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Abstract

The purpose of this study was threefold: 1) to illustrate how preservice teachers undergo identity transformations toward becoming teachers, 2) to understand the challenges these preservice teachers face as they navigate their B.Ed. program and 3) to identify potential impacts of prior perspectives on their journeys and challenges. Twenty-three secondary preservice teachers completed the Teaching Perspectives Inventory (TPI) twice and were interviewed twice over the course of their one-year B.Ed. program. TPI data were analyzed using a pre/post design along with comparisons of dominant teaching perspectives held at the beginning and end of the program. Analyses of the TPI data revealed an increase in participants’ grouped mean scores on the Developmental perspective. The comparison of dominant perspectives showed that by the end of the program two shifts were evident: seven of twenty-three participants held no dominant teaching perspective and ten moved away from their initial dominant perspective to another dominant one. The multidimensional nature of these movements was reinforced by the analysis of interview data. Relying on a constant comparative method the interview analysis revealed the importance of participants’ perceptions of their teaching identity and their commitment to the profession. These two dimensions were used to ‘profile’ participants in terms of their position at the beginning of the program and the changes (journeys) participants made over the course of their teacher education. The analysis of participants’ journeys reinforced the notion of multidimensionality. Participants began with various levels of a teacher identity and a variety of reasons for why they began teacher education. Similarly, participants ended the program with different perceptions of themselves as teachers and wanted to engage in a variety of different teaching careers options (i.e., full time contract, teacher-on-call). The final analysis focused on what challenges participants experienced over the course of their teacher education program. Three themes emerged from the analysis: structural, professional, and role challenges. Initial perceptions of teacher identity strongly differentiated how participants experienced the challenges.
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Chapter I: Introduction

Journeys toward becoming teachers are processes of professional development into new and complex worlds. There are a myriad of experiences and contexts which contribute to making this journey unique for each who engages in it. During their preservice training, students begin to receive formalized messages about notions of “practice” and of “good teaching”. Faculties of education provide a context and forum to discuss these notions. As well, faculties challenge beliefs about teaching and learning with the hope of creating a pedagogical awareness that forms the basis of sound teaching practices allowing students to begin their professional transformation. Yet very little is known about how preservice teachers resolve these challenges or how they internalize these messages of “good practice”.

To understand what challenges preservice teachers experience, the first step is to illustrate how they undergo identity transformations toward becoming teachers. Connected to this is identifying the potential impact of these individuals’ prior perspectives on these journeys and challenges. These considerations will be discussed in turn.

Journeys Toward Becoming Teachers

Preservice teachers combine elements of both student and teacher. As they begin their formal training, they enter teacher education as learners but also begin an identity transformation toward teacher. In most teacher preparation programs, there is a mix of university coursework and field (classroom/practicum) experience which affords preservice teachers opportunities to be both students and teachers. Nevertheless, the aim of teacher education programs is one of professional development – for students to emerge as teachers.

During this journey, preservice teachers are undergoing an identity transformation. According to stereotypical beliefs about teacher development, people enter their B.Ed.
programs as students. At some point during their teacher education program, the assumption is that they become student teachers. Finally, near the end of their journey, possibly while they are walking across the stage at graduation, they become teachers. This is a very simplistic and, at times, comical portrayal of the identity transformation students undergo as they journey toward becoming teachers; but for the people who engage in this transformation, there are points at which they feel differently about who they are.

While the above description seems simple and linear, these journeys toward becoming teachers are complex and fraught with ambiguity and vacillation. For example, a student coming into a B.Ed. program may already have had experiences teaching in other contexts and might consider herself a teacher. Once immersed in her first term courses, she may feel her identity is wrapped up more in a “student’s role”. As she embarks on her practicum, she is thrust back into a “pretend teacher’s role” (Tom, 1997, p. 131). While in her practicum she may, at times, feel like a student again (e.g., when she is being evaluated or when she is observing her sponsor teacher). Sometimes the practice teaching activities are so short that she may only “momentarily escape student status – the best the teacher-to-be can hope for is a brief role playing experience at being a teacher” (Tom, 1997, p. 136). Once again returning to the university, she may revert to a student’s role, possibly holding onto some teacher identity from practicum experiences. Her first teaching position may be the first time she feels like a “real teacher” with her credentials in hand, embarking into the professional world of education. This example illustrates the many layered process inherent in such identity transformation. As preservice teachers begin their professional development, they are expected to assume an identity as teacher. But how does this journey unfold? What are the challenges along the way? How do students become teachers? Beyond a simple
recitation of their course calendar and practicum placements, how do preservice teachers experience this change? And in a more pluralistic sense, is the change experienced differently for different students? These are important questions to consider in understanding the journeys toward becoming teachers, but not the only ones. It is also important to consider how prior beliefs may influence what challenges students perceive as they assume a teacher identity.

Impact of Prior Beliefs

Preservice teachers do not enter teacher preparation programs as blank slates. At a minimum they have had a "career" of being exposed to a variety of teaching influences, both good and bad. They have been learners in a variety of settings and have formulated ideas about teaching (Bird, Anderson, Sullivan & Swindler, 1993; Britzman, 1987; Weinstein, 1990; Wodlinger, 1985). They have probably also had experiences in "teacher roles", while tutoring peers, coaching, acting as teaching assistants or just being a brother, sister, mother, father, daughter or son. But how do all these early messages influence students' transition toward teachers?

Thus, preservice teachers embarking on their journeys toward becoming teachers do not enter teacher-training programs without beliefs and experiences about "good practice". These students bring with them years of internalized messages regarding teaching and learning. Researchers have even shown that beliefs held prior to teacher preparation sometimes remain intact at the end of the program (Hollingsworth, 1989; Holt-Reynolds, 2000; Lortie, 1975; Powell, 1992; Zeichner & Tabachnick, 1981). Knowing this, the potential exists for students' prior beliefs to permeate every aspect of their interactions within their teacher education programs. Students rely on prior "beliefs to make sense of the
experiences of teacher education in ways that teacher educators might or might not intend” (Bird, Anderson, Sullivan & Swindler, 1993, p 254). In the best-case scenario, prior beliefs held by preservice teachers are grounded in a pedagogy that is well adjusted to classroom situations. In the worst-case scenario, their beliefs are “not well adapted to teaching” (Calderhead, 1991, p. 135) and may be “faulty” beliefs about teaching and learning. In either case, prior beliefs may “limit the range of ideas or actions that students are willing and able to consider” (Bird et al., 1993, p. 254).

How students’ beliefs impact their experiences of teacher education is also a function of how specific teacher education programs account for and address students’ beliefs. For example, programs may implicitly establish two types of goals related to student beliefs: supporting those beliefs or challenging them. One goal of teacher preparation might be to challenge the “faulty” beliefs that counteract ideals of "good teaching" and support beliefs that are consistent with the institutional ideology of the program, in some instances undoing one identity and forming another (Sumara & Luce-Kapler, 1996). Another option is for teacher educators to simply support, nurture and develop the variety of beliefs preservice teachers hold when entering teacher education programs. The differences between program goals, in terms of how they address student beliefs, arise from two considerations: 1) how a program is constructed in terms of the dominant philosophical beliefs connected to teaching and learning; and 2) whether programmatic goals are implemented or simply stated (i.e., do we practice what we preach?). These differences emerge from what teacher educators, department heads, and deans from faculties of education see as the important messages the program should impart (i.e., whose theories are important?) and how those theories are enacted. Potential challenges to preservice teachers exist if program ideals do not match
practices. For example, if prospective teachers are taught that they should treat their students as active constructors of knowledge, but are not themselves allowed to do the same, there may be a mismatch between dominant messages of good practice in a given program and the way those messages are conveyed.

Another central issue to challenges experienced by preservice teachers is how they interpret these "programmatic beliefs". There may be differences across or within programs or contexts as to how explicitly program orientations are communicated to preservice teachers. The danger is that the dominant messages of a teacher education program may not be explicitly communicated to preservice teachers and that these messages have the potential of becoming a hidden curriculum. Exploring the role of teacher education and the impact of prior beliefs should help illuminate the journeys toward becoming teachers and the potential challenges faced along the way.

The Study

This study investigates the challenges associated with preservice teachers' journeys toward becoming teachers. As well, the study investigates the challenges associated with their journeys, the interaction between student beliefs and program goals/structures, and some associated changes in preservice teachers' beliefs over the course of preservice teacher education program.

Since some consider formal teacher education to be a catalyst in this developmental process, it is also important to understand its impact on preservice teachers (Doyle, 1990; Graber, 1996). The important consideration is how preservice teachers perceive these experiences and challenges within their teacher-training program. This approach provides a grounded outlook in terms of the perceptions and expectations of the very people who are
experiencing the process *in situ*. Listening to the accounts of preservice teachers' development and experiences illuminates how the transition from a student identity to a teacher identity is personally experienced.

While there exists a multitude of ways to investigate a teacher's development, this study focuses on the voices of those experiencing the journey: preservice teachers themselves. A combination of qualitative and quantitative methods details the experiences of a group of preservice teachers who were contacted four times during their teacher education program to explore their personal experiences and to articulate challenges associated with navigating their own professional development. The data from these preservice teachers' experiences provide a basis for understanding their journeys.

**Organization of Chapters**

The review of the literature in Chapter II introduces the research that guided this investigation. This review (Chapter II) focuses on the impact of prior beliefs on preservice teachers' experiences in a teacher education program, and on research connected to understanding journeys toward becoming teachers. Chapter III outlines how the study was conducted, including a discussion of the method, data collection, and data analysis procedures. The research site and how participants were selected are also discussed in this chapter. Since the study employs a mix of quantitative and qualitative methods to create a holistic analysis of the data, a discussion of each method is detailed in Chapter III. The qualitative data analysis investigated how participants journeyed toward becoming teachers and the challenges they faced along the way. The quantitative data analysis investigated changes in certain prior beliefs at the beginning and end of students' teacher education program.
Chapter IV presents the initial findings from the data analyses, synthesizing the quantitative and qualitative data. This chapter outlines the analyses of changes in participants' beliefs about teaching over the course of their teacher education as well as the analyses of participants' journeys. Chapter V continues the presentation of findings and provides an in-depth analysis of challenges students face during their journeys, both as students and as developing teachers. The final chapter (Chapter VI) links findings from this study with conclusions from literature. This chapter also outlines the implications of the study, recommendations, and directions for future research.
Chapter II: Literature Review

Researchers have shown that the development of teacher identities progresses from pre-established beliefs about teaching, which are present before entering a formal education program, through various “identities” developed during that education program, to how preservice teachers negotiate their professional identity after graduation (Sumara & Luce-Kapler, 1996; Zulich, Bean & Herrick, 1992). To better understand challenges associated with becoming teachers, the present research focuses on the journeys toward becoming teachers during teacher education. Because prior beliefs have been shown to influence those journeys and associated challenges, the study examines the relationship between prior beliefs and challenges experienced while engaged in a teacher education program. To situate this study, this literature review provides an overview of relevant research connected to “journey” and “prior beliefs”. Following each section is a brief discussion designed to crystallize the research in each area. The chapter concludes with a summary that integrates findings across both topics.

Impact of Prior Beliefs

More than 20 years ago, Fenstermacher (1979) predicted that the study of beliefs would be important to understanding how individuals become teachers. Many have agreed since that understanding the effect of beliefs is essential to understanding the development of teachers (Ashton, 1990; Buchmann, 1984; Feiman-Nemser & Floden, 1986; Pajares, 1992; Tabachnick, Popkewitz & Zeichner, 1979; Weinstein, 1988; Wilson, 1990). As Powell (1992) points out "preservice teachers enter their teacher preparation programs with strong beliefs about teaching and with personally constructed theories of classroom instruction" (p.
225). It is necessary, therefore, to understand the influence of prior beliefs in the journeys toward becoming teachers.

Richardson (1995) reviewed research on the role of beliefs in professional teacher development. She defined beliefs as “psychologically held understandings, premises or propositions about the world that are felt to be true” (p. 103). Richardson selected research connected to both preservice education and inservice staff development that investigated how potent prior beliefs were in mediating incoming messages. In terms of inservice teachers, she found teachers’ prior beliefs affected the messages they received about staff development, what they learned, and how they learned it. For example, she highlighted one study where investigators found that when preservice teachers moved into their practicum classes, their pre-existing beliefs prevailed (Cochran-Smith, 1991). This study showed the tenacity of prior belief even in the face of practical, in-class experiences. Taken together, the studies Richardson reviewed supported the notion that beliefs impact on students’ learning continued in teacher education programs. Richardson concluded that at all stages in teacher development, prior beliefs were influential.

Wodlinger (1985) examined the values and beliefs of first-year preservice teachers in a two phase study which included: 1) identifying entry beliefs of first year education students; and 2) comparing those beliefs with those of other first year students in Arts and Science. To determine the values and beliefs of first year preservice teachers, ten preservice teachers enrolled in their first year of a 4-year Bachelor of Education program were interviewed in phase one. One caution about this procedure concerned the “representativeness” of the belief statements. The investigator used interview transcripts from the ten first-year education students to compile 35 belief statements. As Wodlinger
points out it "was assumed that the ten students selected for Phase One were representative of all first year Education students. There was no confirmation sought that indeed this assumption was valid" (p. 63).

Based on these interviews, Wodlinger outlined eight belief categories held by first year education students. These categories encompassed ideas about social group importance, the influence of peer behaviours, teachers’ respect for students, processes of effective learning, classroom management, teacher control, motivational feedback and teaching as more than just a job. Once preservice teachers’ values and beliefs were delineated, the second phase was to compare these beliefs to those of other first year students in Arts (n=36) and Sciences (n=37). Wodlinger hypothesized that preservice teachers should be no different from other first year students, as they have had no experience teaching in classrooms, and would thus have similar “student” perceptions of classrooms as their first year counterparts in other departments. However, Wodlinger found that, even though there were no significant differences between any of the first year students on their classroom beliefs, education students held more liberal perspectives on education than their Arts and Science counterparts. Wodlinger conjectured that the “liberal beliefs” held by first year preservice teachers were similar to beliefs about teaching held by high school students. Wodlinger concluded that these beliefs statements may “be more easily understood when realizing that, upon entry in their education program, the subjects held perspectives of secondary students; their experience constructs, carried into the university classroom are those of secondary school students” (p. 62). The impact of this knowledge may be on how preservice teachers filter the messages being presented in their teacher education programs and how teacher educators understand this influence.
Powell (1992) investigated the influence of prior experiences on preservice teachers' personal constructs of teaching and how these experiences influenced pedagogical development. Unlike Wodlinger (1985), Powell focused on the difference between traditional and non-traditional preservice teachers. The author categorized non-traditional students as those entering teacher education after being in careers other than education. The traditional group was made up of students who moved straight from an undergraduate degree to their teacher education program with little outside work experience. The focus was on how both groups assessed their own classroom instruction. To collect data, Powell interviewed traditional and non-traditional students once and categorized their responses in term of prior experiences.

Analysis of the interview data revealed four categories of prior experience, which included: 1) schooling experiences, 2) personal features, 3) life experiences, and 4) content knowledge. Within these four categories were twelve subcategories that encompassed the information provided by participants. The first category, schooling experiences, included three subcategories: 1) experiences related to the teacher education courses, 2) experiences in the K-12 system as a student and 3) experiences related to other college courses or instructors. Therefore, discussions about any formal school experiences were captured in this first category. The second category, personal features, had three subcategories related to information about: 1) personal needs being met by entering the teaching profession (e.g., stable income, job security), 2) personal beliefs and values about teaching, and 3) beliefs about students and ways they should learn and how they should be treated (Powell, 1992, p. 229). The third category, life experiences, included prior work experiences, non-classroom teaching experiences, and parenting experiences. This category encompasses non-formal
teaching experiences as well as experiences associated with children. The final category, content knowledge, had no sub-categories and was simply concerned with teaching content.

The study reported percentages of comments made by both traditional and non-traditional students within each of the 12 subcategories. Powell found that traditional preservice teachers linked their developing teacher practices to previous high school and college experiences. In contrast, non-traditional preservice teachers tended to attribute their development of teaching strategies to the information provided during their teacher education courses. Regardless of their differences, the author found that both traditional and non-traditional preservice teachers felt insecure about their content knowledge.

Powell (1992) concluded that different program experiences may be needed for traditional and non-traditional students and that teacher education programs need to acknowledge that students come with personal, practical experience, and knowledge. He argued that teacher-training programs need to be sensitive to the fact that the student population entering teacher education may rely on different sources of information in terms of their professional development. Non-traditional preservice teachers may need help to reflect on and refine teaching strategies they developed in roles they held prior to teacher education. In contrast, traditional students may need assistance to begin to develop and articulate their teaching strategies.

Bird, Anderson, Sullivan and Swindler (1993) investigated an education course designed to challenge the prior beliefs of students who were considering teacher education. Their course, Exploring Teaching, challenged beliefs by forcing students to consider alternate views. The first author, Tom Bird, was the course instructor and the article described his experiences in designing and delivering the course. The authors found that
students tended to “mute their own voice in their writings despite prompting to express their views in relation to the literature” (Bird et al., 1993, p. 265). The authors concluded that the course was unable to change students’ beliefs about teaching.

Bird and colleagues offered a number of explanations for why students failed to change their beliefs. One potential explanation was the tension between the students’ drive to secure a good grade and the instructor’s desire to inspire students’ beliefs and reflections through educational literature used in class. In other words, students were trying to write their reflections in accordance with what they thought the instructor wanted (since each assignment was being graded) rather than genuinely writing their own musings. Bird and colleagues concluded that “students enter teacher education as experienced and successful students, and based on that experience they hold a ‘subjective warrant to teach’ (Lortie, 1975) ... that is they think they are suited to teaching; some of them believe they have little to learn from teacher education” (p. 263). It is interesting to note that the authors never considered the quality of the course as the critical intervention and thus a plausible reason for why there was no effect on students.

Weinstein’s (1990) research investigated the effect of teacher education on preservice teachers’ beliefs about future performance and about what constitutes a "good teacher". Her focus was on a single, mandatory course rather than on a program level. First, she administered pre- and post-test questionnaires to thirty-eight preservice teachers who were enrolled in a Principles and Practice course in an elementary teacher education program. Questionnaires included two open-ended and one fixed response question. In the first open-ended question, students were asked “what do you have in mind when they use the phrase ‘a really good teacher’?” (Weinstein, 1990, p. 281). In a fixed response question, students were
then asked to compare themselves to others in the teacher education program and determine how well they thought they would do during student teaching and during their first year as a teacher. Responses were rated on a 7-point Likert type scale anchored with “much below average” and “much above average”. The second open-ended question asked students to explain their ratings on the second question by listing the strengths and weaknesses they considered when answering the previous question. Subsequently, from the group of participants who completed the questionnaires, a subset of 12 was interviewed. The interviews were designed to explore the questionnaire information in more depth, to ask students about how their thinking had changed, and discover their goals as teachers.

The investigator found that only three preservice teachers rated themselves much above average at the beginning of the semester. By the end of the course three participants still rated themselves much above average and 12 rated themselves above average. According to the author what is most “striking about the data reported here is the lack of change that occurred during the semester” (p. 285). The only real movement was between slightly above and above average ratings. At the beginning of the semester, the most frequent explanations for participants’ self-perceptions were categorized as “caring/understanding/warmth”, “experience with children” and “enjoyment/enthusiasm for working with children”. The least frequent category was “knowledge of pedagogy”. By the end of the semester “caring/understanding/warmth” still remained high. “Enjoyment/enthusiasm for working with children” also was rated high, while “ability to relate to children” moved into the top three. Two of the observed changes were statistically significant. Specifically, “experience with children” changed from 40% to 26% pre to post
(p<.001) and "knowledge of pedagogy" moved from the least frequent explanation (3%) into the top 5 at 18% (p<.05).

Interviews provided additional insight into participants' changes on responses to questionnaires from pre- to post- test. Interviews were conducted with participants randomly chosen from two groups: 1) those who predicted they would be much above or above average and 2) those who predicted they would be average or below average. All interviewed participants (from both groups) explained that they had decreased optimism at post-test, which explained some of the lower ratings. Students at the end of the course also seemed to be more aware of personal handicaps (e.g., shyness) and that awareness affected their personal ratings. Finally, the authors found that participants discussed having an increasing awareness of the complexity of teaching.

Weinstein (1990) also found a lack of substantive change in terms of beliefs of teaching held by preservice teachers between the beginning and end of the course. According to Weinstein "even at the end of the semester, students still held some unrealistic optimism" about teaching (p. 285). Interestingly, the principles and practices course included both university classes and field experience so that the lack of change occurred even after being engaged in classroom practice. Weinstein ended with a discussion of design implications for the education of teachers. She notes that while teacher education programs are often built on a foundation of reflective practice, very few explicitly explore preservice teachers' prior beliefs on teaching and learning.

Hollingsworth (1989) also studied the impact of prior beliefs in teacher education. She employed a comprehensive and longitudinal approach to investigate changes in preservice teachers' beliefs about reading instruction. More specifically, the aim of her
project was to understand how teachers cognitively adapted to 1) the culture of a teacher education program, 2) their practicum contexts, 3) societal beliefs, and 4) themselves. The author accomplished this by interviewing 14 elementary and secondary preservice teachers three times (as they entered their B.Ed. program, while they were attending classes and when they were in their practicum). Hollingsworth also interviewed the students' 32 cooperating teachers, 6 university supervisors, and 2 reading course instructors.

Hollingsworth used four case studies to illustrate the "composite portrait of cognitive change within the culture of the teacher education program at UC Berkeley" (Hollingsworth, 1989, p. 168). The cases described the personal, program and contextual factors that appeared to account for or to hinder the intellectual change of preservice teachers. Data analysis revealed that prior beliefs play a critical role. According to Hollingsworth "pre-program beliefs served as filters for processing program content and making sense of classroom contexts" (p. 168).

In the end, Hollingsworth contended that programs should acknowledge the diversity of students' incoming beliefs and use that knowledge in the education of teachers. Specifically, she concluded that student beliefs should be explored in order to create sponsor teacher/student pairings that would benefit the students' growth. In this way the study "challenges the common sense notion that preservice teachers should be placed with teachers with whom they agree and that cooperating teachers should be chosen who are model teachers according to program philosophy" (Hollingsworth, 1989, p. 186). The study also challenges the underlying premise that student-teacher pairings lead to rote copying or modeling of teacher behaviour with no reflection on the part of the student. Understanding students' prior beliefs may help teacher education programs choose sponsor teachers and set
teacher/student relationships that create disequilibrium on the part of the student as a way of promoting knowledge growth.

Hollingsworth also concluded that program designers needed to pay close attention to the timing and order of course offerings. Her suggestion was that programs needed to be cautious about presenting all aspects of teaching at once. From her investigation, she proposed that cognitive overload could result in a preservice teacher who is unable to reflect on becoming a teacher. Hand in hand with this suggestion is her idea that teacher education programs need to create more learning and less conformity. In this sense, teacher education needs to provide a flexible approach that takes into account the power of prior beliefs and challenges students’ notions of good teaching. According to Hollingsworth (1989) a “more generic approach to teacher education – valuing a single cultural view to the exclusion of others, for example – may indeed contribute to the reproduction of existing instructional patterns and superficial learning” (p. 187). She concludes that teacher educators need to embrace more flexible goals to create a program that allows students to truly reflect on their prior beliefs and be challenged by notions of good teaching.

