7

b) “I wonder how it is that I did so poorly” and feel disappointed.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7

c) “That stupid test doesn’t show anything” and feel angry.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7

When you and your friend are making plans for Saturday evening, it is likely that you would:

b) Leave it up to your friend: he (she) probably wouldn’t want to do what you’d suggest.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7

c) Each make a suggestion and decide together on something that you both feel like doing.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7

d) Talk your friend into doing what you want to do.
You have been invited to a large party where you know very few people. As you look forward to the evening, you would likely expect that:

a) You’ll try to fit in with whatever is happening in order to fit in and not look bad.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
very unlikely moderately likely very likely

b) You’ll find some people with whom you can relate.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
very unlikely moderately likely very likely

c) You’ll probably feel somewhat isolated and unnoticed.

2 3 4 5 6 7
very unlikely moderately likely very likely

You are asked to plan a picnic for yourself and your fellow employees. Your style for approaching this project could most likely be described as:

a) Take charge: that is, you would make most of the major decisions yourself.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
very unlikely moderately likely very likely

b) Follow precedent: you’re not really up to the task so you’d do it the way it’s been done before.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
very unlikely moderately likely very likely
c) Seek participation: get inputs from others who want to make them before you make the final plan.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
very unlikely  moderately likely  very likely

Recently a position opened up at your place of work that could have meant a promotion for you. However, a person you work with was offered the job rather than you. In evaluating the situation, you’re likely to think:

1 You didn’t really expect the job; you frequently get passed over.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
very unlikely  moderately likely  very likely

2 The other person probably “did the right things” politically to get the job.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
very unlikely  moderately likely  very likely

3 You would probably take a look at factors in your own performance that led you to be passed over.

a) 2  3  4  5  6  7
very unlikely  moderately likely  very likely

You are embarking on a new career. The most important consideration is likely to be:

a) Whether you can do the work without getting in over your head.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
very unlikely  moderately likely  very likely

b) How interested you are in that kind of work.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
c) **Whether there are good possibilities for advancement.**

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

very unlikely    moderately likely    very likely

➢ **A person who works for you has generally done an adequate job. However, for the past two weeks their work has not been up to par and they appear to be less actively interested in her work. Your reaction is:**

a) **Tell the person that their work is below what is expected and to work harder.**

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

very unlikely    moderately likely    very likely

b) **Ask the person about the problem and let them know you are available to help work it out.**

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

very unlikely    moderately likely    very likely

➢ **Your company has promoted you to a position in a city far from your present location.**

As you think about the move you would probably:

a) **Feel interested in the new challenge and a little nervous at the same time.**

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

very unlikely    moderately likely    very likely

b) **Feel excited about the higher status and salary that is involved.**
c) Feel stressed and anxious about the upcoming changes.

Within your circle of friends, the one with whom you choose to spend the most time is:

a) The one with whom you spend the most time exchanging ideas and feelings.

b) The one who is the most popular.

c) The one who needs you most as a friend.

You have a school-aged daughter. On parents’ night the teacher tells you that your daughter is doing poorly and doesn’t seem involved in her work. You are likely to:

a) Talk it over with your daughter to understand further what the problem is.

b) Scold her and hope she does better.
c) Make sure she does the assignments and works harder.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
very unlikely moderately likely very likely

➢ Your friend has a habit that annoys you to the point of making you angry. It is likely that you would:

a) Point it out each time you notice it, that way maybe he (she) will stop doing it.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
very unlikely moderately likely very likely

b) Try to ignore the habit because talking about it won’t do any good anyway.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
very unlikely moderately likely very likely

c) Try to understand why your friend does it and why it is so upsetting for you.

a) 2 3 4 5 6 7
very unlikely moderately likely very likely

➢ A close friend of yours has been moody lately, and a couple of times has become angry with you over “nothing”. You might:

1 Share your observations with him/her and try to find out what is going on for him/her.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
very unlikely moderately likely very likely

2 Ignore it because there is not much you can do about it anyway.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
very unlikely    moderately likely    very likely

3 Tell him/her that you’re willing to spend time together if and only if he/she makes more effort to control him/herself.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

very unlikely    moderately likely    very likely

➢ Your friend’s younger sister has just begun college. Your friend tells you that she has been doing poorly and asks you what he (she) should do about it: You advise him (her) to:

a) Talk it over with her and try to see what is going on for her.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

very unlikely    moderately likely    very likely

b) Not to mention it to their sister; there is nothing he (she) could do about it anyway.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

very unlikely    moderately likely    very likely

c) Talk to their sister and tell her it’s important for her to do well and that she should work harder.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

very unlikely    moderately likely    very likely

➢ You feel that your friend is being inconsiderate. You would probably:

a) Find an opportunity to explain why you feel this way with your friend; he (she) may not even realize they are being inconsiderate.
b) Say nothing; if your friend really cares about you he (she) would understand how you feel.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
very unlikely moderately likely very likely

c) Insist that your friend start being more considerate; otherwise you’ll respond in kind.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
very unlikely moderately likely very likely
Appendix C: Faculty Advisor Information Letter and Consent Form

The Role of Beliefs and Self-Determined Motivation in Teacher Candidates’ Development of Practices that Promote Self-Regulated Learning

[Date]

Dear Faculty Advisor,

My name is Charlotte Brenner. I am a doctoral candidate in the department of Human Development, Learning and Culture at the University of British Columbia. The purpose of this letter is to describe my research and invite you to participate in it.

Invitation and Study Purpose

Across diverse academic and employment contexts, support for people’s feelings of autonomy/independence, competence, and relatedness with others has been demonstrated to improve motivation and performance. I am interested in the extent to which teacher candidates (TCs) perceive experiences in their teacher education program to support their motivation and development as professionals. The overarching aim of this study is to understand how TCs’ own feelings of motivation, and features of their university and practicum experiences, act together to shape TCs’ valuing and use of teaching practices promoted in their teacher education program, particularly those associated with self-regulated learning (SRL). I am writing this letter to invite you to participate in this study.

Study Procedures

To help me understand TCs’ experiences within the teacher education program, I would like to collect information from a variety of sources, including from you. Specifically, I would like to interview you once during the TCs’ extended practicum. The intent of this interview will be to gather: (a) general information about the teacher education program and TCs’ university and
practicum contexts, (b) information that relates specifically to TCs’ experiences in the SRL cohort, and (c) information about what you perceive to be affordances and constraints for TCs’ development of SRL promoting practices.

Also, at the end of the extended practicum, I will ask you to rate TCs’ development of general teaching and SRL promoting practices. These ratings will be used to supplement other sources of data collected from TCs during their extended practicum (e.g., lesson and unit plans, researcher observations). All of the information collected from you will be kept confidential and used strictly for the research purposes. This information will not be shared TCs or school advisors.

**Time Commitment**

Interviews will take approximately 45-60 minutes. Rating a TC’s teaching and SRL promoting practices will take approximately 10 minutes. Nine TCs in this year’s SRL cohort who participated in a previous research study (in Fall 2013) will be invited to participate in this study. If they all agree to participate, this activity would take approximately 90 min.

**Potential Benefits**

Participation in the interview will provide a confidential, non-evaluative context for you to discuss your experiences as a faculty advisor. Specifically, the interview will provide a forum for you to describe features of the teacher education program and the SRL cohort, and your views about how they support (or constrain) TCs’ development of SRL promoting practices. Your participation in this study may also benefit future TCs and people who support them by identifying ways in which universities and schools can work together to enhance learning experiences for beginning teachers.

**Participation is Voluntary**
Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary and you may choose not to participate in any of the research activities or to withdraw your participation at any time without penalty.

**Compensation**

You will receive a $40 Starbucks gift card as a small token of appreciation for your participation.

**Confidentiality**

Every effort will be made to keep your identity and data confidential. In publications and presentations that result from this study pseudonyms will be created for individual cases and identifying information will be removed. All data will be stored in a secure location and destroyed when it is no longer being used for the research purposes.

**Contact Information about the Study**

If you have any questions or would like more information about this study before agreeing to participate, please contact Charlotte Brenner

**Contact for Concerns About the Rights of Research Participants**

If you have any concerns about your treatment or rights as a research participant you can contact the Research Subject Information Line in the UBC Office of Research Services or if long distance, email

Sincerely,

Charlotte Brenner
Please return this page. Keep the study information letter (pages 1 and 2) and a copy of this consent form for your own records.

Consent

- I have read the letter describing Charlotte Brenner’s research project, “The Role of Beliefs and Self-Determined Motivation in Teacher Candidates’ Development of Practices that Promote Self-Regulated Learning.” I understand the nature of my participation in it. I understand that my participation is voluntary and any information I provide will be kept confidential. I understand I may withdraw from the project at any time with no negative consequences.

My signature indicates my desire to participate in this study.

Signature: ______________________
Date: ______________________

Email Address: ______________________

I do not wish to participate in this study.

Signature: ______________________
Date: ______________________

I would like to receive a summary of the results of this study when it is complete.

Name: ______________________
Address: ______________________
Email: ______________________
Appendix D: Faculty Advisor Interview

The questions included in this semi-structured interview are intended to guide a conversation between the researcher and the university-based supervisor of the SRL cohort (Faculty Advisor) about the presence of structural and motivational supports for TCs’ development of SRL promoting practices. This protocol provides a flexible framework to enable discussion. There is a logical flow to the identified topics, but the protocol is intended to be flexible enough to allow school advisors to lead the conversation. Below are examples of the kinds of questions to be asked. I am not committed to asking every question within a category or asking questions in the order they appear. The goal is to cover the broad topics.