Holt-Reynolds (2000) studied a single case, a third year English student named “Taylor”, to describe how preservice teachers interpret constructivist pedagogy underlying a teacher education program. In that context, the study illustrated the impact of preservice teachers’ prior beliefs during teacher education. Holt-Reynolds (2000) argued that learning to “envision [the] classroom as discourse-based and student-centred is a complex task and particularly vulnerable to prospective teacher misinterpretation of role” (p. 22). She suggested that misinterpretation is based on how prior beliefs about teaching and learning interact with the messages being promoted in teacher education programs. The author chose
to investigate prospective teachers before they entered teacher education (and not students who were currently enrolled in teacher education programs). To do this, she interviewed 16 students, drawn from third year English courses, of which Taylor was one. Everyone in the study completed entrance and exit interviews as well as an interview at the end of each of three semesters.

When justifying her choice of Taylor as an illustrative case study, Holt-Reynolds noted that Taylor’s data were not outstanding in terms of how Taylor discussed her experiences in relation to the larger group. What did set Taylor apart was the very explicit nature of her discussions and that, during the time she was a part of the study, she was the only participant to change her mind about what a teacher should do. The author contended the Taylor’s data “illustrated a dilemma we [the research team] saw in varying degrees in each participant’s data, but Taylor’s transcripts offer a particularly clean, direct commentary on the question” (Holt-Reynolds, 2000, p. 24).

Taylor was the second of three children whose parents were both teachers. Early on Taylor felt there was a certain role a teacher was supposed to assume so that all she needed to do was to learn that role. In early interviews, Taylor focused attention on her English professors searching for teacher models she was going to emulate. She also understood the role of teacher to be that of the “maker of meaning”. By the final interview, Taylor began to embrace the ideas of “personally valid interpretations” and to notice and to appreciate multiple meanings and personal interpretations (Holt-Reynolds, 2000, p. 26). Holt-Reynolds concluded that while Taylor was enamoured with the constructivist program messages, she held to this philosophy simply as a means of avoiding confrontation between the program’s dominant philosophy and her own prior beliefs. Holt-Reynolds concluded, similar to
Hollingsworth (1989), that the goal of teacher education should be to challenge prior beliefs even if they fit with the dominant perspective of the program.

The author's account of Taylor's experiences began to reveal issues related to the effects of prior beliefs on teacher education. But the study failed to address how third year English majors could be classified as prospective teachers. As well, the "representativeness" of Taylor's case is further compromised by the fact that both of her parents were teachers. Holt-Reynolds had chosen to track English students in their third year as a way of exploring the beliefs of those who had little experience with teacher education. The fact that Taylor's parents were teachers could have influenced Taylor's beliefs about teaching and learning in unexplained or unanticipated ways.

Summary

In summary, prior beliefs about teaching and learning have been shown to exert a significant influence on how preservice teachers interpret professional knowledge (Hollingsworth, 1989; Lortie, 1975; Powell, 1992). The studies reviewed in the preceding section suggest that entry beliefs of education students may be no different than those of other first year students (Wodlinger, 1985). But the reaction to a teacher education program of "traditional" and "non-traditional" students may differ, such that students who move from undergraduate to teacher education (i.e., traditional students) tend to rely more on previous experiences than the information presented to them in teacher education courses (Bird et al., 1993; Richardson, 1995). Students may hold prior beliefs regardless of the information presented during these education courses (Britzman, 1986; Carter, 1990; Hollingsworth, 1989; Holt-Reynolds, 2000; Zeichner, 1984). Some students may only adopt the dominant philosophy of their teacher education program as a way of avoiding confrontation (Holt-
Collectively, these studies call for teacher educators to be aware of what beliefs students hold as they enter teacher education and to challenge those beliefs (Weinstein, 1990). Virtually all of the studies call for teacher educators to challenge beliefs even if they fit with the program’s dominant philosophy as a way of pushing students to recognize how they view teaching and learning.

**Journeys Toward Becoming Teachers**

The second section of the literature review examines research on journeys toward becoming teachers and associated challenges. The metaphor of journey was chosen because it conveys a sense of something that parallels the duration and progressions that are part and parcel of becoming a teacher. For example, the Random House Dictionary of the English Language (Unabridged Edition, 1966) defines journey as, “travel from one place to another, usually taking a rather long time; passage or progress from one stage to another.” Both of these meanings capture some of the character inherent in moving through a teacher preparation program. Yet, it is also clear that the same process is referred to in many other ways as well. For example, the process of becoming a teacher is referred to variously as ‘teacher development’ (see Burden, 1990; Gilles, McCart Cramer, & Hwang, 2001; Ingvarson & Greenway, 1984; Jackson, 1992; Raymond, 1992; Reilley Freese, 1999; Zulich, Bean, Herrick, 1992), professional growth and development (see Kagan, 1992; Sprinthall, Reiman, & Theis-Sprinthall, 1996), identity development/construction (see Graham, 1998; Gratch, 2000; Walling & Lewis, 2000), and/or learning to teach (see Alexander, 1992; Carter, 1990; Feiman-Nemser, 1983; Sumara & Luce-Kapler, 1996; Wideen, Mayer-Smith, & Moon, 1998). With this variation of referent it was important to remain open to the possibility of more than one path, more than one course of development and, indeed, more
than one type of journey. Thus, journey as it is used here, that is, the process of traveling from one place to another or the passage or progression from one stage to another was not assumed to imply either a singular or linear path.

Interestingly, much of the prior research, by what ever name, has either implicitly or explicitly portrayed the path toward becoming a teacher as similar in character for most who take it and unidirectional in its trajectory. Cole and Knowles (1993), for example, reviewed a number of studies on teacher education and investigated their own personal development as teachers and teacher educators. The authors did this by describing research conducted within a larger, ongoing qualitative research program focused on learning to teach. Their 1993 report summarized research on: 1) preservice teachers’ images and expectations of self as teachers during formal teacher education; 2) preservice teachers’ disillusionments with understanding what it means to be a teacher; and 3) discrepancies between preservice teachers’ expectations and the realities of school and classroom experiences. From the analyses of several studies, Cole and Knowles (1993) conclude that “greater attention needs to be paid to preparing preservice teachers for the realities of field experiences and helping them make sense of their encounters in light of their prior expectations” (p. 459). The authors illuminate the need for teacher education to help preservice teaches uncover the critical moments connected to their professional development which may be accomplished through a greater connection between coursework and practicum experiences. As well, the authors comment that teacher education needs to be a “sounding board” for students to understand their practicum encounters while still acknowledging how prior beliefs filter those messages.
Bramald, Hardman, and Leat (1995) documented the perceptions of 162 secondary teachers throughout their teacher education. The purpose of their study was to explore the hypothesis that “student teachers’ thinking is mainly influenced by educational histories rather than professional training” (Bramald, Hardman & Leat, 1995, p. 24). Their study employed a mix of both quantitative and qualitative methods. They asked participants to complete a questionnaire comprising two subscales: one related to teaching and learning and the other related to professional training. The questionnaire was comprised of twenty-six paired statements on a seven point bi-polar scale (1 or 7 indicating strong agreement with the adjacent statement). The statements on the teaching and learning subscales focused on either a pupil-centered or a teacher-centered attitude.

Bramald and colleagues (1995) administered these questionnaires three times, “at the start of the course (October), after the first school experience (December) and toward the end of the course after the final school experience (May)” (p. 24). The purpose of the questionnaires was to investigate potential changes in beliefs between the beginning and end of the program. Further, as a way of creating a more in-depth understanding of the results from the questionnaire data, two groups of participants were interviewed: those whose thinking changed the most and those whose thinking did not change at all. Using the criteria, ten interviews were conducted six with “non-movers” and four with “movers”. Interviews explored why change or no change had occurred. One of the major strengths of this research is the size of the participant pool. Most previous studies, because of their biographical nature, had not investigated this large a group of participants.

Results of the questionnaire data showed a significant shift in participants’ perspectives on teaching over the course of the program toward a more traditional, teacher-
centred approach. Participants were grouped according to their major and the authors found that all groups except students preparing to be English and Geography teachers fit this overall pattern. In terms of the interview data, the authors discovered that the students who moved toward a more traditional approach focused on classroom management issues. In contrast, students who moved toward a more pupil-centred approach showed a higher level of critical thinking. Finally, interviews carried out with the “non-movers” tended to show strong role identities that were held right from the beginning of the course.

The authors concluded that preservice teachers’ beliefs could be influenced during teacher education. While the data collected do not address coursework directly, the authors concluded that most research treats coursework as homogeneous and “rarely takes into account the character and quality of teacher education [coursework] … leading to the pessimistic conclusion that past educational experiences rather than teacher education programs have a major influence on early classroom behaviour” (Bramald, Hardman & Leat, 1995, p. 24). Bramald and colleagues argue that investigators must understand the heterogeneity of coursework when evaluating teacher education and describing the process of professional development. This reinforces Zeichner and Tabachnick’s (1981) review of the effects of teacher education on preservice teachers.

When describing how students become teachers, Sumara and Luce-Kapler (1996) characterize the journey as a process of identity negotiation, transformation, and, in some cases, degradation. The authors propose a three-stage developmental process in the journey from student to teacher. Like others (e.g., Britzman, 1987; Carter, 1990; Lortie, 1975), the authors accept that there is an influence on professional development by students’ prior beliefs and experiences. Sumara and Luce-Kapler (1996) refer to pre-teaching identity as the
stage where prior beliefs are most potent (p. 67). They argue that in some cases learning to teach requires "engaging in acts of forgetting, discarding, silencing, and ignoring" prior understandings (p. 78). As teachers move into a period of formal teacher education they begin to confront their "fictive identity": that which develops while they are learning to teach (Sumara & Luce-Kapler, 1996. p. 67). Finally, the authors describe the third identity stage as "lived" (p. 67). This "lived" identity begins to take shape as preservice teachers interact with their own students during their practicum. The authors propose that learning to teach requires being able to flawlessly integrate these three selves. The authors go on to caution teacher educators that for some preservice teachers this can be a very problematic endeavor but for others it is relatively simple.

Parallel to the work completed by Sumara and Luce-Kapler (1996), Zulich, Bean, and Herrick (1992) developed a three-stage model of teacher development. Their stages correspond with the three distinct aspects of most teacher education, namely introduction to education, content area training, and student teaching. The authors refer to these stages as 1) introductory, 2) intermediate, and 3) immersion. Their study was designed to examine program and personal dimensions that interacted to shape preservice teachers' beliefs and actions. They asked eight education students to complete journals over three courses in their B.Ed. program: an introduction to education course, a content area reading-writing course, and a student teaching seminar. Three participants in each class were asked to complete journals. This was possible with only eight participants because one participant completed journals for both the introduction to education and content area reading-writing courses.

The study charted the journal entries of the eight education students over the three distinct stages. Using a constant comparative analysis to identify emerging patterns, the
researchers found eight journal entry types: 1) course value, 2) preservice teacher thoughts, 3) professional immersion, 4) individual development, 5) relationships to students, 6) relationship with cooperating teacher, 7) awareness of effective lesson and teaching, and 8) stress/frustration/anxiety (Zulich et al., 1992, p. 349). Participants in the introductory stage tended to be more idealistic than those in other stages, although non-traditional students’ age and experiences tended to dampen their youthful idealism. The journal entries for participants in the second stage focused on the “specifics of developing effective lessons and less concerned with the more global issues of education considered in the first course” (Zulich et al., 1992, p. 357). Participants in the third stage, who were also in the student teaching seminar, described very diverse experiences. One student’s journal entries showed her struggles with feelings of inadequacy as a teacher. Another Stage 3 participant cultivated a strong attachment to her students and was reluctant to leave her practicum. The third participant’s “enormous enthusiasm for her English classes reverberated across the pages of her journal” (Zulich et al., 1992, p. 358). She was considered one of the outstanding students in her program and won a student teaching award. After graduation she became a speaker at workshops the authors organized to help preservice teachers discuss issues connected with becoming a teacher. She was also hired to teach at her practicum school immediately after graduation. This research project supported Britzman’s (1986) recommendation that teacher educators need to uncover preservice teachers’ "personal biographies", given that participants’ prior beliefs on teaching and learning provided a strong influence or "filter" (Carter, 1990) on how they progressed through the stages of their professional development.

One drawback of this study was the lack of explicit discussion about how the researchers were able to comment on the intersection between "personal biographies" and the
reflective journal data. More specifically, it was not clear how researchers assessed participants' prior beliefs. Participants were simply chosen as a representative sample of cultural and content considerations and were grouped according to their major. The other critical issue that was not discussed as a delimitation was the cross-sectional nature of the study. Participants were chosen to represent the three developmental stages but no one was traced over the three stages in a longitudinal fashion. While cross-sectional studies are powerful in their own right, the lack of a single trajectory of many participants over all three stages needed to be acknowledged.

Bullough (1992) also investigated the journey toward becoming a teacher, but by examining teaching metaphors. According to the author, metaphors encourage beginning teachers to self-reflect and the "identification and analysis of metaphors is a promising avenue for uncovering and then exploring assumptions about teaching and learning" (Bullough, 1992, p. 240). Two beginning English teachers (one woman and one man) were interviewed several times throughout their B.Ed. program and into their first year of teaching. At the beginning of data collection, participants wrote education-related histories, which students discussed at length in class. As well, in a weekly seminar, preservice teachers were encouraged to write about personal teaching metaphors. Then in approximately every third meeting, students in the seminar had a chance to discuss their feelings about their metaphors, changes to their metaphors, and factors which influenced those changes. Observations were also conducted roughly every third week during practice teaching. At the end of their teacher education, participants took part in interviews that focused on program experiences as well as problems. A final interview took place in late October of their first year of teaching. The
focus of this last interview was on the desired versus real role of a teacher as well as the relationship between their personal metaphors and teaching.

The first case Bullough described was Lawrence, a 36-year-old father of two who began the teacher education program after a personal crisis during which he lived in the mountains for 10 years. Lawrence’s initial teaching metaphor was “teacher as husbandman” (Bullough, 1992, p. 242). Lawrence felt his students were like the wilderness and a good teacher would be the farmer who is able to approach nature with real respect and looks around before he starts cutting trees and plowing the land (Bullough, 1992). Bullough found that Lawrence’s metaphor remained relatively unchanged during the course of the program (with one small modification where he added teaching is husbandman and conversation). The relationship he had with his sponsor teacher, Mary, was supportive and open which allowed him the freedom to explore his own teaching metaphor in the classroom.

During the course of his practicum and into his first year of teaching, Lawrence found it difficult to incorporate his metaphor into the classroom structure. In contrast to the open and supportive sponsor teacher Lawrence had in his practicum, the expectation of the school that hired him was that he followed a prescribed, established curriculum. By the final interview, Lawrence was spending an inordinate amount of time (60-70 hours per week) trying to harmonize the district’s expectations with his own metaphors of teaching. Lawrence was not willing to surrender to a new environment but rather was trying to find ways to adapt (like he did in the mountains). Lawrence struggled with designing curriculum expectations to fit with his conception of teacher.

The other case Bullough followed was Lena, a 24-year-old married secretary who wanted to be a teacher for as long as she could remember. Initially Lena was very unclear
about her metaphor, vaguely thinking about teacher as friend: fun and supportive. When Lena began her practicum, her actions conformed instantly to the expectations of her sponsor teacher, and she abandoned her teaching metaphor. For example, Lena’s sponsor teacher was controlling and when Lena’s classes began to go awry, the sponsor teacher threatened to take them over. In response, Lena became stricter with the students. As this transformation occurred, Lena’s metaphor shifted to teacher as “butterfly”. During the latter stages of the practicum Lena’s metaphor changed to teacher as “chameleon”. While Bullough described Lena’s metaphors as fuzzy, they seemed to capture her struggle to reconcile with what she was becoming. During Lena’s first year of teaching, she began to choose lessons based on their “fun factor”. And in the end, she simply metamorphosed into a kinder version of her sponsor teacher. Bullough concluded that, in her development as a teacher, Lena had no real direction and was simply responding to her environment – students and teachers alike.

Bullough argued that Lena’s overpowering sponsor teacher was a detriment to her development as a teacher. He contended that an open, flexible relationship (i.e., Lawrence’s sponsor) was better for creating an impact on how novices think about teaching.

According to Bullough, these case studies illustrated that education programs should be aware of the personal dimensions of becoming a teacher and the institutional influence on that development. As well, Bullough’s concluding discussion called for an increase in four types of knowledge that may have aided both participants in the struggles they faced. These included: 1) pedagogical knowledge (increasing content specific knowledge); 2) relational knowledge (helping students understand the relationship between curricular decision-making and the role of the teacher); 3) self knowledge (knowing who you are as teacher), and 4)
knowledge of journey (understanding beginning teacher development). Bullough argued that programs needed to provide exposure to all of these types of knowledge.

One of the limitations of this study was the small number of participants. Because of the remarkably different experiences of these preservice teachers, one cannot help but wonder how personal factors contributed to their experiences. Lawrence, in particular, is a very atypical case from which Bullough tried to draw general conclusions. Further, Bullough argues that the sponsor teacher created problems in Lena’s case, but it may be that the sponsor teacher only filled a void already present in Lena’s understanding of teacher. Lena’s sponsor may not have had the same influence on someone as strong in his conviction as Lawrence. Bullough superficially separated relationship and context in this instance.

Calderhead and Robson (1991) also followed a group of students through their teacher education training. Their research was designed to identify participants’ understanding of teaching upon the entry into a teacher-training program and how those understandings affected students’ reactions to their courses and to their own practice. The authors began the study with 12 participants but concluded with seven. The data collection process included four interviews, two stimulated recall sessions, and a script writing exercise. The authors summarized the data in terms of “images” held by preservice teachers about teaching and learning.

Calderhead and Robson found that several students discussed negative images of teaching. These students tended to build negative stereotypes by integrating the most negative points of several of their past teachers. Students also held some positive images. Rather than being based on a collective memory, these images were derived from a particular teacher that stood out for a participant. Six of seven preservice teachers held very vivid
images of teaching. Harriet was one of the participants who held vivid images which were built as a way to combat the negative images she had of past teachers. Her images were connected to feelings of failure and embarrassment at being ridiculed by teachers when she asked for help. Sara's images were of a teacher who should plan lessons (except for math lessons) based on the curiosity of the student. Anna's images considered moods as important in teaching and learning. Alison's images were very transmission oriented, and were of teachers who stood at the front of the class, directing and leading activities. Organizational routines and efficiency were important to her. In contrast, Amanda's image of a teacher incorporated ideas of creating a great relationship with her students. Vanessa had accumulated many images and felt she needed to keep an open mind as to which image would be most useful to her. The seventh student, Steven, did not rely on any images to guide him. He described teaching in terms of principles and felt that since primary teaching had changed so much since he was little, he could not rely on past teacher images.

Calderhead and Robson (1991) clearly showed that students "start their teacher training with different ideas about teaching and about their own professional development" (p. 7). The authors recognized that a few case studies do not provide the basis for prescribing changes to teacher education, but suggested that their findings shed light on the experiences of preservice teachers. They call for more research to examine how teachers develop in terms of their journeys toward becoming teachers. Unfortunately, Calderhead and Robson fail to describe the demographics of the study participants. Beyond program specialization and gender, little information is provided. This limits the readers' ability to transfer the experiences of any particular participant to their own experiences or the experiences of others. As well, there was no justification for why the authors chose to track primary
preservice teachers, in particular, and the reason for losing five participants. The authors also never consider how gender might contribute to the results. Steven, the only male in the study, was also the only participant who never held images that described his practice. The authors did not consider that Steven's "maleness" might have contributed to his unique ideas about teaching and learning. Finally, the authors never tried to connect the specific conclusions of the data (i.e., participants) with the discussion about facilitating growth in a training context.

Morine-Dershimer (1993) contributes to a broader understanding of how preservice teachers change during their formal teacher education. In her study, Morine-Dershimer used concept maps to understand how conceptions of teacher planning change over the course of a methods class. Concept maps were collected for 15 men and 50 women in a one-year longitudinal study. These participants were fourth-year students in a five-year teacher education program and were a mix of secondary (n=47) and elementary (n=18) students. Participants were asked to complete a concept map describing teacher planning on the first and last days of their methods course. All students received the same written directions and an example of a concept map. After they completed the second concept map, participants were given their first concept map and asked to write a short description of the changes they saw.

Morine-Dershimer used a process of quantitatively analyzing concept maps wherein she identified how central a feature was to the centre of the map and the proportional frequency of mention. The author described three feature categories; each of which was divided into a set of sub-categories. The major categories included: 1) curriculum (subcategories: goals, content, instructional materials/resources, lesson/unit plans); 2)
instruction (subcategories: classroom management, instructional process, time/timing, evaluation/feedback); and 3) social context (subcategories: student characteristics/background, teacher beliefs/principles, professional knowledge and professional relationships). These categories were mapped in a 2x2 matrix based on how central each was to the concept map (centrality) and how often it was mentioned (frequency). A given category could be high centrality/high frequency, high centrality/low frequency, low centrality/high frequency or low centrality/low frequency.

After comparing pre-concept maps to post-concept maps, Morine-Dershimer concluded that the methods course was useful in emphasizing evaluation and planning. She found that these concepts became more central and more frequently mentioned in the post-concept maps. As well, data showed that the course was able to decrease the emphasis on content and allayed students' fears about working within class schedules. Finally, students showed an increased ability to organize knowledge, which opened up a broader set of options in terms of classroom decisions. Contrary to expectations, Morine-Dershimer also found that course instruction did not effectively highlight the importance of social context. Further, the author acknowledged that the collected data provided no information as to whether the understandings reflected in concept maps were being integrated into practice.

In terms of limitations not stated by the author, the study failed to outline how the categories were derived from the data set. There was very little discussion about how the author organized major categories and how other concepts became minor or sub-categories. As well in the discussion of “centrality” versus “frequency”, no category fell in the quadrant of low centrality/high frequency. There was no discussion about why categories did not
appear in this quadrant. Finally, some conclusions were based on results which only “approached” significance.

Tardif’s (1985) research also sought to highlight how students defined themselves in the process of becoming a teacher. This study documented the experiences of four students over three university semesters, including their student teaching experience. The varieties of data collection strategies, including interviews, document analysis, stimulated recall interview sessions and video recording, facilitated a holistic investigation of the research questions. While the research study investigated broader teacher themes, the paper focused only on findings related to how perspectives of teaching evolved during the practicum. Specifically, the research report focused on perspectives concerned with 1) self as teacher, 2) developing a professional self-image, 3) adopting classroom teacher behaviour, 4) taking the class through a lesson, 5) finding a happy medium, 6) taking the path of least resistance, 7) securing control, and 8) justifying behaviour. The author concluded that participants in this study “held clusters of beliefs relating to the ‘ideal’ situation as opposed to the ‘real’ situation” (Tardif, 1985, p. 146). Preservice teachers tended to retain unrealistic ideas about the practicum experience.