General Information

a. Can you briefly describe your role?
   i. Within the Teacher Education Program
   ii. Within the SRL cohort
   iii. Within practicum contexts

1. Working with school advisors
2. Working with TCs

Faculty Advisor Goals

b. What are your goals as a faculty advisor?
   a. What do you think is most important for TCs to learn?
   b. Where is your focus in terms of supporting that learning?
      i. On particular practices?
      ii. On attitudes?
Faculty Advisor’s Identification of Affordances and Constraints for TCs’ Development of SRL Practices

c. How are TCs supported in their understanding and development of SRL promoting practices?

a. Within the TEP?

b. Within the SRL cohort?

c. Within practicum classrooms?

   Do you feel most of the school advisors working with TCs are supportive of the cohort’s focus?

d. What are some of the challenges in supporting TCs’ understanding of SRL and development of SRL practices?

   Within the TEP?

   Within the SRL cohort?

   Within practicum classrooms?

   Time?

   Resources?

   Program mandates?

Is there anything else you would like to add/comment?
Appendix E: TC Pre-Practicum Interview

Past Experiences

1. Tell me why you decided to become a teacher.
   a. Did your own experiences as student shape your decision?
   b. Did past experiences working with children/youth shape your decision?
   c. Other experiences?

Program Fit

2. What made you choose the MY/SRL cohort within UBC’s TEP?
   a. How do you feel about SRL now?
   b. Would you say this cohort is a good fit for you?
      i. Why/why not?

Previous Teaching Experiences

3. Have you had chance to see or use SRL promoting practices in your practicum setting?
   a. Have you seen SRL modelled in your practicum classroom?
   b. Have you built SRL into any of your lessons/unit plans? (Can you share them with me?)
   c. Have you had a chance to implement these lesson/unit plans?
   d. How did it go? Successes/challenges?

Perceptions of Support/Constraints

4. Do you feel supported to develop and implement SRL promoting practices? In what ways?
a. Are there things that get in the way of you developing your teaching in this regard? Explain.

b. Are you free to try new practices in your practicum classroom?

c. How confident do you feel about implementing SRL practices? (e.g., very confident; somewhat confident; not confident)
   i. What experiences led to your feelings of competence?
   ii. What supports/experiences do you think would help build your confidence?

d. Is there anything else you would like to experience in terms of support within the program?

Congruency Between Teacher Education Program, SRL Cohort and Practicum Settings

5. Is there congruency between your experiences in the TEP generally (e.g., the courses you’ve taken; the theories and practices promoted) and the themes that are part of the SRL cohort?
   a. What about your practicum placement? How do your experiences there align with your experiences on campus?
      i. In the SRL cohort?
      ii. How important are these alignments to you? Explain.

Relationships

6. What are key relationships in your teacher education experience? Tell me about them.
   a. What is your relationship with your school advisor like? (e.g., strong, positive, strained)
   b. Do you share the same views on teaching?
c. In what ways are your views similar/different?

d. What about your relationship with your faculty advisor? TC colleagues? The students you teach?

e. How have these relationships impacted your teaching? Learning?

f. How will they impact your teaching/learning in the future?

**Personal Goals and Expectations**

7. What are your goals for this practicum?

   a. Goals for your understanding of teaching principles?

   b. Goals for your practice?

   c. Goals for your students?

8. What challenges if any do you think you’ll encounter?

   a. What forms of support do you think will be available?

   b. How are you most likely to seek support to cope with challenges?

9. Is there anything else you would like to add/comment on?
Appendix F: TC Observation Debriefing Interview

The questions included in this semi-structured debriefing interview are intended to serve as a means of clarifying observations and to guide conversation between the researcher and teacher candidates (TCs) about: (a) their perceptions of support for their development of SRL practices, (b) the challenges they face implementing these practices, and (c) changes in TCs’ beliefs about SRL practices over the course of their practicum. This protocol provides a flexible framework to enable discussion. There is a logical flow to the identified topics, but the protocol is intended to be flexible enough to allow TCs to lead the conversation. Also, I am not committed to asking every question within a category or asking questions in the order they appear. The goal is to cover the broad topics.

1. What would you like to talk about in relation to the lesson we just observed?
   a. What do you think went well?
   b. Is there anything you wish you could change?

2. What were your goals/intentions regarding self-regulation/self-regulated learning (SRL) during this lesson? What opportunities for SRL did you want to present to students?
   a. How do you think it went?
   b. What felt good/went well?
   c. Were there any challenges for you during the lesson?
   d. Is there anything you would like to do differently?
   e. How might you build from this lesson in future lessons that incorporate SRL?
3 What are you thinking about SRL at this point in your practicum?

a. How helpful are you finding this focus?
   i. Generally (Does it help with teaching generally—managing student behaviour, assessing student learning, supporting diverse learners?)
   ii. The SRL practices (Could point to some of the practices, e.g., giving choices, control over challenge, opportunities to self-evaluate …)

b. How supported are you feeling in your efforts to develop and implement SRL practices?
   i. What are some examples of support you’ve received?
   ii. Or wish you would receive?

4 Anything you would like to add?
Appendix G: TC Post Practicum Interview

The questions included in this semi-structured interview are intended to guide a conversation between the researcher and teacher candidates (TCs) about their: (a) teaching experiences within their practicum settings; and, (b) perceptions of whether and how their development of teaching practices, particularly SRL related practices, were supported or constrained within their practicum settings, the Self-Regulated Learning Cohort and the Teacher Education Program (TEP); and (c) changes in TCs’ beliefs about and valuing of SRL. This protocol provides a flexible framework to enable discussion. There is a logical flow to the identified topics, but the protocol is intended to be flexible enough to allow TCs to lead the conversation. Below are examples of the kinds of questions to be asked. I am not committed to asking every question within a category or asking questions in the order they appear. The goal is to cover the broad topics.

**Personal Goals and Expectations**

1. In April you mentioned that your goals for your practicum were…
   a. Do you feel you were able to achieve these goals?
   b. Did you feel supported in meeting these goals? How?
   c. Did you feel constrained in any way trying to meet these goals? How?

**Practicum, SRL Cohort, and TEP Experiences**

2. Did you have the chance to use – “build in” SRL promoting practices in your practicum setting?
   a. How did it go? Successes/challenges?
   b. Did you free to try SRL practices in your practicum classroom?
3. Did you accomplish what you wanted to?
   a. Did you have to make adjustments to your units/lessons? If so, why and what were they?
   b. Did you feel free to adapt practices advocated in your TEP and the SRL cohort to meet the needs of your students?

**Perceptions of Support/Constraints**

4. Did you feel supported to develop and implement SRL promoting practices? In what ways?
   a. Within your practicum setting? Within the SRL cohort? Within the Teacher Education Program?
   b. Are there things that got in the way of you developing your teaching in this regard? Explain.
   c. How confident do you feel about implementing SRL practices? (e.g., very confident; somewhat confident; not confident)
      i. What experiences have made you feel confident?
      ii. What supports/experiences could help build your confidence?

**TCs’ Perceived Congruency Between Teacher Education Program, SRL Cohort and Practicum Setting**

5. Was there congruency between your experiences in the TEP generally (e.g., the courses you’ve taken; the theories and practices promoted) and the themes that were part of the SRL cohort?
   a. What about your practicum placement? How did your experiences there align with your experiences on campus?
i. In the SRL cohort?

b. How important are these alignments to you? Explain.

**Relationships**

6. In April you described your relationship with your school advisor as… Has your relationship with your school advisor changed over the course of the practicum? How?

7. What were other key relationships in your teacher education experience?
   a. Tell me about them.
      i. Relationship with your faculty advisor? TC colleagues? The students you teach?
      ii. How did these relationships impact your teaching? Your experiences within your TEP?

**Program Fit**

8. How do you feel about SRL now?
   a. Benefits? Limitations?
   b. Do you think this themed SRL cohort was a good fit for you? Why? Why not?
   c. Can you see yourself using SRL promoting practices in the future?

9. What recommendations do you have for improving TCs’ experiences in their TEP and the SRL cohort?

10. Is there anything else you would like to add or comment on?
### Appendix H: Intercoder Reliability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Text Identified By Coder 1</th>
<th>Text Identified By Coder 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal Characteristic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td></td>
<td>“…gaining strategies to deal with certain situations that you might not be coping with so well, or, sort of like that. But yeah, so I had…I think it’s super beneficial so you know how to implement it.”</td>
<td>“I felt like I was able to reduce callouts, and I got a better…I felt more comfortable managing the class …”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td></td>
<td>“…especially like things like classroom management. I felt like I was able to reduce callouts, and I got a better…I felt more comfortable managing the class …”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivational Orientation</td>
<td>I coded as developing practice</td>
<td>“I think I implemented them pretty closely to what I wanted overall, and lesson planning, I got more comfortable with taking risks.”</td>
<td>“I think I implemented them pretty closely to what I wanted overall, and lesson planning, I got more comfortable with taking once the speaking fear was gone risks.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Especially when you get more comfortable in front of the class. It… once the speaking fear was gone …”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“I wasn’t so worried about trying new things out as much, because I already tried some things out and I’m like, oh, they’re going well so far, and why not.”</td>
<td>“…near the end of the practicum, I started”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I coded as structural support from school associate

modifying the questions that I was giving out for them. So, I would pick ones that would be more reasonable or I would re-word it in a simpler way for them.”