Tardif’s discussion contributes to a greater understanding of the journeys toward becoming teachers but the specific description of themes, major themes, and perspectives was confusing. As well, the participants were only described in terms of gender with no other demographic features being discussed. The lack of demographic information made it difficult to understand how these experiences transferred to the reader. Finally, in the discussion of the theme “developing professional self-image”, Tardif described student teachers as trying to act according to what they perceived as a teacher identity that involved
ideas of content mastery and the efficient transmission of knowledge. Tardif seemed to assume that this is a universal identity beginning teachers strive to achieve. Other studies (e.g., Kember, 1997; Pratt, 1992, 1998; Sameulowicz & Bain, 1992) have shown that this is a one-sided view of how teachers hold beliefs about teaching and learning.

Alexander, Muir and Chant (1992) asked 19 students to complete a questionnaire at the end of their one-year B.Ed. program as a way of understanding how new teachers think they learned how to teach. The investigators employed a mixed method including both quantitative and qualitative measures. Thematic Structural Analysis (TSA) was used to quantitatively analyze each participant's answers. In their qualitative analysis, the authors brought their "subjective interpretations to bear on the TSA data by giving meaningful context within the story of becoming a teacher" (Alexander et al., 1992, p. 63). The research produced four themes which included: 1) concerns for public learning, 2) concerns for fundamental elements of teaching, 3) concerns for lesson management, and 4) concerns for practical teaching. For example, a concern for public learning was reflected in one student's description of not having the opportunity for the free exchange of ideas in class discussions which he had hoped for as a member of the group (p. 63). An example of a concern for fundamental elements of teaching is reflected in the description: "I began the lesson saying what they had learnt in each section so far – then introduced what the final section was about" (p. 64). Concerns for lesson management are reflected in the following passage: "A lot of personal experience knowledge was required simply in terms of people management – having worked in a variety of jobs you become used to managing personalities and getting your point across" (p. 64). Finally, concerns for practical teaching included: "I had already
established how I thought I ought to teach and practicum sessions served to allow me to ‘test’ my attitudes and approach and confirm or alter my ideas/approach” (p. 64).

Overall, the discussion of results was strong when the authors concentrated on the “reconstruction of the parts”. That is, while the discussion of the TSA analysis was informative, once the authors turned to the qualitative discussion of a consolidated rendering of the main elements of the narratives the analysis became more meaningful. The authors succeeded in combining “common or recurring thoughts from [individual] narratives to construct condensed narratives as representatives of the collective experiences of the preservice teachers in the study” (Alexander et al., 1992, p. 63). However, one of the major limitations of this report was the lack of discussion concerning achieving agreement between investigators through the use of TSA to achieve the initial 55 data categories. Since Alexander and colleagues strongly stated one major advantage of this type of quantitative data analysis was that it is replicatable, there needed to be a discussion of the initial process of category derivation involved in this form of analysis.

Summary

Research focused on journeys showed that while prior beliefs provide a strong influence in learning to teach (Hollingsworth, 1989; Powell, 1992; Richardson, 1995), there is also an interaction between three distinct stages of development: the pre-teaching phase, the time during formal teacher education, and experiences of student teaching (Sumara & Luce-Kapler, 1996; Zulich, et al., 1992). These stages and their interactions may contribute to students becoming teachers. During formal teacher education, students tend to rely on strong images of teaching to guide their development (Calderhead & Robson, 1991). These images contribute to their understanding of the messages they receive about teaching and
learning. Other researchers have focused on changes in thinking during teacher education. Results have shown that within a methods course, students may move toward understanding the importance of evaluation and planning issues and away from the social context issues of classroom situations (Bird et al., 1993). Preservice teachers during their training are also expected to incorporate messages from their students, sponsor teachers, as well as the larger school community during their journeys toward becoming teachers. These messages also need to be integrated with the pedagogy being presented in their teacher education programs (Bird et al., 1993; Graber, 1996; Tabachnick & Zeichner, 1984; Tom, 1997).

These studies expose some long-standing assumptions about teacher education. Researchers caution not to underestimate the relationship between the heterogeneity of the coursework and the messages students are receiving about teaching and learning (Bramald et al., 1995; Holt-Reynolds, 2000). Courses are not unified in their messages, and a teacher education program cannot be seen as a constant. As well, there is a call for increasing the types of knowledge to which students are exposed. These include: pedagogical knowledge, relational knowledge, self-knowledge, and the knowledge of journey (Bullough, 1992). These differing types of knowledge will help students understand the dominant philosophies of teaching and learning, how messages and actors relate to one another, how individuals come to understand themselves as teachers, and finally, a vision of the journey toward becoming a teacher. These forms of knowledge may contribute to students being better prepared to enter the professional world of teaching.

The Present Study

Overall, the impact of prior beliefs cannot be underestimated in students' journeys toward becoming teachers. In fact, research has shown that there is a strong, sustained
influence of prior beliefs on how students conceptualize and interact with the messages being presented in teacher education programs. The literature has shown that prior beliefs affect what students learn and are influential during all phases of teacher education (i.e. both coursework and practicum).

While research provides some understanding about the influence of prior beliefs on the development of teachers, there are also some shortcomings in the methodologies of previous studies. For example, understanding the specific types of beliefs held by prospective teachers needs to be based on larger groups to allow for more variations in their prior beliefs and experiences. Most of the research discussed in the literature review had relatively small samples (fewer than 12), with some conclusions based on only one or two participants. While there are definite advantages to focusing on only one or two prospective teachers in-depth, studying larger groups would contribute a better understanding of the landscape of beliefs held by preservice teachers as they enter and move through teacher education.

Another shortcoming of some of past studies was the focus on changes at the course level, rather than program level. At a course level, data collection begins and ends over a short period of time and is focused only on a portion of the whole teacher education experience. Studies are needed that investigate the influence of all aspects of a teacher education program to better illustrate the interaction of effects beyond the influence of a single course. The present study responds to both these methodological shortcomings by focusing on the changes and impact of prior beliefs using program level analyses and accomplishing this with a somewhat larger sample – 23 participants.

Part of this dissertation focuses on “beliefs” about teaching and learning. The common use of this term refers to beliefs teachers hold about learning, knowledge, and about
their role as teacher (Pajares, 1992). However, there is an additional body of literature, much of it in higher education and adult education fields that speaks of "conceptions" of teaching (e.g., Gow & Kember, 1993; Kember & Gow, 1994; Prosser, Trigwell & Taylor, 1994; Samuelowicz & Bain, 1992). Embedded within conceptions of teaching is the notion of beliefs. More recently, there is also an emerging literature that discusses "perspectives" on teaching (e.g., Pratt, 1998). Pratt's (1998) work from which some of this study is derived, speaks about perspectives on teaching which are constituted by "the way a person teaches (actions), what a person is trying to accomplish (intentions), and statements of why those actions and intentions are reasonable, important, or justifiable (beliefs) (Pratt, p. 7). Consequently, there is some overlap between the terms beliefs, conceptions, and perspectives. For the purposes of this study, 'belief' specifically refers to participants' beliefs about learning, knowledge, and participants' roles as teachers. 'Perspective' is used when referring to a more global orientation to teaching such as teacher actions, personal intentions and also includes beliefs.

There are also strengths and weaknesses associated with studies focused on journeys toward becoming teachers. Specifically, the literature review's "journeys section" illustrated the need to uncover the critical moments connected to students' professional development. One way this has been accomplished in previous research is to uncover stages associated with preservice teachers' professional development through the description of a small number of in-depth case studies focused on prospective teachers' experiences. The drawback of this approach is that it only provides a global description of development and fails to provide a more in-depth explanation of what occurs within these stages.
The present study builds on these previous attempts to uncover critical moments by extending the understanding of preservice teacher development with a focus on challenges associated with becoming a teacher. This approach of delineating the challenges students experience provides more information in the exploration of teacher development and provides a complement to the conclusions of previous studies.

The research on “journeys” also has methodological shortcomings. For example, most of the studies that examined teacher development over the course of teacher education used a cross-sectional design. While cross-sectional studies provide a way of studying longer-term changes in a short period of time, longitudinal research provides a stronger complement by tracing the experience of a single set of participants over the course of their development in multiple aspects of teacher education. The present study employs an in-depth, longitudinal approach to understanding the journeys toward becoming teachers. Participants complete interviews and questionnaires over their yearlong teacher education program.

Some “journeys” research also focused on course level data collection rather than on a program level analysis. In these instances, relying only on course assignments as data may have further compromised the studies. As Bird and colleagues (1993) cautioned, the possibility of students muting their voices in course assignments for the sake of marks is a distinct possibility. Finally, within these short-term studies, some research also focused on only practicum experiences as a way of understanding teacher development. The present study addresses both of these issues in a number of ways. First, data were collected outside the purview of classroom assignments. Therefore, participants were able to discuss their journeys and the challenges they faced without feeling constrained by a course grading
system. Second, analogous to the strengths of other studies, the use of multiple data sources (i.e., questionnaires and interviews) provides a strategy to triangulate results. Finally, because data collection was position before and after the practicum both influences could be considered in the final analyses.

In sum, the present study builds on the strengths of previous research while at the same time addressing some shortcomings. Its purposes are to understand how preservice teachers journey toward becoming teachers, the challenges they face as they become teachers, and the potential impact of their prior beliefs on these journeys and challenges.
This project comprises a multiple case study approach employing mixed methodologies. While both qualitative and quantitative data collection and analysis were used, each method was not equally relied upon. The approach taken was what Creswell calls a “dominant/less-dominant design” (1998, p. 177). According to Creswell (1998), in the utilization of mixed methods “the researcher presents the study within a single, dominant paradigm with one small component of the overall study drawn from the alternative paradigm” (p. 177). This study is predominantly a qualitative, multiple case study using a constant comparative method to analyze interview data. The less-dominant, quantitative portion of this study assessed potential changes in perspectives of teaching over time using a pre/post test analysis. Using mixed methods added breadth and scope to the investigation. Further, each data collection and analysis procedure was chosen for its appropriateness to particular research questions.

Method

The intent of this study was to understand how journeys toward becoming teachers unfold and the potential challenges facing preservice teachers during these journeys. Consequently, a selected subsample of cases from a single group (i.e., UBC secondary preservice teachers) was selected to reveal challenges in becoming a teacher. Rather than seeking descriptions of broad generalizability, the aim of this study was to develop an in-depth understanding of the cases being investigated. The study’s purposes were threefold: 1) to illustrate how a selected set of preservice teachers undergo identity transformations toward becoming teachers, 2) to understand what challenges face these preservice teachers as they
navigate their B.Ed. program and 3) to identify the potential impact of these individuals’ prior perspectives on their journeys and challenges.

Research Site

The University of British Columbia (UBC) was chosen as the research site for three reasons. First, a larger, longitudinal study from which a sub-sample was drawn for this study was underway at UBC. Second, as a teacher educator at UBC for five years, I could bring to the study an insider perspective regarding the values, assumptions, and practices embedded within the program. Finally, UBC provides a course/practicum combination similar to that used within many other teacher education programs. Results generated in this context may have transferability to many other similar teacher education programs.

UBC is a large research institution with a student population of approximately 29,000 full time students in 12 faculties. Within the university, the Faculty of Education, which comprises 1300 graduate and 1700 undergraduate students, represents approximately 10% of UBC’s student body. The Faculty offers five undergraduate teacher education options: 1) a one-year elementary program, 2) a two-year elementary program, 3) a one-year middle years program, 4) a one-year secondary program and 5) the Native Teacher Education Program.

This study focused on the secondary option and all of the participants were drawn from students attending the Bachelor of Education program at UBC. In 1999-2000, the academic year during data collection, 444 students were admitted to the secondary B.Ed. option in the Faculty of Education. According to the Faculty, this 12-month program prepares students to teach one or two subjects in grades 7 through 12 and includes the equivalent of two full academic years of coursework and student teaching. Applicants interested in the secondary program must have completed a Bachelor’s degree in one of 15
recognized secondary teaching fields. Table 1 outlines the teaching fields recognized by the Faculty of Education for admission into the secondary program.

Table 1: Secondary Teaching Fields Recognized by UBC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Field</th>
<th>Sub-fields</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English as a 2nd Language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Languages</td>
<td>Chinese, German, Italian, Japanese, Punjabi, Russian, Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Agricultural Science, Biological Science, Chemistry, Earth &amp; Space Science, Physics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>Geography, History, Social Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The only exception to this general admission requirement is for students who are interested in applying for the Technology Education secondary option. These prospective teachers must have a recognized trade (e.g., carpentry, metal work, automotive, etc.) and must complete a two-year technology education program at the British Columbia Institute of Technology (BCIT) before being admitted to UBC. BCIT and UBC have a partnership whereby students successfully completing their first two years at BCIT are transferred directly to UBC for their final year in the secondary teaching program. Therefore, technology students do not possess a university degree before entering the B.Ed. program, but rather they complete a two-year diploma at BCIT and one year at UBC as a combined three-year program.
Besides having previous degrees or diplomas, the Faculty of Education requires all applicants to have some experience working with children or youth (e.g., as a camp counsellor, daycare worker, etc.). Applicants must also have a minimum grade point average of 65% (although due to the competitiveness of the program, this is rarely sufficient for admission).

Once students have satisfied the prerequisites and have been admitted to the program they have the choice to complete their three terms (September-December; January-April; May-August) in either a traditional manner or as a cohort. In the traditional option, students are given an outline which lists the 14 required courses (with fixed timing for pre-practicum and extended practicum placements) and are left to create an individual schedule for the duration of their program. Students enrolled in one of the nine integrative cohort options are registered as a group, and their course schedule is set upon entering the cohort (see Appendix A for cohort descriptions). In some instances (i.e., Math-Science-Technology Education Program) courses are amalgamated into a single offering and, therefore, the workload is integrated and class time is reduced.

**Selection of participants**

The selection of participants from a one-year option was partly based on practical considerations. Firstly, preservice teachers in a one-year program have a pre-set schedule with very little option in terms of electives or the timing of their courses. This was preferable to a more open course schedule as there would be fewer unwanted variations between potential participants. As well, because the study is aimed at understanding the experiences of preservice teachers with regards to their formal teacher education, it seemed reasonable and economical to track participants over one year.
The other delimitation of the study was the decision to choose only preservice teachers in the secondary school specialization. The decision to focus on this group of preservice teachers was the 'wanted' qualitative variability of their background. It was assumed that of the three groups (e.g., elementary, middle years, and secondary), preservice teachers in a secondary specialization would have the greatest variability in terms of their prior educational majors; therefore, the potential for qualitatively different prior perspectives on teaching (see Collins, Jarvis Selinger & Pratt, 2002). As well, unlike other preservice teachers (e.g., elementary), secondary teacher education students have to declare a major. As a result, it was easier to know students' previous educational histories. No decision was made to exclude students in either cohort or traditional course schedules. Again, including both groups created a 'wanted' dissimilarity with which to understand experiences during teacher education.

Participants for this study were a subset of students participating in a four-year longitudinal study (Pratt, Collins, & Jarvis Selinger, 2001). As part of that study, all secondary students were contacted through UBC instructors who taught a required, first term adolescent development course. Each UBC instructor introduced the larger study and requested participation from their students. Those students who wanted to participate signed a consent form and completed the Teaching Perspectives Inventory (TPI) (Pratt & Collins, 1998), which questions teachers about various actions, intentions, and beliefs related to teaching. Information pertaining to the possibility of being interviewed for the present study was contained within the consent letter (See Appendix B). All but one UBC instructor (n=8) carried through with the introduction and distribution of the TPI resulting in 409 possible participants. Of the 409 distributed inventories, 211 preservice teachers completed the TPI.
Because this original contact with preservice teachers required participation in a four-year longitudinal study, obtaining a 52% return rate was considered reasonable.

When selecting participants for the present study, the goal was to identify a subsample of participants who held different initial perspectives of teaching. Thus, selection started with analyzing the TPI for the 211 students in the larger, longitudinal study. Analysis of the TPI reveals the dominant and recessive perspectives of teaching that a given student might hold (see Table 2 for perspective descriptions).

Table 2: Longitudinal Study: Perspectives of Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dominant Perspective 1</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transmission</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprenticeship</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurturing</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Reform</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO Dominance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Percentage             | 2%     | 6%      | 13%      | 52%   | 2%            | 5%            | 100%   |

*NOTE: Three participants had more than two dominant perspectives.

To select participants for this study, an analysis of preservice teachers' perspectives on teaching was completed from the longitudinal group. For this larger group, dominant perspectives were calculated and from that analysis, participants were selected for this study who showed strongly characteristic scores on one (and only one) perspective. Table 2 shows the distribution of dominant perspectives held by the larger group of students from the longitudinal study. The literature (e.g., Kember, 1997; Pratt, 1992, 1998; Sameulowicz &
Bain, 1992) shows that practicing teachers tend to hold a dominant perspective on teaching and one or two back-up perspectives.

Table 2 indicates the number of students holding various combinations of perspectives. Rows represent one dominant perspective while columns represent a second dominant perspective. As can be seen from Table 2 the majority of preservice teachers from the larger study (157 out of the 211 participants) held a single dominant perspective. The intersection of perspectives (i.e., Apprenticeship X Apprenticeship) represent preservice teachers holding “single” dominant perspectives. With the exception of three preservice teachers who each held more than two dominant perspectives, Table 2 (n=208) represents all participants in the larger study. For this study, the original intent was to sample 25 participants, five from each of the single dominant profiles. Choosing to track ‘single dominant’ preservice teachers was particularly interesting in terms of their identity transformations to becoming teachers. As it was assumed that this group of UBC preservice teachers was not remarkably different from those in any other year of the program, the questions were 1) would participants’ perspectives change during their one-year teacher education program? and 2) if so, what changes take place in their journeys toward becoming teachers?

Since the intent was to interview and question participants over the course of their one-year B.Ed. program, more than the planned 25 students were contacted at the start of the study to compensate for attrition. Of the original 157 participants who had a single dominant teaching perspective in the longitudinal study, 56 had provided email contact information. All of these individuals were contacted and 35 agreed to be part of the project. Of those, 33 preservice teachers were able to schedule interviews during the first phase of data collection.
Because of extenuating circumstances (e.g., people agreeing to an interview time and then missing the appointment; not responding to email requests to set up an interview appointment; etc.), the first data collection period resulted in 29 interviews being completed. Again, the intent was to have five participants representing each of the five teaching perspectives. This sampling strategy was possible for all but one of the perspectives (See Table 2 i.e., Social Reform, n=3). Of the three Social Reform people contacted, only two agreed to participate in this study. The perspectives of the remaining 27 people who participated in the first phase of data collection were distributed as follows: 6 Transmission, 6 Apprenticeship, 6 Developmental and 9 Nurturing.

Through attrition, scheduling conflicts, and loss of contact, only 23 preservice teachers were interviewed during the second phase of data collection near the end of their B.Ed. program. Final analyses included only these 23 preservice teachers. The breakdown of initial dominant perspectives for the final set of participants was: 6 Transmission, 4 Apprenticeship, 6 Developmental, 5 Nurturing, and 2 Social Reform.

Table 3 presents demographic information for each of the 23 participants. Twelve participants were female and eleven were male. Their education ranged from associate degrees at a local technical institute to masters’ degrees. Fifteen participants were Caucasian, six Asian Canadians and two Indo-Canadians. Participants ranged in age from 22 to 40 years. Finally, in terms of their teacher education, 10 participants completed their B.Ed. degrees as part of an integrative cohort and 13 did not. Participants picked their own pseudonyms.
Table 3: Participant Demographic Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Previous Degree</th>
<th>Previous Degree Specialization</th>
<th>Previous Career</th>
<th>Years - Career</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>M.Sc.</td>
<td>Exercise Rehab.</td>
<td>Physiologist</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adrian</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>B.Com.</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beau</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Technology Diploma</td>
<td>Tech. Sciences</td>
<td>Swim Instructor</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bobby</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>M.Sc.</td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buff</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>B.Sc.</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>Lab Instructor</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caitlyn</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carla</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>Canadian Studies</td>
<td>Bank Teller</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erika</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>Canadian Studies</td>
<td>Civil Servant</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felix</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>B.Sc.</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>Optician</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamid</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>B.H.K.</td>
<td>Human Kinetics</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hani</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>B.Sc.</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jared</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>B.Sc.</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>Lab Instructor</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>B.Sc.</td>
<td>Ecology</td>
<td>Field Biologist</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiyoshi</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>Chinese / History</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacey</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>B.Sc.</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>ESL Teacher</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mia</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owen</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>B.Sc.</td>
<td>Physiology</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachael</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>B.Sc.</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>B.Sc.</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stella</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Technology Diploma</td>
<td>Tech. Sciences</td>
<td>Teacher’s Aide</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syd</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>B.F.A.</td>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yasmin</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>B.Sc.</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>Chemist</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Collection

This study employed a mix of both qualitative and quantitative methodologies. Participants were interviewed twice during the year of their teacher-training program, which constituted the qualitative data collected for the study. The quantitative data were collected at pre- and post-test using the TPI, which provides numerical profiling of a person’s teaching perspective. In this study the pencil-paper version of the TPI was used in the first administration. Shortly thereafter, a web-version was developed (www.TeachingPerspectives.com) which was used in the second administration. The questions were identical to the pencil-paper version with the added advantage of being self-scoring. Figure 1 illustrates the data collection timeline in terms of the interview and TPI data.
Figure 1: Data Collection Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term 1: Coursework</th>
<th>Term 2: Practicum</th>
<th>Term 3: Coursework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sept.</td>
<td>Jan.</td>
<td>May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov.</td>
<td>Mar.</td>
<td>July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec.</td>
<td>April</td>
<td>August</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 1st TPI Administrations (TPI-1)
- 1st Interviews (Intv-1)
- 2nd TPI Administrations / 2nd Interviews (TPI-2 and Intv-2)

Questionnaires

The *Teaching Perspectives Inventory* (TPI) (Pratt & Collins, 1998) is a questionnaire designed to measure five distinct teaching perspectives (see Pratt 1998 for the conceptual discussion of the perspectives; see Table 4 for a summary of the five perspectives; see Appendix C for a copy of the TPI). Questions are directed toward a respondent's actions, intentions, and beliefs about teaching and learning. Collectively this instrument yields scores on five perspectives: Transmission, Apprenticeship, Developmental, Nurturing, and Social Reform.