“And have different strengths. So, adjustments would usually be made to the lesson, okay, the first time this didn’t go well so I’m going to try and fix it for the next classes, and then usually the third time around it goes rather smoothly.”

Beliefs about SRLPPs

“I think it’s super beneficial”

“I think it’s super beneficial”

Relationships

With students

“They were a good group of kids – I miss them. And yeah, I was…I could tell I had built relationships with them.”

“They were a good group of kids – I miss them. And yeah, I was…I could tell I had built relationships with them.”

“…how much they appreciate you, and how much they like you and you like them. So, yeah, I felt good about that and sometimes they’d come and talk to you before or after school, so that’s always interesting and fun.

“…how much they appreciate you, and how much they like you and you like them. So, yeah, I felt good about that and sometimes they’d come and talk to you before or after school, so that’s always interesting and fun.”

“…so, I felt better about that as well. I definitely got to know my students.”

“…that remained positive, I think, throughout the whole practicum. I never…no one ever started hating me or like…”

“They remained steady.”
“...it was really helpful having a good relationship with the students.”

“Like at the end of the year, me and the other student teacher, we worked on our HACE and French units together, and we’re like, oh, these are great. We’re co-constructing criteria. We’re going over these things and this is where we’re ending. And then it just...like our HACE unit basically got scrapped because something came up with Work BC, and we’re like, okay, we have to follow this program because it’s a way better opportunity...“

“I was still able to – Um, because we were with the PL Tech group for most of the time...”

“...so, one of my friends helped me with some things. And I did a professional development in it as well.”

“It was really nice.”

“I was talking about non-related teaching things too.”

“he was very chill. ...But the kids still respected him, so it was...that was a good balance.”

“And my school advisor, would be my top three.”

“I took some of the things I learned in my French class that I got to use in my practicum and I adapted it...well, one of the things, to them more than some of the
others. But it worked pretty well for them and made it more interesting, so I was happy with that. And for my social studies, I was using the historical thinking concepts that I had learned in school and the kids seemed to understand what they were, so that was pretty good.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Freedom</th>
<th>“…it was just kind of like, well, this is what I learned about in class. Let’s see if some of these things work in a practical sense.”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“But overall, I was able to do what I wanted – for the most part.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“…it was just kind of like, well, this is what I learned about in class. Let’s see if some of these things work in a practical sense.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“But overall, I was able to do what I wanted – for the most part.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I did through the project-based learning again and just implementing choice and allowing kids to, you know, choose how they want to make their project to what they want to do in their project. And they had freedom in that sense. And also, with cooperative learning – so they’d be doing it in group work as well. So, they had to regulate, you know, who are they going to…like pick their partners, is it a good idea. And then also regulating who’s doing what? How much of what? How does that play into your other project, or, things like that? So, I thought that was good for cooperative learning, and I guess the SRL umbrella…”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“… Because you could upload the results and then it’s anonymous unless you get them to actually put their names down. But, it gives you a sense of where…”

FA Support

“He still told us, like, you know, talk to me if anything’s bothering you.”

“He was open in the sense that he was there for us if we had to ask him questions, and he always gave really helpful advice when we did see him. So, I think overall he was supportive…”

“I took some of the things I learned in my French class that I got to use in my practicum and I adapted it…well, one of the things, to them more than some of the others. But it worked pretty well for them and made it more interesting, so I was happy with that. And for my social studies, I was using the historical thinking concepts that I had learned in school and the kids seemed to understand what they were, so that was pretty good.”

“I used some of the science…we learned some outdoor education things and science. So, I got to try some of those out and it worked pretty well. And same with the science game as well that me and two other people constructed for our cross-curricular lesson planning…”
### School Associate Support

“…he was very chill … But the kids still respected him, so it was…that was a good balance.”

### Resources

“…that SRL workshop that we went to at Como Lake.”

### Peer Support

“Probably the other student teachers at your school. That was a very important.”

“…another student teacher on the same team as you who’s dealing with the same kids and you’re co-planning units. That was really nice. And something like when you’re in the same boat it feels *(chuckles)*…it feels better to have someone there like that.”

“And it’s good because you don’t want to…it’s like in teaching practice. You don’t want to just come up it yourself. A big part of its collaborating with others. So, it was nice having someone to collaborate with.”

**Constraints**

**Personal Characteristics**

| Confidence | “I don’t feel fully confident…” | “I don’t feel fully confident…” |

**Student Characteristics**

| Abilities | “…our French ended up…it didn’t change so much for me as more for him, just because our kids hadn’t learned any French, so we started at the bare bones, and then it just kind of…that was interesting…” |

| Motivational Orientations | “I was looking at motivation, and I was like, oh, how can I | “I was looking at motivation, and I was like, oh, how can I
Understandings of SRL

“...it's still hard to implement. I guess, especially, if you don’t…if you haven’t seen it implement. But, like I think so many kids that I was teaching with, I would want them to be more self-regulated, but it was hard getting them to a place where they could do that…”

Structural Supports

Lack of Alignment

“I was kind of hoping or a little more from that, but that’s also, you know, it’s just a placement thing … Yeah, so I had no control over it. But I wish I had more support for learning about that. Or, I felt more constrained that way. And same with social emotional”

“I felt constraint because, again, there wasn’t as much from what we were doing in class that I could gain off of that was already setup.”

“Otherwise, I never really heard or like got any of those reminders again about SRL. Like my FA didn’t talk about it at all with me …”

“Yeah, it wasn’t really there. Like I was like, yeah, I’m the SRL cohort. But it wasn’t a
driving force in my practicum.”
“…just not seeing it done. There’s no example.”
“…it would have been nice to see it implemented again if I had maybe a classroom that was already focused on SRL, it would have been really great to learn from that.
“…some things you can connect, but other things, it just didn’t lead to it…”
“…it’s still hard to implement. I guess, especially, if you don’t…it you haven’t seen it implement. But, like I think so many kids that I was teaching with, I would want them to be more self-regulated, but it was hard getting them to a place where they could do that…
“…it’s one thing if you walk into a class that’s focused on that all year.’
“Otherwise, I never really heard or like got any of those reminders again about SRL. . Like my FA didn’t talk about it at all with me…”
“…and our French ended up…it didn’t change so much for me as more for him, just because our kids hadn’t learned any French, so we
started at the bare bones, and then it just kind of…that was interesting.”
Appendix I: CLASSROOM OBSERVATION INSTRUMENT

(COPYRIGHT 1998, 2002 NANCY PERRY)

Teacher _____________________ Date _____________________

Activity _____________________

Beginning Time ________________ Ending Time ________________

Description of Activity

(what's going on)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute of the Activity</th>
<th>Descriptions/Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>___ Choice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ Control over challenge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ Self-evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ Peer support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ Teacher support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Category Descriptions for Teacher Observations**

**Choice:** For each kind of choice, decide whether students had no choice—the teacher decided (0), choices with fairly tight constraints (1), or choices with lots of latitude (2).

Examples:

- no choice—write X, put X in your portfolio

  **teachers almost always decided “when” students would write, but within the writing block, students might have more or less control over organizing their writing activities. Therefore, let’s ask the question, “Did students follow a rote plan” (i.e., first this, then this), or could they decide to write a bit of their rough draft, then enter that on the computer or illustrate it before returning to the draft?**

- choices with constraints—you can write about a or b, you can work with the students at your table, you can move from your desk, if you ask the teacher first
choices with lots of latitude—students choose a topic, have lots of options re: organizing
information, their time, their partners

Also consider the nature of the choices given. Distinguish between no choice = 0, a choice that
involves low levels of thinking (e.g., which colour crayon or paper to use, whether or not to draw
a picture when you finish a task, and even which centre to go to, if they have nothing to do with
task objectives) = 1, and a choice that involves higher level thinking (e.g., what resources to use,
how to organize information, roles of group members) = 2.

Challenge: Decide whether the level of difficulty presented by the task/activity, or the
expectations regarding the product(s) of the task/activity, were the same for all students (0),
modifications/adaptations were made by the teacher (1), modifications/adaptations were made by
students, or negotiated between teacher and students (e.g., generating criteria together) (2).

Examples:

degrees of challenge might be provided by allowing students to work at their own pace,
decide on the length of their writing, choose their topic and the resources they use to
prompt their writing (e.g., reference books for research), determine the criteria for
judging their work or selecting it for their portfolio

Self-evaluation: Decide whether students are given opportunities to evaluate or reflect on their
work, or to think about what makes “good writing” or an interesting/meaningful portfolio entry
in general. If no, (0); if yes, but the substance of the evaluations/reflections focuses on
mechanical aspects of writing (e.g., spelling, punctuation, neatness), (1); if yes and the focus of
the evaluation/reflection is on the meaning related aspects of writing (e.g., is it interesting? does it make sense? What did you learn?) as well as the mechanical aspects (2).