It is important not to confuse perspectives with "teaching styles" or "teaching techniques"; perspectives encompass more than a repertoire of behaviour or teaching actions (Pratt & Collins, 2000). Each perspective incorporates fundamental beliefs about teaching and learning, instructional intentions within teaching contexts and actions *in situ*. No perspective is either good or bad, and excellent or poor forms of teaching can occur within each perspective (Pratt, Arseneau, & Collins, 2001).
Table 4: Summaries of Five Teaching Perspectives

**Transmission:** Effective teaching requires a substantial commitment to the content or subject matter. To be a good teacher means having mastery of the subject matter or content. It is a teacher’s primary responsibility to represent the content accurately and efficiently for learners. It is the learner’s responsibility to learn that content in its authorized or legitimate forms. Good teachers take learners systematically through sets of tasks that lead to content mastery. Such teachers provide clear objectives, adjust the pace of lecturing, make efficient use of class time, clarify misunderstandings, answer questions, provide timely feedback, correct errors, provide reviews, summarize what has been presented, direct students to appropriate resources, set high standards for achievement, and develop objective means of assessing learning. Good teachers are enthusiastic about their content and convey that enthusiasm to their students, and for many learners, they are memorable presenters of their content.

**Apprenticeship:** Effective teaching is a process of enculturating students into a set of social norms, a professional or vocational identity, and specific ways of working. Good teachers are highly skilled at what they teach. Whether in classrooms or at work sites, they are recognized for their expertise. Teachers must reveal the inner workings of skilled performance and must translate them into accessible language and an ordered set of tasks. Learning tasks usually proceed from simple to complex, allowing for different points of observation and entry depending upon the learner’s capability. Good teachers know what their learners can do on their own and what they can do with guidance and direction; namely, engaging learners’ within their ‘zone of development’. As learners mature and become more competent, the teacher’s role changes, and over time, teachers offer less direction and give more responsibility as they progress from dependent learners to independent workers.

**Developmental:** Effective teaching must be planned and conducted “from the learner’s point of view”. Good teachers must understand how their learners think and reason about the content. The primary goal is to help learners develop increasingly complex and sophisticated cognitive structures for comprehending the content. The key to changing those structures lies in a combination of two skills: (a) effective questioning that challenges learners to move from relatively simple to more complex forms of thinking, and (b) ‘bridging knowledge’ which provides examples that are meaningful to the learner. Questions, problems, cases, and examples form the bridges that teachers use to transport learners from simpler ways of thinking and reasoning to new, more complex and sophisticated forms of reasoning and problem solving. Good teachers work hard to adapt their knowledge to each learner’s level of understanding and ways of thinking.

**Nurturing:** Effective teaching assumes that long-term, hard, persistent effort to achieve comes from the heart, not the head. People will become motivated and productive learners when they are working on issues or problems without fear of failure. Learners are nurtured by the knowledge that (a) they can succeed at learning if they give it a good try; (b) their achievement is a product of their own effort and ability, rather than the benevolence of a teacher; and (c) their efforts to learn will be supported by their teacher and their peers. The more pressure to achieve, and the more difficult the material, the more important it is that there be such support for learning. Good teachers care about their students and understand that some have histories of failure leaving them with lowered self-confidence. However, they make no excuses for learners. Rather, they encourage their efforts while challenging students to do their very best. To do this, teachers promote a climate of caring and trust, helping people set challenging but achievable goals, and supporting effort as well as achievement. Good teachers provide encouragement and support, along with clear expectations and reasonable goals for all learners. They do not sacrifice self-efficacy or self-esteem for achievement. Therefore, the assessment of learning considers individual growth or progress as well as absolute achievement.

**Social Reform:** Effective teaching seeks to change society in substantive ways. From this point of view, the object of teaching is the collective rather than the individual. Good teachers awaken students to the values and ideologies that are embedded in texts and common practices within their discipline. Good teachers challenge the status quo and encourage students to consider how learners are positioned and constructed in particular discourses and practices. To do so, common practices are analyzed and deconstructed for the ways in which they reproduce and maintain conditions deemed unacceptable. Class discussion is focused less on how

---

knowledge has been created, and more by whom and for what purposes. Texts are interrogated for what is said and what is not said; what is included and what is excluded; who is represented and who is omitted from the dominant discourses within a field of study or practice. Students are encouraged to take a critical stance to give them power to take social action to improve their own lives. Critical deconstruction, though central to this view, is not an end in itself.

The TPI scores for each perspective can range from 9 - 45 points. Once raw scores are calculated within a person’s profile, comparing the means of each perspective score determines perspective dominance. In other words, a perspective score is considered dominant if its score is one or more standard deviations above the mean of the remaining perspective scores for that person’s profile. Therefore, perspective dominance was calculated "within participant" rather than "between participants". Dominance is calculated relative to how a person answers the items on the inventory rather than as a comparison to an absolute value. It is important to avoid equating dominance with a higher absolute score.

Through successive versions, the TPI had been streamlined into a 45-item instrument with an overall internal consistency of .80 (Pratt & Collins, 1998). There are nine items corresponding to each of the five teaching perspectives, resulting in a potential of 45 points per perspective (5 point scale X 9 items). As well, respondents are given belief, action, and intention scores. Fifteen items within the Inventory are devoted to each of these scales with a maximum of 75 points per scale (5 point scale X 15 items). The “actions” section includes statements such as “I ask a lot of questions while teaching”, “I model the skills and methods of good practice”, and “I help learners see the need for changes in society”. Participants are asked to “circle the letter code that best represents how often you do each action when teaching or instructing people” (Pratt & Collins, 1998).

The second section of the TPI targets intentions. Again, respondents are asked to rate 15 statements on a 5-point labelled scale (anchored with Never and Always) in terms of how
often they set out to accomplish each intention when instructing or teaching people (Pratt & Collins, 1998). This section includes statements such as “My intent is to present the content in order to prepare students for assessments”, or “I expect students to enhance their self-esteem through my teaching”.

The final section of the Inventory investigates what teachers believe about instructing or teaching. For the 15 statements in the beliefs section, participants are asked to “circle the letter code that best represents your agreement or disagreement” (Pratt & Collins, 1998) with statements such as “Most of all, learning depends on what one already knows”, “Individual learning without social change is not enough”, and “Learning is enhanced by having predetermined objectives”.

Interviews

All preservice teachers in this study had restrictive schedules in terms of their B.Ed. program and course requirements. While they had some choice between course sections, they had no choice on course timing. The program of study at UBC is one year in length and divided into three terms (fall, winter and summer). The fall term, from September to December, is devoted to introductory coursework. Students in the secondary program have a short two-week practicum within the first term, but the bulk of their time is spent in classes at the university. During the winter term, from January to April, preservice teachers engage in an extended 13-week practicum. Although they spend the first two weeks in a seminar at UBC, they spend the majority of their time in field experience (i.e., practicum). Finally, they return to campus for further coursework during their last term. This summer term begins in May and ends in mid-August.
In order to understand the various challenges that face preservice teachers during their initial teacher education and potential changes over time, interviews were carried out twice during this program. Participants were interviewed once at the end of their first term coursework (December 1999 to January 2000) and once after their practicum (May to June 2000). The first interview was held at the end of the first term in order to discuss participants’ course experiences. Interviews held at the end of this term allowed participants to talk about their experiences and any potential challenges. The goal when interviewing participants’ post-practicum was to capture their thoughts about the other significant experience in their teacher education: the practicum. This interview period was chosen to elicit thoughts and feelings about their experiences while on campus as well as challenges they may have faced during their extended practicum teaching experience. The post-practicum interviews also allowed for a more holistic discussion of the program including coursework, practicum, and any potential challenges.

Interviews were semi-structured and informal. A set of probe questions was developed to guide the conversation (see Appendix D for the interview #1 and #2 questions) and were designed to elicit preservice teachers’ perceptions of their personal journeys toward becoming teachers as well as any associated challenges. The exploratory nature of the study meant that participants were not asked to decide what challenges applied to their circumstances in a "check list" format, but, instead were asked to describe their experiences toward becoming teachers. Over both interview periods, there was a mix of open-ended and structured interview questions. At times interviews may have appeared to be more open because the questions themselves were actually set aside where a conversation ensued. At other times, however, the frame was more powerful in determining what participants might
say and, indeed, what was possible. For example, as a way to begin the discussion during both interviews, all participants were asked to draw a line from student to teacher and place a mark on that line. As part of this discussion, participants were also asked to explain why they felt “that way” (e.g., why they felt strongly like a teacher). Therefore, the exercise of “putting a mark on the line” was a way to start the conversation. Indeed the initial assumption was based on a discussion of journey that began as student and journeyed toward teacher. Both these assumptions were used to create an interview framework, but participants also challenged these assumptions as they responded to interview questions.

Interviews during both time frames ranged from 40 to 120 minutes in length. Some students had other commitments that prevented them from booking the full hour for interviews and others simply gave short, concise answers. The interviews that lasted longer than an hour occurred when participants gave comprehensive answers that allowed for greater discussion.

Each interview was audiotaped and transcribed. Interview transcripts were given to the participants for two reasons: 1) to check for transcription errors and 2) to give participants a chance to expand on any thoughts or concepts they felt were "underdeveloped" during the taped conversation. If participants had "anything to add" to their original thoughts and ideas, they were invited to elaborate on their points. Giving participants my email address and asking them to contact me if anything else occurred to them during the study facilitated collection of the data. A friendly reminder was emailed to participants approximately two weeks after each interview to invite them to follow up with anything they felt was underdeveloped or not discussed in the interview. Some participants did send a
follow up email and one person left a follow up phone message. Once interviews were corrected for any errors or elaborations made, data analysis began.

**Data Analysis**

In order to understand how the analysis plan was constructed, a discussion of the philosophical underpinnings that guided the plan and inherent assumptions precedes the discussion of specific analyses. Since the qualitative analyses are the dominant portion of the study, the analysis of the interview data appears first followed by a discussion of the TPI data analysis.

**Philosophical Assumptions**

This study is situated within a research tradition with an emphasis on discourse that includes participants as co-constructors and embraces readers as “part of the story”. Unlike more positivist approaches to understanding phenomena, the intent is not to control error in order to create generalizable conclusions. Rather, this research invites readers to take from these discussions those ideas that “transfer” to their own lives or the lives of people they know. Further, one cannot understand participants’ journeys toward becoming teachers without understanding the context in which individuals find themselves.

Case study approaches are appropriate for investigating phenomena in context. Within such approaches, reality is viewed as subjective, multiple, and socially constructed; and peoples’ realities are to be conveyed and constructed by them (Gergen, 1995; Guba & Lincoln, 1994; Schwandt, 1994; Shotter, 1998). Therefore, the goal of this study is to report and to interpret ‘becoming a teacher’ from the perspectives of individuals who are thus engaged.
In keeping with the nature of the research design and the assumptions about experience and reality, this project was based on a contextual approach to knowledge. In this type of study, the researcher tries to minimize the "distance" or "objective separateness" between herself and the participants (Creswell, 1998, p. 76). The view of knowledge as interpretation allows the researcher and participants to co-construct narratives describing participants' perceptions of the experience (not the experience itself).

In the study, I was not only a graduate student in the Faculty of Education but also a certified elementary/secondary teacher and instructor in UBC's Teacher Education program. My connection to the Faculty of Education and my training as a teacher provided an "insider" perspective to the experiences of participants. However as Creswell points out, the "role [of the researcher] and the close distance between the researcher and the participants have implications for the axiological assumption, the role of values in a study" (1998, p. 76, parenthesis added). The main consideration is how the researcher deals with her values. In the objective/subjective continuum the researcher may either treat his/her values as biases which need to be controlled or accept values as inherent and inevitable in the accumulation of knowledge. As researcher, I accept that the information I gather will be value-laden and that a relationship exists between my values and the data (Guba & Lincoln, 1994). The intention here is not to try to control or corral these values but rather recognize them as part of the research process. Nonetheless, because my intention was to capture participant perspectives, I adopted systematic methods of data analysis that helped me recognize and avoid potential biases.

How one chooses to describe research is also an important consideration. Such terms as validity, reliability, and generalizability reflect assumptions that research strives to
describe singularly formal reality (Schwandt, 1994; Steffe & Gale, 1995). In contrast, this study employs qualitative conceptions of credibility, transferability, and confirmability (Creswell, 1998, p. 77). These terms convey a more personally constructed meaning and do not impose an external structure on participants’ experiences. The aim of such language is to provide an analysis of experiences defined by the participant using an inductive process.

**Interview Data Analysis**

Procedures most closely associated with grounded theory were used to analyze the data. Because this was an iterative process after transcript errors were corrected, data collection, coding, and analysis occurred in most instances simultaneously. While data collection and interview transcription were being carried out, preliminary/ongoing analysis began in the form of memos and notes. These memos helped keep track of tentative descriptions that were arising out of the data and set the iterative process in motion. As suggested by Yin (1994), there are two levels of analysis: 1) that which takes place during data collection and 2) that which occurs after data collection has been completed. As well, coding is itself a stage in data analysis. It must be remembered that the nature of this project is such that analysis was ongoing even though it is described here in a more linear fashion.

Interviews were analyzed using a constant comparative method. This method of analysis, developed by Glaser and Strauss (1967), leads to theory development. While the aim of this project was not to develop substantive theory, the grounded theory method was used to understand the challenges associated with becoming a teacher and the journeys of professional development (Merriam, 1998). As Merriam states, the constant comparative strategy is to “do just what its name implies – constantly compare” (p. 159). As the analysis progresses, incidents are compared with other incidents in the data set to achieve an
explanation of the phenomenon under investigation. According to Janesick (1994) the aim of this type of analysis is to aid the researcher in coding, grouping, and clustering the data in order to interpret them. The researcher “uses constant comparative analysis to look for statements and indices of behaviour that occur over time and in a variety of periods during the study” (Janesick, 1994, p. 216).

In the study, I was the only person collecting data and transcribing interviews. This intimacy with the data further facilitated iterative, ongoing analyses and constant comparison. Once the interviews were transcribed, they were emailed to participants and asked to elaborate on any points they felt were underdeveloped or to change any information they felt was not an accurate reflection of their thoughts or opinions. As well, a third party was employed to error check tapes against the transcriptions.

Coding is the process that transforms raw data into categories, which are then linked in the final analysis. The constant comparative method was employed to create data codes that were linked to larger categories and allowed a story (i.e., a series of connected propositions) to be built that combined the categories into a set of tentative hypotheses.

The first step was to open code the interview transcripts. This stage is referred to as ‘open’ because only the most tentative framework incorporating a broad understanding of the research and interview questions was relied upon. Open coding was carried out on a subset of total number of interviews which included the twenty-three interviews from both phases (Intv-1 and Intv-2). The total number in this subset was not set in advance, but rather, open coding stopped once a stable set of codes was established. A code list was developed using the subset of interviews in conjunction with the research questions and interview probes. Through the entire process, codes emerged from the data.
Every time a new code was added or an existing code was modified, the date was recorded next to the applicable code. As well, once coding was completed for each transcript, the coding completion date was recorded on the first page. Interviews were grouped by date when completing this analysis. Recording when transcripts were coded created a system to compare the dates of completed interviews to the progress of the code list. This ensured that transcripts coded before the final code list was created were recoded. Separate code lists were created for interviews at Intv-1 and Intv-2. Ultimately, some code items appeared on both lists, but because of the unique nature of each discussion and the timeframe in which it was situated, the coding remained separate for each phase. After all interviews in each timeframe were coded, any interviews that were coded before the "final" code list was developed were recoded to reflect the final set of codes.

The forty-six interviews resulted in approximately 39,000 lines of text and 4,600 coded segments. The sheer volume of these data warranted using a software program to organize the coding and code networks. Therefore, a computer program developed by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention in Atlanta, Georgia (Milstein, 1999) aided the coding. The program, known as Analysis Software for Word-based Records or AnSWR, is a freeware program fully capable of handling large qualitative databases. According to the developers, "among AnSWR’s features are tools to organize and streamline common tasks necessary for systematic analysis of lengthy, complex text such as that associated with open-ended interviews" (Milstein, 1999, p. 1-1). AnSWR has the capability to create and maintain codebooks, develop hierarchical connections among codes, and create detailed reports to allow researchers to summarize their work in various formats (e.g., narrative text, descriptive
tables, or matrices). The decision was made to code all interviews on a paper copy of the transcript to allow easy modifications or additions of codes.

AnSWR was used once open coding was completed. First, each interview was source coded using AnSWR. This is the process of ascribing the proper speaker to each segment of text. Next, a copy of each code list was created in AnSWR, and code segments were transferred to an electronic copy of the interview. For example, codes included: cohort (experiences in a cohort), expectations (descriptions of what participants thought about the program before embarking on it), feeling pressured (times when participants felt pressured to adopt a particular view of teaching), and sponsor teachers (e.g., relationships with, impressions about). Once all the text coding was transferred to the AnSWR platform, interpretive analyses could be completed. In this final phase of data analysis, codes were compared and combined to understand participants’ journeys toward becoming teachers, challenges they faced, and how their perspectives on teaching shifted during their time in the program.

TPI Data Analysis

For the TPI data, two separate analyses were completed. The first focused on how TPI scores changed from the beginning to the end of the program using a pre/post t-test analysis. The analysis of the TPI data was completed for the whole group of participants (n=23). No attempt was made to break out the analysis by dominant perspective since the cell sizes were low (ranging from 2 to 6). This analysis contributed to understanding the changes that took place during teacher education.

The second stage of analysis, connected to perspectives of teaching, focused on the change in dominant perspectives. The five perspective scores on the TPI, totaled for each
respondent, created a profile which included dominant and recessive perspectives. Summary tables overviewed the shifts in teaching perspectives over time and aided in the exploration of individuals' journeys toward becoming teachers.
Chapter IV: Results – Perspective Changes & Journeys Toward Becoming Teachers

This study asked the questions: How do people experience the journeys toward becoming teachers?, What challenges are associated with these journeys?, and Do prior perspectives affect preservice teachers’ construction of their teacher identities? A mixed approach of qualitative and quantitative data analyses created a “dominant/less-dominant” framework (Creswell, 1998).

The discussion of findings is presented in two chapters. This chapter introduces findings related to observed changes in participants’ perspectives of teaching between the beginning and end of the program, followed by a discussion of their journeys toward becoming teachers. The next chapter summarizes challenges experienced during participants’ journeys.

Change in Perspectives

To examine the change in preservice teachers’ perspectives between the beginning and the end of the teacher education program, I conducted a pre/post t-test analysis of the TPI data for the entire group, followed by an investigation of changes in individuals’ dominant perspectives. As discussed, the TPI measures a person’s perspectives on teaching using five perspective scales (see Table 4 – Chapter 2 – for descriptions). Participants in this project were originally chosen for their dominance in a single perspective at the beginning of the program. That is, each participant had a perspective score that was one standard deviation or more above the mean of the other four perspectives for that individual.

The analysis examined all 23 participants as a single set. Participants were not grouped according to dominant perspectives as cell sizes were small (ranging from 2-6). As
can be seen in Table 5, only one significant difference emerged. Specifically, participants' mean responses on Developmental Perspective items increased at posttest.

Table 5: Analysis of Pre/Post TPI Administration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perspectives</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Pretest Means (SD)</th>
<th>Posttest Means (SD)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P&lt;.05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transmission</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33.91 (4.33)</td>
<td>33.83 (4.66)</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprenticeship</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34.04 (3.72)</td>
<td>34.65 (4.22)</td>
<td>-0.83</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33.60 (3.97)</td>
<td>35.74 (3.43)</td>
<td>-2.54</td>
<td>.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurturing</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34.83 (4.11)</td>
<td>35.78 (4.16)</td>
<td>-1.52</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Reform</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29.70 (4.91)</td>
<td>30.26 (5.74)</td>
<td>-0.52</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.05  
1 Two-tailed

Participants in this study generally described UBC's teacher education program being as based on a learner-centered, constructivist philosophy. Having taught in this program for five years, I have seen this dominant message being filtered through coursework and discussed by UBC instructors in a number of ways. In some instances, a constructivist philosophy underlies instructors’ implicit messages (i.e., hidden curriculum). In other cases, constructivism is front and centre to the way a cohort, specialization, or class is structured, especially in the science specialization. In fact, some instructors teach constructivist views to the exclusion of other pedagogical orientations. As Rachael observed, in her first interview: “They [the instructors] were always, I think from the onset they said, you know, your focus, our focus will be constructivism … it was all about constructivism so you want your students to build the skills to learn so don’t give them the information”. This reference to a ‘constructivist orientation’ fits most strongly with the TPI’s Developmental Perspective.
While both the Nurturing and Developmental Perspectives portray also a student-centered orientation, the Developmental Perspective focuses more on creating "increasingly complex and sophisticated cognitive structures for comprehending the content" (Pratt, Collins, & Jarvis Selinger, 2001, p. 3) — central tenet of constructivism.

While participants tended to score higher on items connected to the Developmental Perspective, this finding does not necessarily mean they changed their perspectives about teaching to fit the program's dominant philosophy. Instead, participants may have only begun to "appropriate" the program's messages by beginning to "talk the constructivist talk". Certainly, students were able to recognize items and wording in TPI statements that fit with the messages they were receiving from the program. Indeed, some participants commented that they were able to "give back the language" that program instructors wanted even though it was not necessarily something they believed. According to Jared:

You knew like all students do, you know, you figure out what your instructor wants and you give it to them. And we knew what they [the instructors] really wanted, constructivism, so in your assignments you give constructivism. And that hurts a lot because you're writing something you don't necessarily believe in.

The preceding pre/post-test TPI analysis does not give an indication of any individual's perspective change between the beginning and end of the program. Thus, to investigate patterns of perspective change over the course of the program, each individual's pre- (TPI-1) and post-test (TPI-2) dominant perspectives were calculated and then compared (see Table 6). In this table participants are grouped according to their initial dominant perspective. To inspect the raw scores on which these are based see Appendix E.
Table 6: Pre- and Post-test Dominant Perspectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yasmin</td>
<td>Transmission</td>
<td>Transmission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamid</td>
<td>Transmission</td>
<td>Apprenticeship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>Transmission</td>
<td>Nurturing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carla</td>
<td>Transmission</td>
<td>Nurturing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Transmission</td>
<td>No Dominance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bobby</td>
<td>Transmission</td>
<td>No Dominance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachael</td>
<td>Apprenticeship</td>
<td>Apprenticeship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiyoshi</td>
<td>Apprenticeship</td>
<td>Nurturing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buff</td>
<td>Apprenticeship</td>
<td>No Dominance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owen</td>
<td>Apprenticeship</td>
<td>No Dominance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>Developmental</td>
<td>Developmental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hani</td>
<td>Developmental</td>
<td>Transmission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan</td>
<td>Developmental</td>
<td>Transmission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caitlyn</td>
<td>Developmental</td>
<td>Nurturing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erika</td>
<td>Developmental</td>
<td>Social Reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felix</td>
<td>Developmental</td>
<td>No Dominance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syd</td>
<td>Nurturing</td>
<td>Nurturing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jared</td>
<td>Nurturing</td>
<td>Apprenticeship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stella</td>
<td>Nurturing</td>
<td>Social Reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacey</td>
<td>Nurturing</td>
<td>No Dominance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beau</td>
<td>Nurturing</td>
<td>No Dominance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mia</td>
<td>Social Reform</td>
<td>Social Reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adrian</td>
<td>Social Reform</td>
<td>No Dominance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of the dominant perspectives from TPI-1 to TPI-2 revealed two interesting shifts in perspectives between the beginning and end of the program. The first shift focused on the movement from a dominant perspective held at the beginning of the program to a different dominant perspective held at the end. For example, of the six students who held Developmental Perspectives at pre-test, only one maintained a Developmental Perspective (Cam); two shifted to Transmission (Hani and Ryan); one shifted to Nurturing (Caitlyn); one shifted to Social Reform (Erika); and only one (Felix) had no post-test dominance. Patterns of change to other dominant perspectives were equally diverse for students in the remaining
four perspectives (i.e., few staying the same with others relocating to various other perspectives). The second shift in perspective focused on participants’ movement away from holding a single dominant perspective to no dominant perspective at Time 2. That participants had a single dominant perspective at Time 1 suggested that they held strong and clear teaching views at the outset of the program. But, by the end, seven participants clearly showed no dominant perspectives regardless of where they started. Taken together, these two shifts suggest that while in the teacher education program, participants may have started to reconsider initial beliefs or reflect on other possibilities. Regardless, at the end of the program, participants may have been less certain of their initial convictions.