Examples: “check to see if your sentence matches the one on the board and your printing is neat” are examples of evaluation that focuses on mechanical aspects of writing. Checking for stickers or looking at the score on an assignment without reading teachers’ or peers’ feedback are examples of shallow evaluation. Higher-level reflections focus on whether all the ideas in a paragraph go together, explaining why you’ve chosen a piece of writing for your portfolio, or generating a list of criteria that describes good writing.

Support from teacher: Determine whether the support provided by the teacher is procedural (1) or instrumental (2). I can’t imagine too many activities in which there would be no support from teachers. Procedural support is directive, whereas instrumental support guides students toward independence by helping them to develop the skills to solve problems for themselves. It’s the difference between saying “I think … ” and saying “Can you think … ”

Examples:

procedural support—explicit directions (do X, then do Y) or giving an answer without explanation or prompting to see if students can generate their own solution

instrumental support—prompting students to think of strategies for finding answers/solutions, modelling (i.e. through self-talk) how to approach tasks/problems

Student: How do you spell … ?

Teacher: Have you tried it on your own?
Student: No

Teacher: “What are some things you can do when you are having trouble spelling a word?” or, “Let’s see if we can work it out together. How does it start? What sound(s) do you hear at the beginning?”

**All teachers will provide procedural support some of the time (for survival). Try to get a sense of the general trend.

Support from peers: Again, determine whether students are providing each other with procedural support or instrumental support.

Examples:

procedural support—student doesn’t know how to spell a word, asks a friend, friend spells it; students who finish cutting out pictures first, help your neighbour

instrumental support—sharing ideas/information, peer editing where peers make suggestions to improve the content of one another’s stories/reports

Embedded assessment: Look for evidence of teachers providing students with feedback, verbal or written, about their work, keeping records for themselves, or reflecting on how well the activity is going/how students are responding to it (usually verbally). Code 0 if there is no evidence of assessment, 1 if it targets mechanical aspects of writing or shallow assessment issues, 2 if it targets meaning related aspects of writing and higher-level assessment issues (see examples for self-evaluation).
Accommodations for individual differences: Look for evidence that modifications to activities/tasks and/or criteria for evaluation are made, or can be made, to accommodate individual differences. Teacher and peer support may also reflect accommodations for individual differences. Ideally, the accommodations for individuals don’t result in achievement groupings or some students doing different tasks. Code 0 if no accommodations are made for individual differences, 1 if accommodations exclude students from what most of their peers are doing and 2 if accommodations include students in mainstream classroom tasks, while maintaining an optimal challenge.

Example: Tasks that are open ended, provide students with lots of options, and allow for a variety of products accommodate individual differences.

Tasks: To get a rating of 2, the task environment has to incorporate most of the following characteristics.

a) Multiple goals: Complex tasks have multiple goals. At least some of these goals should be in aid of learning meaningful content (see meaning below) or complex processes (higher-order goals). Also, the goals, like the other aspects of the task, should relate to/build on one another.

Example: Lynn used research about animals to accomplish the following: learn how to do research, write expository text, edit, and use the computer as a tool for writing. Individual skills were taught in the service of preparing the research report, skills students will use throughout their school career and, for some, beyond.

b) Meaning: Complex tasks/activities are “authentic” (i.e., have real world meaning), “integrate” content and skills from across the curriculum, promote understanding of
what it means to think and act like a mathematician, scientist, poet/writer, and be involved in a community of scientists or writers, involve large chunks of meaning (macro-meaning).

Examples: Darrin involved students in a design task (build something that flies) that required students to use/apply multiple concepts they had learned in a unit on flight. Allen asked students to be city planners, coping with complex (ill-structured) problems of urbanization.

c) Time: Students engage in these tasks over extended periods of time (projects, units of study).

d) Processes: Complex tasks involve the combination and coordination of both cognitive and metacognitive processes (e.g., planning, organizing, predicting) in aid of accomplishing higher level goals and meaningful purposes. More than asking students to apply a strategy, or even a particular set of strategies, these tasks require students to think and act strategically (i.e., to choose, generate, evaluate … strategies).

e) Products: Finally, complex tasks don’t have one right answer, one way to represent learning. Even if everyone is producing a research report, a reflections journal, an airplane, there is lots of leeway about the ideas, organization, appearance, resources used, etc.
Task Environment Ratings for Individual Classrooms

Rater: ____________________

Teacher: _________________ (indicate mentor or student)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observation #</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Self-eval.</th>
<th>Teacher Support</th>
<th>Peer Support</th>
<th>Task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix J