These findings showed that most participants began to shift their perspectives and potentially their identities as teachers during the teacher education program. Across research studies that relied on the TPI (Pratt, Arseneau & Collins, 2001; Pratt, Collins, & Jarvis Selinger, 2001) this was the first group to be studied who were not practicing teachers. Preliminary analyses (not yet published) from other studies have shown that the TPI is stable over time for practicing teachers. In contrast, these preservice teachers were clearly more malleable or trying just to play the game (Zeichner & Tabachnick, 1981). The finding that changes were multidirectional also illustrates that there may not be a single trajectory for teacher development, a conclusion that was reinforced with the subsequent data analyses that will be described in upcoming sections.

Journey Analysis

Originally, it was expected that the TPI would provide the framework for examining the impact of participants’ prior perspectives on their journeys toward becoming teachers. However, as the data in the previous section illustrate, while the TPI analysis was valuable
for understanding variation in participants' struggles with different belief systems, another level of analysis was needed to provide a more complex picture of how participants moved towards becoming teachers. Thus, during data analysis, other prior experiences and attitudes toward teaching emerged as being more influential in shaping preservice teachers' journeys. These were: 1) Identity – the extent of individuals' perceptions of their teacher identity at the start and end of the program, and 2) Commitment – individuals' attitudes toward becoming teachers. In this study, these dimensions provided a richer framework for understanding the kinds of transitions preservice teachers were making during their teacher education. To aid in analysis, the two dimensions were arranged into a simplified organizing heuristic for describing participants' journeys (Figure 2).

Figure 2: Combining Identity and Commitment

While this matrix might oversimplify shifts in preservice teachers' identity and commitment, it proved useful in describing the shifts that emerged in identity and commitment. These will be illustrated in later discussions.
In terms of the identity dimension, during both interviews, participants were asked to create an “identity line,” anchoring one side with student and the other with teacher, and then to mark on that line where they thought they were at that moment. This exercise facilitated discussions of how participants conceived their identities along the journey toward becoming teachers. Once participants made a mark, they were asked, “Why there?” Analysis of the ensuing conversation placed teachers along the “identity” continuum. In order to streamline the analysis discussion, these “marks” were categorized into 4 potential levels, indicating the extent to which preservice teachers felt they had taken on a teacher identity: 1) 0-25%, 2) 25-50%, 3) 50-75%, and 4) 75-100%. Percentages categorized participants’ teacher identity as a way of capturing their discussions. However, the nature of the original question, asking participants to mark along a line anchored by student and teacher, was a definite influence on any potential data. Therefore, while it was participants who located their identities along an “identity line” this aspect of the interview framework certainly structured these discussions. As the analysis will show, some participants stayed within this framework to describe their identity, while many participants contradicted the original framework which allowed the discussion to move beyond this initial organizing tool.

The other dimension included in the matrix was participants’ level of commitment to teaching. This dimension captured the quality and strength of preservice teachers’ motivation to become teachers. Since commitment was discussed in a slightly different manner during each period, this dimension was interpreted differently at Times 1 and 2. During the first interview, participants described how they decided to become teachers. Based on this discussion, six initial reasons emerged that ultimately reflected different levels of commitment to teaching. The first category included discussions where participants
described more preferred career options, but for a variety of reasons settled on teaching as a “fallback choice”. The second category captured comments by participants who needed to make a career move after being displaced (for a variety of reasons) and chose teaching as an alternative. The third category incorporated decisions to teach based on practical considerations in choosing a career. The fourth category reflected how families influenced participants’ decisions to teach. Family influences were both positive and negative and either fostered or hindered participants’ commitment to teach. The fifth category represented comments by those who decided to teach because they felt joy from a previous teaching encounter. The final category encompassed participants who “always wanted to be teachers”.

To interpret commitment at Time 1, these six categories were grouped into four areas on a commitment continuum: 1) low commitment (low), 2) moderately low commitment (mod-low), 3) moderately high commitment (mod-high), and 4) high commitment (high). Figure 3 shows the commitment continuum and how the six reasons were mapped onto different commitment levels. Family influence was split into two subcategories that translated into either low (negative) or moderately high (positive) commitment.

Figure 3: Participant’s Commitment Level and Reasons for Choosing Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Commitment</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Mod-Low</th>
<th>Mod-High</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reasons for choosing teaching as a profession</td>
<td>- Fallback Choice</td>
<td>- Practical 2nd Career</td>
<td>- Enjoyed Teaching</td>
<td>- Always wanted to be a Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Family Influence (negative)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(positive)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At the end of the teacher education program, levels of teaching commitment were reflected in participants’ future plans. Interpretations of commitment during Time 2 were based on what participants intended to do after graduation. For example, in a case where a participant wanted a full time teaching position (whether or not he/she was able to secure one), the determination of commitment was based on his/her intention to work full time. From the data gathered during Time 2, four types of future plans emerged (see Figure 4). First, participants who left the teaching profession after graduation were categorized as having a low commitment. Second, participants who described wanting to be a teacher-on-call (TOC) were considered to have a moderately low commitment. The third category included participants who only wanted a part time contract (i.e., moderately high commitment). Finally, highly committed participants were those who wanted a full time teaching position immediately after graduation. Figure 4 summarizes how participants’ future plans were associated with the nature of their commitment on a continuum at Time 2.

Figure 4: Participant’s Commitment Level and Future Teaching Plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Commitment</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Mod-Low</th>
<th>Mod-High</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Future teaching plans</td>
<td>Left the profession</td>
<td>Teacher on Call</td>
<td>Part time Contract</td>
<td>Full time Contract</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Combining these two dimensions created an “identity by commitment” matrix, where each dimension had four levels (see Figure 5). The following sections summarize the data analyses at Times 1 and 2, respectively.
Figure 5: Combining Levels of Identity and Commitment

Time 1 Positions

This first section explores participants' positions at the start of the program. The analysis focused specifically on how participants conceived their identity as teachers coming into the program and their initial commitment to the profession. In order to understand participants' Time 1 positions, individuals were grouped according to their combination of identity and commitment. Before beginning the discussion of each profile, it must be remembered that the use of identity and commitment was helpful in organizing and interpreting the data, but that a richer understanding of participants' journeys is revealed through deeper, qualitative analysis of the data and through an examination of the challenges
they faced along this journey (Chapter V). Figure 6 shows each participant’s Time 1 position on the “identity by commitment” matrix. Each profile is discussed in more detail but Figure 6 provides an organizing framework.

Figure 6: Time 1 Positions

Profile 1: Low Commitment – Low Teacher Identity. In this first profile, participants began the teacher education program with both low levels of commitment and low teacher identity. In terms of commitment, participants’ decisions to become teachers were precipitated by one of four general reasons: fallback choices, second career choices, negative family influences, and practical choices. The first reason, fallback choice, occurred when participants chose teacher education after other occupational/academic avenues became unavailable. The discussion of a fallback decision was best illustrated by Felix who said:
I guess the biggest reason is, sort of, a process of elimination to teach. Um, originally wanting to, um, do medicine and I did a couple years of pre-med and I didn’t get into any medical program. Um, I’d prefer to have done graduate work but economically I don’t think it would have worked out, I couldn’t have afforded it. I’m not sure I had what it takes to do [graduate work] because I wanted to do math and once I started my fourth year courses in math [they] were not, ah, not as easy as the earlier ones unfortunately. So like process of elimination I guess.

Other participants in this profile chose teaching as a second career. For example, Adam was a displaced worker who needed to reconsider his career choices. In Adam’s words:

I was working in the rehab clinic, people have neck and back injuries and in December we decided to cut a position and I was in charge of the clinic and I decided to cut my position. My co-workers both had bought houses and were not as flexible in terms of moving as I was. So I started looking at different career possibilities and working as a consultant. We had discussed sort of what I liked about the places I worked, what I didn’t like, what I didn’t want and she [a co-worker] initially said, well you know everything you said points to education. I thought, naw, I could never teach kids. ... [but] by the time I got accepted [at UBC] I was pretty confident that that was my direction.

Family influence was another reason why participants entered teacher education. For some students, the choice to teach was influenced by parental pressure, rather than a strong commitment to teaching. For example, according to Buff:
I think my parents pushed me into it. ... I just, ah, the career that I chose just wasn’t working out and so I started working at Douglas College in the lab there and sort of felt that I could do this, so my parents pushed me.

Finally, some participants chose teaching simply based on practical considerations. For example, Beau entered UBC after completing two years in a Technology Entry program at the British Columbia Institute of Technology (BCIT). Beau took a very practical approach to his decision to teach. In his words:

I knew that there was a call for shop teachers, and I really enjoy messing around with my hands and I like teaching it to sisters, neighbours, friends, etc., doing all kinds of nifty stuff. So that led me into researching how to do it and I found out there's only one way to do that in B.C. You go through BCIT for two years and then you come to UBC, there are no other choices for universities and there's no other choice to get the technical part. So that's how I sort of got into the teaching, just a history that sort of lead me down a path until I finally made a decision and that's how I got into UBC as the only route to get where I need to go.

Kiyoshi, like Beau, discussed the practicality of his decision to teach. Unlike Beau, Kiyoshi's practical decision was less proactive. As Kiyoshi explained:

OK, I don’t know if I actually decided, I kind of geared myself in that direction, because in all the courses I’ve been taking, it’s predominantly ... well first of all I majored in Chinese and history as a double major, with that in mind, I guess I’m somewhat restricted in what I’d like to do. First of all, I’m not a person that’s really interested in business so that kind of ruled out that aspect of careers, and then ... I worked here at the English language institute, just down the road, as a cultural
assistant for about two and a half years. So with that I had experience in classrooms and I was able to develop a good understanding of what teachers have to do. I had to plan out programs, I had to relate with students, I was almost like the peer buddy, type of thing. So I moved on from there and I kind of decided well I’m already somewhat focused on my studies and I ... I know that here in the Education program they don’t have a lot of people teaching Mandarin, for example, but social studies they do, so I decided I’d apply for education with that in mind.

Thus, evidence suggests that these participants had a variety of reasons for wanting to become teachers. Clearly, these students entered teacher education with varying motivations and attitudes. Further, this group of participants showed that not all prospective teachers begin teacher education with uniformly high motivations to teach.

Coupled with their low commitment, participants in this first profile also had low self-reported teacher identities. Participants gave four qualitatively different reasons for their self-assessment of low teacher identity. Some participants based their judgments on others’ assessment of their identity. For these participants what was most important was how they felt in the company of others or how much others treated them like teachers. A second reason for participants’ assessment of their low teacher identity was a perception that there is an objective teaching standard. These participants had a clear understanding, in some cases a living example, of how a teacher was supposed to look and behave, and their self-assessment was in relation to that standard. Thirdly, some held beliefs that teachers are always teachers and learners. For this group, teaching was conceived as an ongoing learning process that never firmly entrenched them in a teaching identity, but kept them both teachers and learners. Finally, some participants had a perception that teacher development is an additive process.
In these cases, their teaching identities were based on adding up all the things that make a teacher and assessing what they have accumulated. Their judgments were very similar to those who relied on a standard, with the major difference being there was not a single teaching icon for the additive group.

Carla was the one participant in this profile who discussed her identity in terms of others' assessments. Her personal teacher identity was closely aligned with how others viewed her. As Carla talked about why she did not see herself as a teacher she said:

And even at home ... at home with my parents I'm a student. ... I live with my parents so I feel like a student ... you know, making sure I'm up and things. We talk about oh yeah what are you doing now and they say, "What books are you reading, what assignments are you doing, do you like your assignments", so I feel more like a student when I'm talking to her [my mother].

For Carla, her self-assessment was based on how others saw and treated her as a student.

Adam was one of the individuals who adopted a standards approach to his identity assessment. When Adam spoke about his identity, he likened his journey to that of his adolescent development instructor. Adam believed that his instructor, Ed (not his real name) was the perfect image of a teacher. Adam believed that he would be an excellent teacher if he were able to begin to do what Ed did in the classroom. Interestingly, Ed had been honoured with a teaching award from the university and was emulated and respected in his department. In terms of Adam's assessment of his own identity at Time 1, he said:

Ed is my mentor. He is what I would like to become as a teacher. (I think at this point) I'm 40 percent, yeah, I'm hopefully 40 percent Ed ... Oh I would be, I will be such a good teacher. I will be even better than most of the instructors out there if I can
become an 80 percent Ed. I’ll be in the 80 percentile Ed. Yeah, that would be, that would be like the ultimate, I think Ed’s got a certain personality and that’s just a charisma that few individuals can have. And you can use him as your gold standard but don’t make yourself miserable by trying to become an Ed.

Adam relied on a teaching icon and continued to measure himself against that standard.

Buff did not buy into the student-teacher dimension. She rated her identity as mid-range because she considered there to be a continual movement between being a teacher and a learner. As Buff commented:

I think that maybe even though I’ve become a teacher I still think I will feel like I’m a student because I’m always learning. ‘Cause then you’re always learning. Shouldn’t you always be learning? That’s what my mom said when she was a pharmacist, you know, like well I have to go study the new drugs, you know… Ah, well I think we’re still students ‘cause they’ve given us grades. If they didn’t give us grades then we’d probably be teachers, right.

Buff also linked her development of identity to her experience of external control. When discussing being graded in the teacher education program, she described not yet feeling like a teacher because the program continued to evaluate her. Buff believed she would feel more like a teacher when this external control was removed.

The remaining participants all based their assessment of low identity on an additive approach. For example, Felix felt his low teacher identity was based on a lack of experience. As Felix commented:

I haven’t actually been teaching. Like yeah, I think I’m gonna, I’ve, I haven’t been there, I haven’t been in the classroom and seen students like either learn or struggle
and I think you can’t call yourself a teacher until you’ve done that. Um, I’ve been a student for a long time. So it just comes naturally being a student.

Like others, Felix felt that adding teaching experiences would give him a stronger identity.

In sum, participants in this first profile had both low commitment and low teacher identity at Time 1. Not only were these participants not sure they wanted to be teachers, but they also did not feel much like teachers. The evidence suggested that this group might have simply chosen teaching to try it. While teacher education programs may logically assume that beginning students do not have a well developed teacher identity, they typically expect that these same people have a strong desire to become teachers. Yet, the challenges facing participants in this profile were not only to develop teacher identities but also to assess their commitment to teaching.

Profile 2: High Commitment – Low Teacher Identity. Compared to participants in the first profile, students in this second profile had higher levels of commitment. These participants joined the teaching profession because they enjoyed previous teaching experiences, had positive exposures to teaching (e.g., family members who were teachers) or because they always wanted to be teachers.

For example, when asked how he decided to become a teacher, Bobby focused on his previous enjoyable teaching experiences. As he explained:

I actually decided when I was doing TA’ing in the undergraduate levels. So I was working as a graduate student ‘cause personally I thought I was gonna go into research and physics. And I was teaching the first year physics labs there and I really enjoyed working with the students and sort of saw them progress as the year went
along, sort of thing. Thought that would be a fun thing to do but more sort of the high school type physics rather than a college or university, so I applied and here I am.

Another reason participants decided to become teachers was based on positive family influences. For example, Yasmin’s influence was her twin sister and father who were both teachers. As she explained:

Um, okay. I decided to be a teacher. I got my degree in chemistry and I worked in a lab for six months and it just was not anything I was used to and I grew up, my dad’s a vice principal and my other sister got her teaching degree and she’s been, so she’s one year ahead of me. This is her second year teaching right now. And she loves it and we grew up in playing basketball and being around teachers and coaches and I mean that’s just the comfortable, where I was comfortable and I saw like a lot of people made a lot of difference and I mean I look at those people now and like, I kind of honour what they do and ‘cause they’re coaches and teachers and administrators and that’s who they are now. And that was something that I thought I’d like to do … I liked being with kids and I liked coaching. And I’ve coached basketball for a long time. I coached soccer and sports camps so I guess it’s more sports oriented than anything else.

Other participants began teacher education because they always wanted to be teachers. Mia felt she wanted to teach for as long as she could remember and typifies comments from others who felt similarly. In her words:

I think my whole life I have always wanted to be a teacher, my grandmother was a teacher, my mother was a teacher and … I really I enjoyed my learning years and everything like that. So I really enjoyed learning and I figure that this is a place
where I can always be learning, all of that time with students. ... And I really think that education has a lot of power, and educating students in certain ways can, I mean, not to teach in a political agenda but I think that empowering students in certain ways and stuff, and that society can change through that, and that education can be a really huge force in making changes. And adolescents are such, they are the future, to be cheesy, but that people that are teaching them have a huge impact on them, they can have a huge impact and it can be very positive and make a lot of positive changes for the future.

A comparison of commitment across the first two profiles highlights again that people decide to become teachers for a variety of reasons. In contrast to participants in the first profile (low commitment/low identity), participants in this profile had a strong desire to become teachers at the start of the program. They exhibited little uncertainty about their decisions to become teachers.

Participants in this profile (high commitment/low identity) had similar self-reported identities as did participants in the first profile. Bobby was the only participant who did not provide an explanation for his level of identity at Time 1. Despite repeated prompting, Bobby simply stated, “So, so in this term, at least, I’m probably 75-80 percent on the student side.” However, other participants’ explanations for their low identities were similar to those provided by participants in the first profile (low commitment/low identity). Two of the remaining three participants felt that their low teacher identity was based on a lack of experience. These explanations, categorized as an additive approach, reflected participants’ perspectives that they needed something more to become teachers. For example, Owen’s
lack of a teacher identity represented Owen not having the skills he believed were necessary to be a teacher. As Owen acknowledged:

And so that's probably why I feel that I'm still very much a student... handling discipline and handling, um, people coming in late, um, people sleeping in class, those kinds of things I, those I couldn't handle. Well I didn't feel that I had the effort to handle all this stuff at once. So it was just focus on teaching and so, um, I think when I get to that stage maybe I'll be more along this point here.

The final participant, Mia, was like Buff, who challenged the student-teacher division. Her perception was that she would be a teacher who always continued to learn. In Mia's assessment this meant never wanting to move towards a "full 100% teacher identity."

According to Mia:

Well, maybe in a way I think that, I think I... know I have tons left to learn. I know how to do this job and how to do it well but I also think even when I am given that certificate that says that I am the teacher, I don't think that I will ever be there because I think my students will always be teaching me, that I will always be student and I am always going to be keeping up on what is going on in my disciplines and so I'm always going to have to be learning ... So I guess I'm 50/50.

In sum, teachers in this second profile were strongly committed to becoming teachers but did not yet have strongly developed teacher identities. Thus, these individuals' journeys began with a strong desire to become teachers but not a lot of experience in the profession. As a result, these participants appeared to be ready and open for the teacher education program to instruct them in how to be teachers.
Profile 3: Low Commitment - High Teacher Identity. Similar to participants in Profile 1 (low commitment/low identity), students in the present profile had low commitment and decided to become teachers as fallback, second career, or practical choices. For example, Syd began her B.Ed. program at 40 years of age after spending approximately 20 years “doing everything”, but with most of those years spent in the army. Syd decided to become a teacher (a second career choice) when her career in the army ended due to an injury she sustained in Bosnia. When talking about how she decided to begin teacher education, she said:

So when I finished my fine arts degree and I was working with youth in the navy, at the time I thought the first kid that tells me where to go I’m gonna deck him and then I’m going to jail, you know, so I can’t do this. So then I went into the animation and I went away to the army and I think the patience that I endured in Bosnia taught me that I can put up with anything. … I came back from Bosnia injured. Ah, I have bursitis which is a way of saying that, I believe very much in gods and guides. And I think the guides or the gods just decided okay Syd we’re gonna give you time. I have money coming in because I’m on a medical pension and I can’t go out, I can’t walk any distance … So when I got back and I was footing around, um, a friend at one of the restaurants that I frequent said he was going into teaching and he said you’d be a good teacher. And it was like the millionth time it had been said but the one time it was heard. So I thought well, I have nothing to lose.

Similar to Kiyoshi in the first profile, Cam’s decision to teach was a practical choice. He wondered, “What do I do with my degree now?” In Cam’s words:
So I knew after completing my [history] degree, okay what can I do, what can I do, and then I thought well why don't I try teaching. I thought I was capable enough to do it and I also thought that it would be a fun profession to do because I always liked talking to people and I thought I had a lot of knowledge that I gained just in university. I wanted to talk and help teach other people the knowledge I learned, right, so that's how I kind of dived into it.

Like students in the first profile (low commitment/low identity), these low commitment/high identity students also seemed to show some apprehension as they began teacher education. As Adrian commented:

I was forced into thinking what do I really want to do and I fell back on teaching like I think a lot of people do. I would never put that on my cover letter (chuckle) to get into a school district or even into this school. But yeah, it was a backup, it was my back up because nothing else really was working out for me, so I'm here.

It is interesting to note that prospective teacher education students are required to draft a letter for admission in order to be selected into the program and that for some the letter belies their actual hesitancy and tentativeness about becoming teachers. In this study, some participants described how their letters did not reflect their actual commitment to teaching. This finding is of importance to admission staff who might otherwise assume higher commitments among entering students.

In contrast to participants in the first two profiles, participants in this low commitment/high identity group started the program with strong teacher identities. Participants who rated themselves at the highest level did so because they felt they were already teachers. For example, as Syd explained:
In relation to becoming a teacher? Oh, right here. I’ve always been a teacher. Just haven’t been in the education teaching. Um, no I’ve always been a teacher. Um, yeah, no I’m here. All I’m, all I’m learning now is how to teach this (secondary art).

Adrian felt the same way but took a much more cavalier approach from the very beginning of the program. As Adrian stated: “I’m going to put it right here. I am just going to circle the ‘T’. I think that as far as teachers go I consider myself a teacher at this point.”

Adrian felt that he had nothing else to learn to become a teacher and that completing a B.Ed. program was simply a bureaucratic hurdle.

Participants with moderately high teacher identities felt they still needed something more to become teachers (again, an additive approach). For example, Cam felt he lacked the experience necessary to take on a strong teacher identity. As Cam stated:

I think I’d only be there (at 100%) with a lot of experience and that’s what I feel like I need. I can watch my parents teach or I can watch other people teach but without doing it on your own you don’t know if you can do that. You can see some great teacher or like a teacher movie or something like, ah, Dead Poet’s Society or something and you can laugh at that or you can think “wow, what a great teaching strategy,” but if you can’t do that then what’s the point of watching it, you know. Or what’s the point of thinking about doing it if you’re not gonna apply it and do that.

Similarly, Hani felt she needed more confidence to feel more like a teacher. She simply said, “I don’t know, um, just, I don’t feel that confident.”

Thus, across profiles, participants with less than full teaching identities had similar reasons for judging their identities. The most common perception was an additive approach where participants felt that something more was needed (e.g., experience, control,
confidence) in order to move towards becoming a teacher. For these participants, their initial assessments reflected a desire to add something during teacher education that they did not have coming into the program. This group was ready (and, in some cases, keen) for teacher education to act as a catalyst for their professional development.

What distinguished the participants in this profile was an interesting combination of commitment and identity. These participants described themselves as teachers (high identity) but were not committed to the teaching profession (low commitment). At least on the surface, this combination appeared to be the most difficult to resolve, and the mismatch set up unique challenges for participants as they journeyed towards becoming teachers. For example, Syd entered teacher education with very clear notions about what teaching should be and a high sense of teacher identity. This was coupled with a “nothing to lose” attitude when it came to beginning the program. For Syd, the challenge was to resolve potential tensions between her strong teacher identity and entry beliefs with those espoused by the program. How would the program shape Syd’s teacher identity or challenge her existing one?

Adrian’s discussion of identity and commitment illustrated another potential challenge for participants in this group. Since he was already a teacher, Adrian’s cavalier attitude was that teacher education was simply a bureaucratic hurdle. His view was that the teacher education program had nothing to teach him about teaching. As with Syd, the question for Adrian was how the teacher education program might challenge this existing belief. Would he learn that teaching is more complex than he thought and that teacher education provides more substance than he expected?
Profile 4: High Commitment – High Teacher Identity. At Time 1, participants in the final profile were highly committed to teaching. Like participants in the second profile their reasons for choosing the teaching profession included previous enjoyable teaching experiences and persistent desires to be teachers. For example, Ryan was among the participants in this profile who “enjoyed teaching”. As Ryan commented:

Originally I didn’t want to be a teacher at all when I got out of high school. I think that’s pretty common. Um, but I was, yeah, I thought my teachers were the dumbest people in the world when I was in high school. And I was convinced I was gonna do so much more with myself and on and on. Um, but I came through university and discovered that I really enjoyed teaching things to people. Um, I spent a lot of time with people that I was studying with. I pick up things relatively quickly so I’d find myself explaining things or, um, trying to come up with a different way to explain it so someone could see what we were working on. And I found that really rewarding and so I started to think about getting into science education.

Caitlyn chose to pursue teacher education because she always wanted to be a teacher. She also was drawn to teaching as a way of countering the negative experiences during her own education. In Caitlyn’s words:

I always thought, any time I had a teacher I always thought I wanted to be a teacher. So if I were a teacher I would never do that … I often was the kind of person that my teachers didn’t, just they didn’t seem to like or to get and I always thought boy, you know, I would love to be a teacher and to be able to respect each person for who they are and not have a preconceived notion of what a good person is and then say oh,
there’s the hopeless cases. Um, so I always want to do that. I really like people. Um, and that’s, that’s really about it, you know.

Caitlyn’s strong commitment to teaching was also reflected in her actions during teacher education. For example, she was pregnant during most of the program and modified the timing of her practicum in order to have the baby. She also finished her practicum after a couple of weeks off and completed her final term at UBC without interruption.

Thus, participants in this profile began the program with a strong commitment to teaching. Like participants in Profile 2 (low identity/high commitment), these participants’ positive previous experiences with teaching translated into a strong desire to teach. In addition, like those in Profile 3 (high identity/low commitment), participants in this profile also began the program with strong teacher identities by noting that they already were teachers. For example, Hamid linked his teaching identity to having substantial experience. As Hamid commented:

‘Cause like I guess they had all these different like classes that we took before now, last semester, and they think if we pass all those and now we’re on the trail we’ll be great teachers, right, we have everything covered. But like yeah, but like I always talk with my colleagues and they’re like experience makes it alright, I mean you can learn about it as much as you want, you can read books, this and that, but once you go out there and do the real world that’s when you really learn it. So that’s what I think makes a huge difference is my experiences.

Rationales varied for participants who rated themselves moderately high in identity. Like Buff and Mia, some challenged the student-teacher dimension because they wanted to be learning teachers. For example, even though Lacey had taught ESL for a number of years
before beginning the program, she did not rate herself 100% teacher. For Lacey, being a teacher was always a "50/50 proposition". As Lacey explained:

Student teacher. Oh that's so funny, really. Well the reason why is 'cause I would always just put myself with two lines. I'm always the student and always the teacher. I'm both, um, — Oh right. Oh right, right. Oh good, um, this is me really. Okay, yeah I just always, that's just my life philosophy though that you're always a teacher and you're always a student.

Also similar to explanations given by participants in other profiles, some Profile 4 (high identity/high commitment) participants felt that more experience and time to reflect would move them towards a stronger teacher identity. When asked what was left for her to become a teacher, Caitlyn commented:

I think that what becoming a, what's left for me is becoming a teacher and this of course then it's gonna be really hard of course. But I guess that's the reflection process, right, 'cause what's left for me mostly I think is to try out all these ideas but then another crucial part of that which is something that I've learned from this program and didn't, hadn't really thought about before but that reflection is really important because it helps you to see what worked and what didn't.

Similarly, Stella correlated her identity as a teacher with experience and her time in the teacher education program. Stella commented:

because of classroom experience. Ah, education. I'm two thirds of the way through. A little more than two thirds of the way through. Um, 'cause I consider it sort of like a, I don't, the stuff I took at Douglas College and at B.C.I.T. prior to getting into
the B.C.I.T. program I was in 'cause I was in another one before, um, I don’t really consider that because it was like so long ago. So I’m very close.

Thus, participants in this profile began the program with strong commitments and strong teacher identities. This group seemed, on the surface, to be the ones who were the best prepared to enter teacher education. However, if high commitment and identity translate into attitudes such as “there’s nothing to teach me … I’m there”, then it is possible to question how smoothly these participants would move through their professional development and teacher education. Challenges may have been set up for these participants in their interactions with the program. Would the program shift their self-perceptions or challenge them to think differently about what it means to be a teacher? What notions about teaching did participants bring to the program and how unyielding were they to outside influences?

In sum, the journey analysis at Time 1 clearly showed that participants began the program with very different opinions in terms of how they felt about themselves as teachers and their commitment to the profession. In discussing the way that someone becomes and takes on a teaching identity, it is critically important to understand the position from which he or she started. The findings presented in this section showed that participants started with various levels of teacher identities. Some participants challenged the student-teacher continuum and felt that they would always be both students and teachers. Others linked the development of a teaching identity to accumulations of knowledge, skills or experience. Participants also entered the program with widely varying reasons for becoming teachers. Contrary to positions espoused in admission letters, many participants did not enter the program highly committed to teaching. It was as if they were entering their journey toward
teaching without being sure they wanted to embark on it. Finally, note that participants also started with different combinations of identity and commitment that set them up to have different kinds of challenges. For example, participants with both low commitment and low teacher identity faced two kinds of challenges simultaneously. They had to learn what it is to be a teacher and determine if they wanted to teach. They might have been more open to ideas from the teacher education program, though, without preconceived ideas about themselves as teachers. Participants with high commitment but low identity were poised to be the most willing and eager students. They had a strong desire to learn more and were committed to the profession. The most interesting combination was perhaps those participants with high teacher identity but low commitment. These students had to reconcile their initial views of teaching with those in the program while testing their commitment to teach. Finally, though seemingly well poised to succeed in the program, participants with high teacher identities and high commitment entered with stronger conceptions about teaching. Their challenge was to reconcile their initial beliefs with what they experienced in the program. The subsequent sections present findings related to how their journeys unfolded.

**Time 2 Position Changes**

At Time 2, participants were re-interviewed during their final four to six weeks of the B.Ed. program. By that time, students had completed their extended practicum and were returning to the university for their last weeks of coursework. Once again, participants commented on their identities on a continuum from student to teacher. Participants also explained their reasons for making the marks where they did. Finally, as part of the interview, they discussed their future intentions. These discussions became the indices of
their commitment. The discussion that follows describes participants’ identity and commitment and how these dimensions changed from Time 1 to Time 2. Patterns of change are described for participants in each of the original profiles.

At both time frames the identity discussion was the same where participants were asked to rate their teacher identity and to explain their reasons for this assessment. Therefore, changes in identity are easy to compare between the beginning and end of the program. However, unlike commitment at Time 1, the measure of commitment at Time 2 focused on participants’ future teaching plans. Since commitment was not equivalent between Times 1 and 2; it cannot be directly compared. Thus, rather than talking about increases or decreases in commitment, qualitative descriptions of participants’ final intentions toward teaching will be provided. Note however, that in many cases shifts in identity and commitment were related. For example, some participants felt their teacher identity was strongly connected to the amount of experience they had gained. Some of these people chose to be teachers-on-call as a way of gaining experiences necessary to becoming teachers. Thus, in the descriptions that follow, a strong interpretive connection is made between participants’ shifts in identity and their teaching intentions (commitment) at the end of the program.

**Pattern 1: Shifts from Low Commitment – Low Teacher Identity.** Recall that participants in the first profile had low teacher identities and low commitments at the start of their teacher education program. Figure 7 shows each participant’s movement in teaching identity and commitment.
Figure 7: Pattern 1: Shifts from Low Commitment and Low Teacher Identity
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For participants in Pattern 1, there were two qualitatively different shifts in their teaching identity, which connected to their shifting commitment patterns as well. Three participants (Felix, Karen, and Carla) had a major identity shift to the highest identity rating at Time 2. All three commented that this identity shift was due to gaining more experience, but each spoke about it in a slightly different way. For Carla, gaining experience as a teacher gave others a greater sense of her teaching identity. At Time 1, she talked about not feeling like a teacher because others did not treat her as such. At Time 2, her teaching experiences showed her that people could consider her a teacher, giving her a "legitimate teaching identity". While Carla moved toward a stronger teacher identity, she wanted to be a teacher-on-call (TOC) after graduation. For Carla, the program had given her some legitimacy to be a teacher, but she explained that being a TOC might make her "feel more like a teacher". In this instance, the fact that others treated her more like a teacher allowed her to shift towards a teacher identity but she still felt she personally needed to gain more experience.

For Felix, his higher teacher identity at Time 2 was directly connected to "getting more teaching experience" during the course of the program. As Felix discussed at Time 1, it was only the lack of teaching experience that mitigated his personal rating. Therefore, at Time 2, Felix felt the experience he gained during his practicum moved him toward adopting a stronger teacher identity. His increased confidence was directly connected to his future teaching plans. Felix felt like a teacher and wanted a full time teaching contract immediately after graduation. He had no hesitation in stating that he had become a teacher and now wanted to take on the complete responsibilities of the profession.

The third participant, Karen, agreed that receiving more experience during the course of the program allowed her to recast her teaching identity. Karen's Time 1 rating was
tempered by the feeling that she lacked the ability to control situations. At Time 2, Karen felt experience helped her “test her control out” during the practicum. Therefore at Time 2, she possessed a stronger teaching identity and wanted to secure a full time position. Similar to Felix, the teacher education program gave Karen the necessary tools and experiences to feel like a teacher and the desire to want to teach full time.

The remaining four participants experienced the second qualitative shift in teaching identity. These participants discussed beginning an identity transformation during teacher education, but in some way that transformation was incomplete. Kiyoshi explained that he still had “more things to learn” which connected to what he said at Time 1 (i.e., needing more experience). Beau, Adam, and Buff also felt teacher education provided some needed experience, but they wanted additional experience to develop a greater teacher identity. Identity assessments for this group were also directly connected to their future teaching practice (i.e., commitment). These participants wanted to either work part-time or be teachers-on-call (TOC). Rather than beginning full-time contracts, they felt being TOCs would give them a variety of experiences to help them feel more confident as teachers.

In sum, for one participant, her self-assessed identity was dependent on how others viewed her as teacher. Her personal self-assessment shifted with her perception that others considered her a teacher. The other major catalyst in moving people toward a teacher identity was experience. For two participants the program provided enough experience to create strong teaching identities and the desire to begin full time contracts. For others, their experience in a teacher education program served as a beginning, but was not enough. As a result, they chose to gain additional experience elsewhere after graduation in their first teaching positions. These patterns illustrate some of the variability in participants’ journeys
towards becoming teachers. Just as there was diversity in where participants began, participants ended teacher education with varying teacher identities and future plans.

Pattern 2: Shifts from High Commitment – Low Teacher Identity. Participants categorized in the second profile (low identity/low commitment) began the program with moderately high to high commitments to teaching but relatively low teacher identities. For these students, the question was whether their identity would increase as a function of taking part in their B.Ed. program (while their commitment to teaching would remain strong). Interview data suggested all four participants developed stronger teacher identities at Time 2; however, their final commitment to teaching was more variable (see Figure 8).

Figure 8: Pattern 2: Shifts from High Commitment and Low Teacher Identity
For example, Bobby felt he had made a substantial identity shift toward becoming a teacher by the end of the program. However, Bobby decided to leave teaching after graduation. In a follow-up email, Bobby described his “lack of fit” with the teaching profession and felt that teaching physics in a secondary school was not something he could continue. After completing his B.Ed. program in August, Bobby returned to the university to begin his Ph.D. studies. Given spring deadlines for graduate school applications, it was clear that Bobby had made this decision well before the end of his practicum. By the end of the program, Bobby was the only participant in this study who felt he did not want to continue as a teacher. For Bobby, teacher education became a year to learn about a career option that he did not want to pursue.

Like Bobby, at the end of the program the remaining three participants felt more like teachers. Yasmin’s strong teacher identity translated into a desire to secure a full time teaching position. At Time 1, Yasmin had commented: “I’m not a teacher yet, like, because I still need to learn how to control things.” While she never explained her reason for pursuing full time work after graduation it may be that, like others who explicitly stated as much, Yasmin felt she had gained sufficient confidence and control to succeed as a full time teacher. Owen was the other person in this pattern who wanted full time teaching after graduation. Owen, who at Time 1 stated that his identity was based on a lack of experience, felt that at Time 2 he had gained the experience needed to feel more like a teacher.

The final participant, Mia, wanted to be a teacher-on-call (TOC) at the end of the program. Her reasons for this career choice strongly connected to her identity judgment. Mia felt she had begun to move more toward becoming a teacher (only slightly above her assessment at Time 1) and talked about wanting to TOC as a way of integrating her beliefs
into the classroom and becoming a teacher who would continue to learn. This was identical to her explanation of identity at Time 1 (always teacher; always learner). At Time 2, Mia felt that being a TOC would give her the opportunity to continue to be a “learning teacher” who could incorporate her strong beliefs into a classroom setting. However Mia worried that after graduation, any school in which she would begin her career would expect her to justify her strong “social reform/social justice” beliefs just as she’d felt the teacher education program had done. She worried she did not fit with the program’s ideology and the ideal portrayal of a teacher. She felt a mismatch between a school’s expectation of her role as teacher and her own identity was imminent. Therefore, Mia’s experience in the teacher education program had the effect of illuminating a difficulty or challenge in her perception of her own teacher identity in relation to the program and how she felt the program expected her to conform to a programmatic teaching ideal. Mia was the only participant in this pattern who did not end the program with a strong teacher identity. Because Mia wanted to return to school at some point, she questioned her identity as a teacher. As Mia stated:

Well I, 'cause I want to go back to school so I'll fall back into the student party and so I don't, but I think yeah, I think like that sort of 50/50, well I guess maybe then I don't feel like I'm at 50/50 if that's where I want my goal to be, but maybe it is more towards the teacher. But like maybe, you know, here or something like that so that would be the goal to achieve. But I don't, I would never want it to be firmly over here and certainly it's not going to be over there because I do feel like I've learned stuff. So, but you know, to even fluctuate within sort of some sort of along this continuum here, some sort of percentage on either side would be, you know, fair to say I think it happens all the time, so.
In sum, all participants in this pattern moved toward stronger teacher identities. However, for this group, variability was present in their future teaching plans. Again, an important conclusion drawn from this pattern is the multidimensional nature of participants’ journeys towards becoming teachers. It was also apparent that for this group, the teacher education program had a differential effect on each person. For these four participants, it created an expected “positive” movement from initial low teacher identities. For Yasmin and Owen this was paired with strong desires to become teachers. Both Yasmin and Owen had a feeling that their journeys were complete, and they were teachers wanting full time contracts. For Mia, her desire to continue to be a learning teacher moved her to decide on being a teacher-on-call. The clear exception was Bobby whose experiences in the teacher education program moved him away from the profession. Bobby’s experience in the program solidified his feeling of not belonging and gave him the opportunity to see what he did not want to do.

Pattern 3: Shifts from Low Commitment – High Teacher Identity. At Time 1, participants in this group had initially high teacher identities but relatively low commitments to teaching. By the end of the year, most participants maintained high teacher identities (see Figure 9). The exception was Jared, who by the end of the program, felt much less like a teacher than he did at the beginning. At the end of the program, all participants appeared at least somewhat committed to the profession. However, commitment movements for this group were variable.
Figure 9: Pattern 3: Shifts from Low Commitment and High Teacher Identity
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*Although there was no shift he was included as part of the original profile*
Four participants (Syd, Adrian, Hani, and Cam) continued to maintain their strong teacher identities at Time 2. Syd felt ready to take on a full time teaching contract after graduation whereas Adrian and Hani wanted to pursue part time work. While Adrian was unwavering in his identity as teacher, he felt that since teaching was originally a fallback choice he did not want to commit to a full time contract until, as Adrian stated: “I am sure that I am where I want to be”. In a sense, Adrian was still “hedging his bet”. Similarly, Hani and Cam did not want to take on a full time teaching position after graduation. Hani wanted to be a teacher-on-call (TOC) as a way of continuing to build her confidence. Similar to others (see Pattern 1), Cam felt TOC’ing would provide a variety of experiences that would allow him to see many different things over a relatively short period of time, which strongly connected to Cam’s assessment of his teacher identity. At Time 2, Cam felt that he was moving towards becoming a teacher, but, as he stated: “There was always something more I can learn”. Notably, in terms of his teacher identity, Cam was one of only two participants in the entire study who made no movement between Times 1 and 2.

The final participant in this pattern, Jared, made the most unique identity shift between Times 1 and 2. Jared was the only participant in the study who moved from a high teacher identity at the beginning to a low teacher identity at the end of the program. Jared felt his identify shift occurred because he was not treated like a teacher in the program. At Time 1, Jared emphasized the link between his higher teaching identity and his previous experience. Jared may have been insulted when he perceived that the program did not value or acknowledge his experience. While the program’s lack of recognition affected how Jared viewed himself as a teacher, it did not affect his desire to pursue a teaching career after graduation. In fact, Jared commented that: “I will feel like a teacher again once I’m out of
the program” – implying that he was a teacher before he entered teacher education, and he would be one again after he left.

In sum, participants in this pattern began the program with strong teacher identities but relatively low commitments to teacher education. Thus, when thinking of the typical starting point in the journey toward becoming a teacher, this combination of identity and commitment seemed in direct contradiction to what might be expected. By the end of the program, all but Jared had stronger teacher identities. But only Syd and Jared felt ready to take on full time positions. Adrian, Cam, and Hani wanted part time or on-call positions to gain more teaching experience. Once again, this pattern reinforces the notion that there is not one single “expected” journey towards becoming a teacher.

**Pattern 4: Shifts from High Commitment – High Teacher Identity.** For these participants with initially strong teacher identities and strong commitment, all maintained their high teacher identities but, as in the previous three patterns, showed variability in their future teaching plans. Figure 10 illustrates the movement of participants from the beginning to the end of the program.

Four participants (Caitlyn, Lacey, Hamid, and Ryan) ended the program feeling very committed to the profession and very much like teachers. Each wanted to take on a full time teaching contract after graduation. Lacey described:

I’m totally a teacher because I, but even though, and not to say that a teacher has that, that, also that total teacher role all the time too but I just like it to be where there’s a, enough learning but teaching distribution, just like I said so you’re just a good steward of what you’re learning.
Figure 10: Pattern 4: Shifts from High Commitment and High Teacher Identity
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Stella also ended with a strong teacher identity; however, her future aspirations were to TOC and not immediately “set up a classroom” after graduation. Stella felt her high teacher identity was because there was “only 2% of teacher left to go ... I’m 98% teacher and the remaining 2% will happen once I’m able to set up my own classroom”. While she did not explain this choice, she may have thought that being a TOC would provide her with exposure to a variety of classroom set-ups that would help her create her own classroom.

The remaining two participants in this pattern (Rachel and Erika) maintained moderately high teacher identities between Times 1 and 2. Like Stella, they also wanted to be teachers-on-call after graduation. For Rachael and Erika their self-reported identities at Time 2 seemed to relate to their desire to be TOCs. Both participants wanted to be learning teachers and felt that being a TOC would give them a variety of opportunities and experiences that would support their continued learning.

In sum, the group of participants in this last pattern began the program with strong identities and commitments to the profession. All maintained their strong initial identities but chose a variety of future teaching plans. For some, a decision to pursue part time or on-call work may have emerged out of the feeling that they wanted to continue to grow and develop as a teacher. For these people, teacher education may have allowed them to reflect on their experiences in the program and begin to understand what was still missing.

Summary

Figure 11 illustrates the shifting patterns between Time 1 and Time 2. Each arrow’s style denotes participants’ starting profile. Those who began with low identity/low commitment (Profile 1) are shown by the solid lines. Participants who began in Profile 2 (low identity/high commitment) are shown by dotted lines. Dashed lines depicts participants
who began with high identity/low commitment (Profile 3). Finally, participant movements shown by double lines are for those in who started Profile 4 (high identity/high commitment).

Figure 11: Beginning and Ending Levels of Commitment and Teacher Identity

Figure 11 demonstrates that participants began the program with varying levels of teacher identities. This finding is important to note because it reinforces the point that preservice teachers start with different beginning positions. While some participants began the program not feeling at all like teachers, many others began with teaching experience and a strong sense of teacher identity. In fact, at least half of the people in this study started with strong teacher identities. At Time 2, all but one participant ended with a strong teacher identity. This finding supports the idea that for participants who began with strong teacher identities, the teacher education program did not undermine this perception. For others who
came in with low identities, the program supported them to develop stronger identities as teachers. Jared was the only exception. But while the teacher education program may have undermined Jared’s perception of himself as a teacher, this was not the case for the majority of participants.