**Catherine’s Initial and Developing Perceptions of Motivational and Structural Affordances**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Practicum Interview</th>
<th>Debrief 1</th>
<th>Debrief 2</th>
<th>Debrief 3</th>
<th>Post-Practicum Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Autonomy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Freedom/time to try new practice</td>
<td>✓ Freedom/time to try new practice</td>
<td>✓ Increased confidence</td>
<td>✓ Freedom/time to try new practice</td>
<td>✓ Freedom/time to try new practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Alignment between university and practicum school’s focus</td>
<td>✓ Alignment between university and practicum school’s focus</td>
<td>✓ TC Peer in practicum placement</td>
<td>✓ TC Peer in practicum placement</td>
<td>✓ SRL Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Alignment between school associate’s practices and TC’s values</td>
<td>✓ Alignment between school associate’s practices and TC’s values</td>
<td>✓ Utility of Cohort Focus</td>
<td>✓ Utility of Cohort Focus</td>
<td>✓ SA Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Alignment between FAs’ instruction and Cohort</td>
<td>✓ Alignment between FAs’ instruction and Cohort</td>
<td>✓ Student (short-term) Outcomes</td>
<td>✓ Student (short-term) Outcomes</td>
<td>✓ TC Peer in Practicum Placement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relatedness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Positive relationship with School Associate</td>
<td>✓ TC Peer Support</td>
<td>✓ TC Peer Support</td>
<td>✓ SA Support</td>
<td>✓ TC Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ FA Encouragement</td>
<td>✓ FA Encouragement</td>
<td>✓ FA Encouragement</td>
<td>✓ FA Encouragement</td>
<td>✓ TC in Practicum Placement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive relationship with FA</td>
<td>School Associate support</td>
<td>Positive relationships with students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive relationships with TC peers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Associate modelling of relationship building with students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Competence**

- Freedom to try new practice
- Modelling of SRL practices
- Alignment between university and practicum classrooms focus
- TC peer in practicum placement
- Alignment between FAs’ instruction and Cohort
- School Associate support
- School Associate Encouragement
- Belief that supports were
- Freedom to try new practice
- TC Peer Support
- FA encouragement
- School Associate support
- SRL Workshop
- Time/practice
- Utility of Cohort Focus
- Student (short-term) Outcomes
- Time/practice
- Freedom to try new practice
- SRL Workshop
- SA Support
- TC Peer in Practicum Placement
available for learning

School Associate modelling of relationship building with students

_Catherine’s Initial and Developing Perceptions of Motivational and Structural Constraints_
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD Need</th>
<th>Pre-Practicum Interview</th>
<th>Debrief 1</th>
<th>Debrief 2</th>
<th>Debrief 3</th>
<th>Post-Practicum Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Time</td>
<td>➢ School</td>
<td>➢ School</td>
<td>➢ School</td>
<td>➢ School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>Associate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>for SRL</td>
<td>for SRL</td>
<td>for SRL</td>
<td>for SRL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ School Associate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>for SRL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ FA Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ FA Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Lack of resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatedness</td>
<td>➢ FA support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competence</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>School Associate Support for SRL</th>
<th>School Associate Support for SRL</th>
<th>FA support</th>
<th>Lack of SRL Focus</th>
<th>Lack of resources</th>
<th>School Associate Support for SRL</th>
<th>FA support</th>
<th>Student Orientations</th>
<th>Student Behaviour</th>
<th>Lack of SRL Focus</th>
<th>Lack of resources</th>
<th>Lack of Alignment between University and Practicum setting</th>
<th>Lack of modelling</th>
<th>Lack of Professional Development Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Examples of evidence of Developing Practices

“So that was something that changed for me at the end of the practicum as well. I was starting to… it wasn’t merely survival, I guess (chuckles), like, for the whole class. It was…I got to start paying more attention to those students as well.”

“…near the end of the practicum, I started modifying the questions that I was giving out for them. So, I would pick ones that would be more reasonable or I would re-word it in a simpler way for them.”

“… that became a lot easier as well.”

“I think I was able to implement it close to what I wanted and it became easier and faster as the practicum went on instead of relying on planning them days in advance. I’d be like… the day before I’d be like, oh, what are doing. Okay. This is our activity. We’ll fit it in there.”

“thought I did through the project-based learning again and just implementing choice and allowing kids to, you know, choose how they want to make their project to what they want to do in their project. And they had freedom in that sense. And also, with cooperative learning – so they’d be doing it in group work as well. So, they had to regulate, you know, who are they going to… like pick their partners, is it a good idea. And then also regulating who’s doing what? How much of what? How does that play into your other project, or, things like that? So, I thought that was good for cooperative learning, and I guess the SRL umbrella”

“I’m not quite sure if I really thought about SRL in terms of assessment. I used different forms of assessment. … filling out the criteria, like this part’s out of five, and this part’s out of this many. And then summing up the total. cause you could upload the results and then it’s anonymous unless you get them to actually put their names down. But, it gives you a sense of where…”

“…especially when you’re teaching three classes the same thing. All the classes have different needs.”