At Time 1, participants’ levels of commitment also varied. Participants did not begin the program with the same views, motivations, or experiences and had very different reasons for wanting to become teachers. In contrast to participants’ identity development, at Time 2 there was not as clear an end point in terms of participants’ commitment. At the end of the teacher education program, there were variations in terms of the extent to which participants wanted a full time teaching contract. For some participants this was directly related to whether they felt they needed more teaching experience to become teachers. For some, becoming a teacher-on-call after graduation allowed them opportunities to gain experience in a relatively short period of time with the hopes of gaining a stronger teacher identity.

Finally, in terms of integrating commitment and identity, ten of the people who had strong teacher identities at the end of the program did not want to take on part or full time teaching positions. These findings reinforce the notion that having a strong teacher identity does not necessarily translate into an immediate desire to pursue full-time employment as a teacher. At both Times 1 and 2, it appeared that these dimensions were considered separately. In that regard, the most extreme cases are perhaps the most interesting. In terms of high teacher identity and low commitment, Bobby held the highest teacher identity but also chose to leave the profession. The other case was Jared who wanted to teach full time even though, according to him, the program had ‘stripped’ him of his initially strong teacher identity.
Chapter V: Results – Challenges Associated with Becoming a Teacher

While the previous chapter described participants’ changing perspectives in their journeys towards becoming teachers, this chapter explores some of the challenges they experienced over the course of the B.Ed program. The intention of this discussion is to explore the experiences which participants encountered during the program and how those experiences impacted their journeys. As discussed in Chapter 3, the first process of data analysis was to create a concept map for each participant which outlined specific challenges he or she described (see Appendix F). Once each concept map was complete, challenges data were compared across participants to find common themes.

Three challenge themes emerged and included: structural, role, and professional challenges. Structural challenges were problems with program coursework, practicum and/or the interactions with instructors, faculty advisors, or sponsor teachers connected to some structural component of the program. Role challenges were those struggles that arose as participants assumed identities as either UBC students, or preservice teachers in their practicum classrooms or made transitions between the two. Finally, professional challenges arose in the context of teaching as participants began to struggle with the duties of the profession. Note that challenges were grouped based on their qualitative connection to a given theme. For example, a challenge associated with sponsor teachers may have been identified as either a role or a structural theme. For some people, challenges with their sponsor teachers were based on the inability to test out their identity because of rigid rules imposed by the sponsor. Because this is a challenge to a participant’s ability to establish a teacher identity, it was classified as a challenge in adopting a teacher role. In contrast, other
participants found that their sponsor teachers were simply too busy because of being given multiple preservice teachers to supervise. These challenges, classified as structural, emerging from the organization of the program.

The subsequent discussion is organized following the three themes of structural, professional, and role challenges. This discussion also shows how participants’ experiences relate to their initial identity and commitment. Note that there were some challenges described by participants that were not included in this analysis. These were challenges that did not directly relate to their journeys toward becoming teachers (e.g., a complaint that an exam scheduled late in the winter term conflicted with a pre-planned ski vacation).

**Structural Challenges**

Every participant spoke about certain common structural challenges. For example, most participants complained about heavy workload and useless assignments assigned within some courses. Three types of challenges were experienced by most participants: 1) the program needed to be more practical and less theoretical, 2) the program failed to challenge prior beliefs and 3) program instructors did not practice what they preached. These three types of challenges showed how participants’ expectations of what they needed to develop as teachers did not match the programmatic reality. For example, a majority of participants in this study felt they would be better served by a program structure with a stronger connection to practice. A quote from Felix represented what these participants were feeling:

I’ve sort of resigned myself that I’m not gonna learn anymore about teaching here, it’s, and I think, um, they do call it a Bachelor of Education program so maybe you are supposed to, well I mean, the assumption is that you’re studying it academically ... theoretically. Um, it’s, it’s fine, I mean you’ve come this far. I mean, I wish the
whole program were different ... more practical, but now that I'm here it's, um, I mean it's, I'm trying to make the best, the best of it and it's possible to get some good out of it.

For Felix and others, the challenge lay in how to reconcile the need for practicality with the theoretical messages being presented in the program's courses.

A second type of structural challenge was that participants felt the program failed to challenge their incoming beliefs. A few believed that their development would be best served by having opportunities in the program to examine and consider what they believed and be challenged to justify those beliefs. For example, Yasmin said:

I feel like I haven't had to think or I haven't been challenged. I mean we're gonna be a bunch of teachers teaching kids. Shouldn't we be challenged a little bit before we do this, like I shouldn't just have to write something, get accepted and get a degree a year later. I should have to be challenged a little bit. So I think if maybe we were challenged a little more and felt like we were, like bouncing ideas off of the instructor maybe or things like that, that would be a little, little bit more useful in making it feel like more collaborative kind of environment.

Finally, a few participants felt that a systemic problem within the program was that instructors did not “practice what they preached”. For these students, the challenge was to reconcile conflicting messages they were receiving about teaching through instructor action and course content respectively. As Ryan commented:

And just, just the whole idea of the method of teaching. Some of these teachers if they could see what we were learning in our principles of teaching class or in our methods class would realize that they look like fools because they’re, they’re like
case in point not what, you know, exactly the opposite of what we’re learning how to do. Um, so that happened throughout.

The difficulty for these participants lay in how to reconcile instructors’ actions with how those same instructors talked about being a teacher.

In addition to challenges common across the majority of participants, some structural challenges were dependent on participants’ initial identity or commitment (as described in Chapter 4). For example, those participants with low teacher identities at the start of the program discussed twice as many structural challenges as those with high teacher identities at the start. As well, there were qualitative differences between how participants with low and high identities discussed these structural challenges. Figure 12 shows (among other things) how some structural challenges could be associated with participants’ initial teaching identities.

Participants with high teacher identities at Time 1 discussed structural challenges that focused on how the program supported their development of teaching competence. They tended to focus on their practicum, courses, course instructors, and how they felt about the overall program. For example, a few participants believed the assessment course (which deals with test writing, observational assessment and general evaluation techniques) should be moved from the summer session (post-practicum) to the fall session (pre-practicum). This group suggested that having practical courses before their practicum experiences would have provided a better set of tools and techniques to be more effective during their teaching experience.
In contrast, participants with low teacher identities at Time 1 focused more on structural challenges that threatened their success as students. For example, these
participants focused on such things as controversial midterms, a lack of unity between multi-
sectioned courses, hating group work, and feeling that the grading system was substandard.

Similarly, participants’ descriptions of challenges related to sponsor teachers were
qualitatively different between the low and high teacher identity participants. Participants
with low beginning teacher identities described challenges with sponsor teachers that were
more structural than substantive. For example, Mia was worried that her sponsor teacher was
too busy to provide feedback. As Mia commented:

I struggled with, I sort of had to figure out on my own, which is good in a way, but I
didn’t really feel like I had all the, sort of, all the sort of techniques, or, you know,
like, I knew of all the different ways to be able to do that. And I, and, ah, I guess I
could have gone to them more and asked them, you know, been more, you know, oh,
you know, monopolizing of their time and whatnot, but I also felt like I, they, I mean
they were so busy, and two of my sponsor teachers had new babies at home, and, I
mean, involved in student government and sports and stuff like this. So it was just
like, oh, you know, every time I’d sort of want to talk to them, and that’s why one of
them didn’t, one of them didn’t even, um, observe me was just because he was so
busy all the time.

In contrast, participants with high initial teacher identities emphasized how interactions with
sponsor teachers threatened their development of a teacher identity. For example, Ryan
commented that he was only permitted to go as far as his sponsor teacher allowed him to in
terms of his teacher behaviours in the classroom.

Finally, a qualitative difference existed in terms of how participants with different
initial teacher identities viewed challenges associated with their practicum. Some
participants with low initial teacher identities reported negative feelings about their practicum experiences. Buff summed up her perceptions most directly by saying “it sucked”. She worried “about what damage the practicum did to me because I just have so many negative feelings about it”. Buff felt her practicum experiences could have had a negative impact on her journey to becoming a teacher. Though not as harsh as Buff, other participants with low teacher identities felt their practicum was boring near the end. For example, Felix commented:

I think I can handle a classroom. I’m confident I can handle my classroom. Like I know the bare minimum a teacher would, like you know, you know the assessment, the special strategies and all the different components you need to know. But I guess just the experience of, you know, just experience different things and different ideas. I just thought I don’t have the resources, you know, I think one day you pull a “okay, I’m gonna do this today, I’m gonna do that today.” Just something different, right. Whereas what I found out, when I did my practicum, is getting very very repetitive. ‘cause you run out of ideas, right, what should I do today. Like for a fun activity, like oh I did that already, you know, kind of thing. That was like, everyday I was like, “what do you have, you know, I’ve tried this,” “well try this,” “I’ve already done that,” right, you know, it’s like oh, it was getting repetitive, I was getting bored.

In contrast, participants with high initial teacher identities spoke about practicum challenges quite differently. A few participants felt a subsequent structural challenge was created upon returning to UBC coursework after the practicum. The act of returning to UBC after being involved in an authentic experience created a feeling of being “let down”. As Adrian commented:
Um, it's fascinating, you know, coming back for this, coming back to UBC is, they always talk about how much you know the practicum as being so important, it's gonna be everything and in some ways that's almost an excuse for not doing anything. In some classes it's kind of like well you won't know until you're on your practicum and then you come back and it's definitely anti-climactic.

This would suggest that participants who experienced the practicum as a place of authentic learning were frustrated by then having to re-enter a place that was perceived by them to be less authentic and relevant to their emerging identity and competence as a teacher.

While the strongest qualitative differences for structural challenges were between participants with low and high initial teacher identities, there were two other noticeable differences. The first was that there were some differences between participants depending on their initial commitment to the profession (see Figure 12). Specifically, a few participants who began the program with a high commitment toward teaching described challenges with faculty advisors. These participants struggled with advisors who were lax, ineffective, provided very little feedback, or feedback that was too theoretical (as opposed to concrete). Rachel expressed her frustration by stating:

Well and he, he was, the thing was he had, he was a faculty advisor for two of us at the same school and, um, he, he wrote the same comments for us all the time. It was like, were you even in my classroom? Like did you have a pre, pre typed script for us. Like I don't understand. And like even if we call and ask for, oh you know, like I didn't, I, he didn't even call the first two weeks we were in our practicum. We would, 'cause I went in and taught right away. He didn't even call to say how were things going, are you okay? But what if I had not, you know, gotten along with my
sponsor teacher or, you know, I was, had a mental breakdown, or I don’t know, what would happen in that case? Like what happens if you were really having problems? Therefore it seemed a few of the participants who were strongly motivated to become teachers felt they needed more from their faculty advisors to fuel their development. For these participants their commitment to become teachers translated into a desire for all people involved to provide the necessary feedback to help them navigate and support them through their journey.

The second notable finding was that there were some unique challenges experienced by participants who were initially low in both teacher identity and commitment (Profile 1). This finding is depicted in Figure 13, which shows how some challenge descriptions could be linked to individuals’ initial “profiles” (see Chapter 4). It was the group of participants with low identity and low commitment who discussed the majority of structural challenges. It seemed the combination of both low identity and low commitment resulted in participants focussing their attention on more UBC student-oriented challenges such as those liked in Figure 13.

There were many structural challenges experienced by participants regardless of initial identity or commitment to the profession. The most frequent challenge was that participants expressed was the feeling that the program focus was overly theoretical and not all practical. At the same time, however, many challenges were experienced differently depending on participants’ self-perception of their initial teacher identities. For example, the majority of participants who began the program with high teacher identities discussed structural challenges associated with the practicum and its timing, placement and length. In contrast, participants with low initial identities most often discussed challenges connected to
coursework. These findings suggest that participants with initially high teacher identities focus on how program structures impact on their personal development as teachers. In contrast, participants with low initial teacher identities, especially those with low commitment, identify challenges connected to a traditional student role. Taken together, these findings show how participants began the program with different self-perceptions which affected how they experienced teacher education.

Figure 13: Challenges Associated with Chapter 4 Initial Profiles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High identity</th>
<th>Structural</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sponsor too similar to me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Changed behaviour when FA present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low commitment</th>
<th>Structural</th>
<th>Professional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High school students had lower abilities than expected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High commitment</th>
<th>Structural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning to write for instructors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Practicum (timing, placement &amp; length)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High commitment</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hard balance between structure &amp; spontaneity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Unique Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low identity</th>
<th>Structural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Problems with other UBC students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Controversial midterm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected more skill development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No unity between courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Practicum boring at the end</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hated cohort</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Unique Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low identity</th>
<th>Professional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High school students had lower abilities than expected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Professional Challenges

A second kind of challenge reported by participants arose when participants focused on their roles as teachers in the classroom and within the teaching profession. These included challenges of discipline, classroom management, and the politics of the profession. Again, most participants experienced some of these challenges similarly. For example, a majority of participants struggled with class management and discipline. As Stella explained:

I was doing a demo, it was a very long demo and it should have never been done that long to start with, but, um, and then the behaviours started, and it was a rough class anyways. This one class, this is my block B class, they were pretty, pretty rambunctious. I had three boys in grade 11 who, you know you hear these horror stories of grade 9’s and how they can’t, you know, all the data that you get from the grade 9’s is just, he can’t use it. Well I met some grade 11’s who put those grade niners to shame. These three boys were just absolutely, and they’re the best of friends and they’re just wild. And dealing with them on a day in day out basis was difficult but they liked me so therefore we, we built up a rapport, we built up a rapport, but when we had these demos situations, you know, they were just all over the place and it wasn’t just for me because they would do it for the regular teachers as well which was nice to know because it’s just them. But I had my, I had my FA there and he was doing this and I ended up sending somebody to the office, this one and only time I had to do that. And then I spent an hour and a half that evening on the phone with his mother. So it was [chuckle], it was quite the thing.
Similarly, most participants were challenged by the lack of resources in their schools. They grappled with limitations like not having enough textbooks for every student in their class. Participants were challenged to reconcile the lack of school resources with their desire to experiment while in their practicum.

Another challenge for participants arose during planning both before and during lessons. For example, Ryan expressed his struggle with pre-lesson planning when he commented:

the planning of those activities, the, ah, the logistics of it has some, has turned out to sometimes be more complicated than I expected. “Oh we’ll just do a little field trip,” “oh wait, you’re in Kamloops and it’s February and we don’t have any funding for a bus so you can walk but it might be minus 15 that day and you’re not gonna find any flowering plants, I’m sorry, it’s February.” Um, so some of that stuff is a challenge, you know, you can’t go to the seashore in Kamloops.

Karen and others struggled with during-the-lesson planning. According to Karen:

I wasn’t very good at time planning at the beginning. I had all these things crammed into one lesson and I ended up just talking like really fast. No one could ask any questions. (chuckle) But that, that seemed to work itself out throughout. I think that was the one thing I noticed the most was my lesson planning and my time allotment. Like I thought that this would take me 10 minutes to do when really it took them a half an hour. So that sort of thing. I just learned to kind of relax a little bit. But I guess that’s just the way it happens. Little bit nervous when you start and then you just relax and it’s a little bit easier.
Students who had challenges associated with planning expressed many concerns typical of practicing teachers. This shows that during the teacher education program, participants were assuming teacher roles and previewing the kinds of struggles they would encounter as practicing teachers. This is significant given that their journeys are toward becoming teachers. These planning issues illustrate how some participants’ during teacher education began to take on strong teacher roles.

Other challenges experienced by participants also reflected common teacher concerns. These included challenges associated with class size, student absenteeism, and student cheating. For example, Buff described an incident three weeks into her practicum when students were cheating. According to Buff:

I remembered this one day I was very, um, disappointed I could say with the students because, um, what had happened is I usually go around to check homework and, um, I found out that the homework has either been copied, it wasn’t done properly or something like that. And, um, it was very disappointing for me. And it was then I realized that, okay, this is not going to be easy and you know basically the dream of getting, you know, every student to, you know, excel and, you know, achieve their potential was not going to be true or it’s not gonna happen. So that some kids are just going to, you know, they’re, this is their potential and this is how much they can do and you can’t push them any further because that’s their limit. Basically that’s how much work they’re willing to do. So it was kind of a sad realization that this was happening in my class and there wasn’t much that I could do about it. And, um, yeah I guess a wake up to reality as a teacher.

Others expressed similar challenges with learning to cope in a classroom setting.
Once again, some professional challenges were experienced differently depending on participants’ initial perspectives and/or commitment. For example, a few participants who had both low identities and low commitment at Time 1 felt they were challenged by an expectation-reality mismatch (see Figure 13). These participants expected that secondary students would have superior abstract reasoning and overall higher abilities than they found to be the case. These participants found themselves creating too many complex lessons which were ill-suited to their students. Their challenge was to adjust to the reality of the classroom situation and change their perceptions about their target audience.

In contrast, participants who had initially strong teacher identities appeared to have more realistic expectations. They also focused more on the challenges typical teachers face in day-to-day practice (see Figure 12). For example, these participants described challenges with ESL/cultural issues, students with learning disabilities, their rapport with students, and general issues connected to evaluation and grading. As well, some participants with strong initial identities were challenged by the politics of the profession. For example, while in his practicum, Cam learned how teaching history was undervalued in relation to other content areas. As Cam explained:

In a whole school, they should all be, they should all say, okay, my class is important, but so is everyone else’s class. Instead, they’re saying, my class is important and screw your class and I really noticed this. There was one, I think it was grade 12 because I taught grade 12 for one week, every two weeks they had a massive test and the idea was the teacher, the math teacher, the math department, he pushed them faster than they needed to go through the program and then they would write their exam in like March or April. Then the teacher himself, he’d have the last two months
off and he wouldn’t have to teach. That was his purpose to do it. And every student in grade 12 had to do the math course like that and they didn’t want to learn anything else because they were being pushed so fast through the math program. That hurts the entire school because you can’t assign a test. The students will say oh no, we’re not going to do that, we have to study for the math test. And that was just stupid. I can’t believe the school let this teacher do that. You know, let them do the tests at the normal test time, at the end of the year, and stop the one teacher from screwing everything up. It just surprised me that someone would do that. Um, and then no one’s, no one’s, ah, speaking up too much to stop it. Because they value math and science so much they’d say oh that, that’s probably a good idea, right.

Cam’s challenge was to understand how his identity as a history teacher (and his love for the content) fit within a school system that valued math and sciences over history. Others like Lacey, described general political challenges. As she explained:  

Um, I think just because there are, um, elements of different classrooms that I still are not familiar with like for example, um, classes that have more special needs in them and how to deal with that plus in combination facts. Um, lesson planning doesn’t really worry me or, um, classroom management actually doesn’t really worry me, it’s more about the special and in some of the other things. And as a teacher a section that really … when I think about it more it’s actually more about the admin and the politics of the school that I have problems with.

Thus for some participants, the day-to-day issues of planning and class management did not worry them as much as learning to navigate the politics of the teaching profession. It may be that those participants who began the program with high teacher identities, and usually more
previous teaching experience, could focus further on the complexities and philosophies of teaching rather than day-to-day practice.

In sum, all participants in this study were starting to face the kinds of challenges that confront practicing teachers. Clearly they were exposed to struggles that would be demanded of them in a teacher’s role. As a result, for some these professional challenges may have been connected to learning what it means to be a teacher. In particular, those participants who began with low teacher identities may have been given a first glimpse of the world of teaching. They were learning to better calibrate their expectations with the realities of classrooms. Other participants with stronger initial teacher identities were also perfecting their practice but the challenges they voiced reflected confrontations with the complexity of the profession (e.g., dealing with multiple student needs simultaneously). For all participants, their practicum experiences and classroom challenges may have brought to light a na"ive or underdeveloped understanding of what it means to be a teacher.

Role Challenges

A third type of challenge experienced by participants was associated directly with their role development. These were challenges related to navigating transitions between student and teacher roles. As with other types of challenges, there were some role challenges common across participants. These included difficulties with sponsor teachers and with moving back and forth between identities of student and teacher.

In terms of sponsor teachers, one or two participants in each of the original profiles described difficulties fitting their beliefs about teaching into their practicum classrooms. For example, Owen explained:
I had three sponsor teachers and, um, one of the things I found very difficult to do, I mean with the practicum was three different teachers, three different ways of doing everything and it was very difficult to try and like this, class I would do it this way and then another class I would do it another way and then this class I would do it this way. So it was very difficult to make everyone happy and do, yeah. But that's just for the practicum itself.

In these cases, conflicts with sponsor teachers challenged their ability to try out a teacher role. Participants who experienced this challenge felt they had to satisfy multiple conflicting demands which impacted on how they were able to enact their role as teacher.

Other students (across profiles) discussed how hard it was to move back and forth between student and teacher identities, for example between practicum and university coursework. This was significant as preservice teachers are required to be university students at the same time as they take on the responsibilities of being teachers. For some the movement back and forth between identities was difficult especially when there was a role-context mismatch. For example, some participants reluctantly returned from the practicum to university coursework feeling like teachers but doing student work. As Cam explained:

When I came back I was, um, mmmm, trying to think of a word to describe it. It was hard to come back. But in a way it was, it was, I felt better about what was going on. I knew, okay, that's what a real classroom was like. Sort of real issues, problems they have, like lack of books or something like that. Then, um, in the university I got kind of sick and tired of the teachers again. Here I have to go through this terrible schedule and I'm not actually teaching but I'm still learning about teaching. Ah, it was weird. It was hard to take actually. I wanted to stay in the practicum and keep
just slowly building up teaching in a way but I knew that through the rest of the
course, November and December, there were still things I needed to learn.

Participants again described qualitatively different experiences depending on their
initial positions. For example, some people who began the program with a low commitment
to teaching seemed to question their decision to become teachers, and this uncertainty may
have contributed to the challenges they faced (see Figure 12). These participants described
challenges connected to three issues: 1) feeling they did not belong in the classroom, 2)
feeling UBC did not give them time to reflect on who they were as teachers, and 3) a
disillusionment that their year was not a real journey. For example, Carla and Hani were two
students who felt a lack of belonging. Notably, both women decided to be teachers-on-call
after graduation. They may have struggled with coming to terms with their readiness to
assume a teaching career.

Others with an initially low commitment to teaching discussed their disillusionment
with the program. Participants felt they were “only doing it [the program] because they had
to”. For example, Adrian questioned whether his teacher education comprised a real journey
when he said:

At this point, is everybody in the education program coming in taking that
responsibility on themselves. Obviously, I don’t think so. But it would be nice you
know it would be nice if it was more a real journey to improving people as teachers.

These participants felt the program did not support their development as teachers.

Certain challenges could also be linked to participants’ initial teacher identities (see
Figure 12). Those who had high initial identities struggled with three types of challenges
over the course of the program. These included challenges with feeling restricted by sponsor
teachers, the program treating them like students, and their identity not fitting with the program. Many participants with high beginning teacher identities felt the program treated them like students when they felt like teachers. As Jared explained:

I guess it's hard for them. We feel like teachers mostly and we're coming back and then, you know, we have to sit down and they need to talk to us when we feel like we know everything I guess, I don't know. But and some of the things they're making us do you're thinking well, you know, if you thought that I was a real teacher you wouldn't be making me do this because I know very well that this is not worthwhile. And this is just a way for you to give me a grade at the end of the year, at the end of the term.

This was a significant challenge for participants because they felt they had taken on a teacher’s role without acknowledgement from the program.

Another challenge experienced by most by participants with initially high teacher identities was feeling that their identities did not fit with the program. For example, Adrian explained:

To jump the right hoops. I've identified exactly what they want, and sure I don't believe it has anything to do with the teaching. But it's just a little catch phrases like if you don't say the right catch phrase at the end of the lesson than we honestly will get marked for it. It's so ridiculous but it's all part of having a very strict process in the teaching and that is her ideal of teaching. I've had to move to make sure there is process when I do it for her but when I was in my practicum ... at no point did I change ... like try and be like that.
Mia was the only case in which feelings of not belonging were not linked to an initially high teacher identity. Although Mia did not feel like she fit with the program her initial teacher identity was low. However, note that at the beginning of the program Mia held very strong beliefs about teaching. In that respect, Mia was similar to those with stronger initial teacher identities. As Mia explained:

Because I think my own philosophy just doesn’t seem to fit very nicely with liberal ideology (of the program) and I’m fine to have that but I know that it’s going to be a struggle for me, because I have these ideas.

It may be that individuals with strong initial beliefs about teaching are more likely to struggle with being confronted with different sets of beliefs and this may translate into a perception that they did not fit with the program’s philosophy. Thus participants with high initial teacher identities (and Mia) had difficulty allowing their initial identities to be tried, reflected upon and understood in a classroom or program context. It was a significant problem for those beginning teacher education with strong teacher identities if they perceived that the program did not support their initial belief systems.

Finally, participants who began with low teacher identities experienced certain identity challenges more frequently (see Figure 12). These participants were most likely to experience three types of challenges: teaching never feeling natural, finding it difficult to be the centre of attention, and having difficulty trying to incorporate the UBC philosophy into a practicum classroom.

Several participants felt “out of place” in the classroom. They described teaching as “not coming naturally”. These people felt more comfortable in a student role at UBC than as
a teacher in various high school classes. A few participants also described being the centre of attention challenging. As Bobby commented:

Comfort level I think is a big one. Just being up there in front of, in front of them and being comfortable leading the discussion, knowing when to pause and how powerful that is and just there’s so much that was challenging.

Note again how these challenges reflect some participants’ lack of comfort with a teacher role. These few participants felt more comfortable as students than they did as classroom teachers.

The final identity challenge associated with low teaching identities was the difficulty of trying to incorporate the message from UBC into their practicum classes. As Kiyoshi experienced:

There’s conflicting stuff about what they teach [the program] and how my sponsor teachers approach teaching. It seems like, a lot of people are like... at least in the education program are really criticizing the standard lecture format of talking to the student, you know of how you have rows, the trend is going toward more of the group work ... or maybe you have seating whereby they’re sitting in small groups, but in my ... with the sponsor teachers that I have ... I have three in total and two of them have the lecture style, you know the regular standard rows and a teacher at the front and students facing the teacher ... So it’s hard to know what I should be doing.

Kiyoshi and others found challenge in the mismatch between the program’s messages about teaching and how teaching was enacted in their practicum classrooms. It may be that this group relied on the program to inform their knowledge about teaching and help them make
sense of their practicum experiences since these participants had low teacher identities and little previous teaching experience.

Summary

Three major types of challenges, structural, professional and role, emerged from the analysis. While all participants experienced challenges within each area, initial levels of teacher identity strongly differentiated how these challenges were experienced. Generally participants with strong initial teacher identities discussed challenges connected to their emerging roles as teachers. The professional challenges they described were concerns common to practicing teachers, and their challenges reflected complexities of the profession, not just day-to-day issues. Those participants with high identities at the start of the program were more likely to view their education program as a forum within which to enact their identities within a classroom setting. In contrast, those participants with low initial teacher identities more often discussed challenges associated with the structural components of the program. This group of participants viewed their development as teachers through a student lens. Taken together these findings powerfully illustrate the impact of participants’ initial self-perceptions on their multidimensional journeys toward becoming teachers.
Chapter VI: Discussion and Implications

Overall, the findings of this study are consistent with previous research. Where consistency exits, findings add depth to the previous literature. Where there are certain inconsistencies, the findings suggest new ways of understanding peoples’ journeys toward becoming teachers. This final chapter reviews specific findings, outlines limitations of the study, offers suggestions for what findings might mean for teacher education programs, and suggests future directions for research.

Review

The purposes of this study were to: 1) illustrate how people undergo identity transformations toward becoming teachers, 2) identify the influences of individuals’ prior perspectives on their journeys and 3) understand the challenges associated with preservice teachers’ journeys. Analyses of research questions employed a mixed method strategy. The quantitative method utilized a pre-post t-test to analyze the Teaching Perspectives Inventory (TPI) as a measure of self-reported beliefs, intentions, and actions related to teaching (i.e., perspectives). Analysis of TPI data revealed that by the end of the program there was an overall increase in participants’ grouped mean responses on the Developmental Perspective. From the results it would appear as though participants had generally gravitated toward a Developmental Perspective. This should not be surprising, given that a constructivist epistemology is the basis for both the Developmental Perspective and how participants described this particular UBC teacher education program. However, there was further evidence to suggest that participants had not necessarily changed their beliefs; rather they
had learned to “talk the constructivist talk”. Indeed, at the end of the program only one participant held the Developmental Perspective as his dominant view of teaching.

The second method was to employ the constant comparative approach to analyze the interview data. The qualitative analysis resulted in two organizational frameworks (matrix plotting and concept mapping). Taken together, the matrix and concept map analyses illuminated how participants experienced their journeys toward becoming teachers and the challenges they encountered along the way. The journey analysis showed firstly, that there was no single starting identity and, more specifically, that some participants began with strong teacher identities. Participants also began the program with a variety of reasons for wanting to become teachers. Secondly, the journey analysis also revealed that all but one participant ended the program with a stronger teacher identity. Finally, as a function of how participants viewed their progress toward becoming teachers, their commitment varied in terms of the extent to which they wanted to assume a full-time teaching position after graduation. For example, some participants actively chose to take on part-time or on-call positions as a way of continuing to gain the teaching experiences they needed to feel more like teachers.

The concept map analysis uncovered three types of challenges associated with 1) structural components of the program 2) professional issues and 3) roles and role transformations, respectively. Participants who began the program with strong teacher identities discussed role and professional challenges more often than those with low initial teacher identities. Further, participants with initially high teacher identities discussed challenges about teaching which reflected the complexity of the profession. Participants with lower initial teacher identities (especially those with low commitment as well) tended to
mention structural challenges most often. Participants also experienced role challenges differently depending on their initial motivations and identities. Overall, the concept map analysis revealed that initial teacher identities strongly influenced how participants perceived challenges associated with becoming teachers. These findings again reinforce how teacher development is multi-dimensional.

This study was able to bring together both qualitative and qualitative analyses in a dominant/less-dominant structure. These two approaches contributed to a stronger understanding of how changing perspectives, journeys towards becoming teachers and challenges were experienced by these participants. The analysis from the TPI data reinforced the findings from the journeys analysis. Understanding participants’ changing perspectives was the first step in understanding their journeys. Taken together all the findings from this study begin to create a more complete picture of the changes and challenges that take place over the course of a one-year teacher education program.

Connections to Previous Research

Impact of Prior Beliefs/Perspectives

Previous literature has documented the influences of prior beliefs on the development of teachers (Hollingsworth, 1989; Powell, 1992; Weinstein, 1990; Wodlinger, 1985). In that context, the use of the TPI with teachers in training provided a new means of articulating those beliefs. Perspectives of teaching provided a more complete understanding of prior influences by including not only prior beliefs but also actions and intentions. Similar to Bullough’s (1992) innovative use of metaphors to help aid belief research, the TPI may be another useful tool for revealing underlying beliefs and their relationship to teaching intentions and actions. In order for this to happen, however, teacher education programs
would have to help prospective teachers not only identify their underlying beliefs about knowledge, learning and teaching, but critically reflect upon the value of some beliefs over others and the relationship between beliefs, intentions and actions. According to participants in this study, such reflection was not a part of their teacher education program.

As discussed in Chapter 4, TPI results when traditionally interpreted provide insight into the types of belief systems participants held prior to beginning teacher education. In this study, analysis of TPI data also revealed transitions in participants' perspectives on teaching. By the end of the program many participants had shifted their dominant perspective on teaching, albeit not in consistent directions. Further, some participants held no dominant perspective by the end of the program, suggesting they became less certain of (or more eclectic in) their beliefs, intentions, and actions.

One might reasonably expect that prior beliefs about learning, knowledge, and the social role of a teacher would change as a result of journeying through a teacher education program. Yet previous research suggests that pre-existing beliefs often persist throughout teacher education, including practicum experiences, and have an important impact on preservice teachers' learning (Bird et al., 1993; Cochran-Smith, 1991; Richardson, 1995). Only one of the studies reviewed previously (Bramald, et al., 1995) cautioned researchers that a teacher education program could influence preservice teachers' prior beliefs. The present study supports the latter conclusion. While there were some participants who maintained their dominant perspective at the end of the program (n=6), more students either shifted dominant perspectives or held no single dominant perspective at the end.

Holt-Reynolds (2000) found that some preservice teachers conform to a prevailing belief system in order to avoid confrontation with their university instructors. This
conclusion may be consistent with some of the results from this study. As mentioned earlier, TPI analysis showed that participants increased on their mean Developmental scores. This may reflect greater agreement with the constructivist messages portrayed in UBC's teacher education program rather than true shift in perspectives. This finding suggests that during teacher education participants may have parroted the discourse of the program whether or not they were actually committed to the underlying ethos. Jared echoed this finding when he said, “We knew what they [the instructors] really wanted, constructivism, so in your assignments you give constructivism”. While participants’ dominant perspectives at the end of teacher education did not necessarily incorporate constructivist belief systems, at some level they recognized the program’s messages. Similar to Holt-Reynolds' conclusion, this study reinforces the call for teacher educators to be aware of the possibility that preservice teachers may simply be repeating dominant program messages as a way to avoid confrontation, while knowing full well that they hold very different perspectives about teaching and learning.

Journeys Toward Becoming Teachers

Many investigators call for more research to understand the journey toward becoming a teacher (Bullough, 1992; Calderhead & Robson, 1991; Cole & Knowles, 1993; Wideen, Mayer-Smith & Moon, 1998). This investigation builds and extends the previous literature by providing a strong framework for describing these journeys and associated challenges. At a simplistic first level, this study confirmed that there is no single trajectory of development but rather that multiple journeys exist and reflect the multi-dimensional nature of teacher development.
Researchers have also argued that teacher education programs need to acknowledge that students begin their training with different personal and practical experiences (Powell, 1992; Weinstein, 1990). This was very true of participants in this study. The analysis of participants’ commitment to the profession and self-rated teacher identity illustrated the variety of reasons for beginning teacher education and different identities with which participants began the program. A teacher education program could have acknowledged, for example, that Bobby began with some TA experience, Syd was in the army for 20 years, Lacey taught ESL for years, and Hani had no prior teaching experience. These practical and personal experiences influenced how these and other participants were able to incorporate messages from the program and practicum as well as how they made the journeys toward becoming teachers. This study reinforces the notion that students begin teacher education with different notions of what it means to be a teacher, differing levels of teacher identities and differing levels of commitment to becoming teachers.

Powell (1992) concluded that teacher education programs need to help non-traditional students reflect on and refine strategies developed in roles they hold prior to teacher education. Recall, that in Powell’s study, non-traditional students were defined as those who had non-teaching careers before entering teacher education. While the present study did not directly investigate the difference between traditional and non-traditional students, the analysis did reveal that some participants began with substantial prior experiences. As participants discussed, teacher education programs need to actively support all students including those with strong initial teacher identities to refine and reflect on experiences.

Powell also contended that for traditional students, teacher education programs need to assist in the development and articulation of teaching strategies. Once again, there is an
indirect connection to this study. For those students who began their B.Ed. program with little experience and very low teacher identities, their education program should (and did) support their development toward becoming teachers. What is less clear in the present study is the program’s role and influence on participants’ commitment to the profession. This study began to reveal a more complex consideration: whether the role of a teacher education program should not only create and support teachers but also create and support teachers who want to take on full time teaching contracts after graduation. Declining confidence may be one explanation for why students end the program not wanting to take on full time work.

Weinstein (1990) reported that some preservice teachers in his study had decreased optimism at the end of the program. Weinstein concluded that this decrease was because of their increased awareness of: 1) personal handicaps (i.e., shyness), and/or 2) the complexity of teaching. Weinstein’s conclusions might relate to why some participants in this study did not want to take on full time teaching contracts after graduation. It may have been that participants’ increased awareness of the complexity of teaching may have moved them towards being teachers-on-call to gain the skills needed to deal with the complexity of the classroom, or towards leaving the profession in more extreme circumstances. The other clear reason for this decreased optimism discussed by participants related to the lack of experience provided by the program. Some participants felt the program did not provide enough teaching experience to allow them the comfort to take on a full time contract. Their solution was to take on-call work as a way of gaining a variety of experiences in a short period of time. Participants’ recognition that they needed more experience to feel more like teachers suggests some were able to actively reflect on the program’s shortcomings in relation to their personal development.
Sumara and Luce-Kapler (1996) characterized the journey toward becoming a teacher as a process of identity negotiation, transformation and, in some cases, degradation. The journey analysis in the present study employed a matrix of “identity by commitment” which illustrated similar processes in participants’ development. In this study, there were many participants who did “transform” in their movement toward becoming teachers. Others “negotiated” a more stable position in terms of potentially holding onto their strong initial teacher identities while negotiating their commitment to the profession. Finally, only one person in this study (Jared) illustrated the process of identity “degradation”. For Jared, the program was an “anti-catalyst” moving him away from feeling like a teacher instead of supporting his strong initial teaching identity. In terms of commitment, it was only Bobby (who left the profession) who may have had a similar “degradation” of his commitment to the profession.

Sumara and Luce-Kapler (1996) as well as Zulich et al. (1992) also portrayed teacher development as occurring in a three stage model: 1) influence of experiences prior to beginning teacher education, 2) experiences of a teacher education program and 3) experiences in the classroom (first occurring during practicum). Sumara and Luce-Kapler referred to these stages as pre-teaching identity, fictive identity, and lived identity while Zulich and colleagues named them introduction, intermediate and immersion. While the present study showed an impact of prior perspectives on teacher development, the study also extended stage explanations by analyzing what happened during teacher education. Instead of characterizing the entire B.Ed. program as a single fictive identity stage, this study characterizes development in terms of identity transformation within teacher education.
Similar to Tom's (1997) description, this study found the journeys toward becoming teachers are neither singular nor linear.

**Challenges Associated with Becoming Teachers**

The final analysis in the present study described challenges participants experienced while becoming teachers. Hollingsworth (1989) also spoke about challenges students may experience during teacher education. She concluded that program designers needed to pay close attention to the timing and order of course offerings. Her suggestion was that teacher education needs to be cautious about presenting all aspects of teaching at once. Her argument was that cognitive overload would result in students having difficulty assimilating new information and therefore shutting out incoming messages. Some participants in the present study echoed this sentiment. Discussions connected to workload, course timings, and assignment types, for example, revealed challenges participants faced in terms of cognitive overload. Recall from an earlier description of the UBC course load that students in a traditional schedule averaged six to seven courses per academic term. This is one to two courses more than most undergraduate degree programs. Similarly, while students in cohort options have some course amalgamation, they do not have a reduced workload. Cohort students complete the same number and types of assignments as those in the traditional option.

The other conclusion Hollingsworth drew from her study related to how program developers should time course offerings. In the present study, some participants felt that the teacher education program should understand certain courses were needed before practicum experiences such as an assessment course designed to cover concepts of test construction that is offered in the summer term after practicum. Participants who began the program with
strong teacher identities felt the program needed to consider that the most practical courses (applicable to the practicum) should be available in the fall term. For them, course timing was based on how it influenced their personal development. Similarly, Cole and Knowles (1993) argued that there needs to be greater attention paid to the preparation of teachers for the realities of the classroom. For many participants, the theoretical (rather than practical) nature of the teacher education program became challenging for them.

An additional challenge discussed by participants was that the program did not provide opportunities to reflect on what they were learning. Weinstein’s (1990) study supports this finding. Weinstein concluded that teacher education programs claim to be reflective but rarely live up to that assertion. For some participants the program at UBC was not an exception to this rule.

Participants in the present study also experienced challenges with their sponsor teachers. Hollingsworth (1989) hypothesized that sponsor teacher/student teacher pairings should be set up to create disequilibrium on the part of the student teacher. Having sponsor teachers that are philosophically too similar to their preservice teachers does not provide any challenge to help students question their beliefs or the foundation of their beliefs. In the present study, participants discussed challenges with their sponsor teachers. One hypothesis is that quite a few of these challenges, misconstrued as negative, in fact, may be positive challenges that create “wanted” disequilibrium. Participants may confuse this disequilibrium with things like personality clashes, problems working with sponsor, or having to satisfy sponsor’s expectations. This study also extended Hollingsworth’s understanding of the sponsor teacher/student teacher relationship. Although most participants experienced some common challenges when relating to sponsor teachers, different participant groups
experienced other challenges differently. For example, participants who began the program with high teacher identities were more likely to describe ways in which sponsor teachers challenged their roles. They were sometimes concerned about how their sponsor teachers may have hindered their development. In contrast, participants with low initial teaching identities were more likely to focus on structural challenges in their relationships (e.g., not enough time). Thus, the present study illuminated the need to look at the potential for disequilibrium in these relationships differently for individual preservice teachers.

Limitations of the Study

There were several limitations to the present study. First, the intent of this study was to explore participants' journeys toward becoming teachers without establishing a restrictive frame that shaped what participants discussed. The interviews allowed them to talk about anything related to their UBC program or practicum experiences. The benefit of this approach was that it captured participants' perspectives without a priori constraints. However, the trade-off in giving participants this latitude to discuss any issue related to their development meant that the research questions had to remain open. Without an obvious framework before data collection began, some concepts connected to prior perspectives, journeys toward becoming teachers, and/or challenges associated with professional development may not have been explored to the fullest extent. This was especially true for the journey analysis since the initial reliance on the TPI data proved not to provide the strongest framework for discussion.

A further limitation in this study was my inexperience with interviewing. Coupled with the lack of interview structure, my inexperience may have contributed to some loss of information, especially in early interviews. However, as my interviewing skills became more
refined, I was able to follow-up on pertinent information and adjust to the pace of the discussion, so that later interviews became more comprehensive. In as many instances as possible, I tried to follow-up (by email) with participants interviewed earlier in the course of the study. As well, as the interviewing process progressed it became clearer which questions provided discussion that was more comprehensive and consequently over time the probes were refined.

Another limitation of the study resulted from participant selection. The initial decision was to select participants with dominant perspectives by using the TPI as a pre-screening device. However, selecting participants with a single dominant perspective may have excluded some potentially informative participants (e.g., participants with more than one initially dominant perspective). In addition, this study was connected to a larger, longitudinal study and as mentioned earlier, the response rate from the initial TPI administration was approximately 52%. Therefore, those students who did not want to be part of the longitudinal study were excluded from being considered for this study as well.

The final limitation of the study arose from the choice of multiple data collection methods. This investigation relied upon interviews for the journey and challenge analyses. For example, participants discussed their identities, challenges, perspectives, and experiences in the teacher education program during their interviews. As with any interview, there is always concern about how participants portray themselves when giving self-reports. One way to overcome this limitation would be to use observational data. A way of expanding these analyses and overcoming the potential issues of self-reporting would be to observe students in their university courses as well as during their practicum to triangulate the observational data with participants' own perceptions.
Implications of the Study

The results from the present study indicated that there is no single journey toward becoming a teacher and that participants began teacher education with a variety of prior perspectives, experiences, identities, and different commitments to the profession which impact these journeys. Building on this, one suggestion for teacher education programs would be to design a course that aided preservice teachers in an exploration of their professional development. The course would not be tied to any specific content area, but rather would allow students to read and write about teacher development at more personal levels. This course could be designed to explore the different identities, transitions, and challenges associated with professional development, and would be focused on the process and meaning of "becoming a teacher". Many participants in this study described one of the education program's major drawbacks in terms of not allowing time to simply reflect on their journeys. As Ryan described:

the program is useful to the extent to which we're willing to be reflective. And it's, and I can't be reflective for 24 hours a week. Um, so when I feel like being reflective, it's good and I can ask myself about my teaching and I can take these ideas people are suggesting and say how can I work that into my teaching etc ... so when I'm not reflecting it feels like it's a waste of time, give me the marks and let me go home, whatever.

However, one caution to heed in the development of a course was discovered by Bird and colleagues (1993) who found that students tended to mute their own voices because of their struggles between expressing their ideas and the grading of their work. Thus, a course
designed to explore individuals' journeys would need an evaluation format similar to that of a practicum, which is a requirement, but not assigned an academic mark. Therefore, any course dealing with exploring journeys would need to be as free as possible from being bound to grades.

Another implication from the results of this study is that teacher education programs should acknowledge that for some students teacher education is not a journey at all, it is simply a reaffirmation of something they already are namely, strongly committed teachers. For others, a teacher education program provides a way to move toward becoming teachers. For these individuals their journeys are tied, not only to the events they experience while in the program, but also to how they understand their teaching identities and their motivations to become teachers prior to even starting the program. For students with lower teacher identities, a program has the ability to act as a catalyst for their identity transformation. Thus, the teacher programs need to be increasingly aware of these variances and tailor program experiences to recognize these differences.

Teacher education programs should also acknowledge that there is no single "right way" to develop as a teacher. The literature indicates (e.g., Kember, 1997; Pratt, 1992; 1998, Sameulowicz & Bain, 1992) that practicing teachers tend not to hold just one dominant perspective of teaching. Instead, perspectives can be described along a continuum or as an integrated profile of two or more perspectives. Therefore, it may be incumbent upon a program to allow for the exploration of a variety of perspectives, not singling out one orthodoxy over another (e.g., constructivism).

The findings from this study support assertions made by Holt-Reynolds (2000) and Hollingsworth (1989) that the goal of teacher education should be to challenge prior beliefs
even if they fit with the dominant perspective of the program. For example, the findings in this study show that while students are able to recognize and choose TPI items connected to a Developmental Perspective of teaching (similar to the dominant, constructivist message of the program), they did not always personally buy into these beliefs. In fact, by the end of the program, students had a variety of dominant perspectives (with only one participant holding a single Developmental Perspective) and some did not hold a single dominant perspective at all. This reinforces the notion that teacher education programs need to challenge all students, even those students whose belief systems appear to fit with the program's dominant messages. As well, teacher education needs to explore, beyond a superficial level, the actual teaching perspectives students hold throughout the program and how these perspectives may change over time.

Finally, this study showed that not only were there a variety of challenges experienced by students during the course of their teacher education, but these challenges were experienced differently. For some, this was dependent on their self-perceptions at the beginning of the program. Again teacher educators should be aware of how students understand their initial teaching identities and their attitudes toward becoming teachers to more fully understand the potential challenges students' experience. For example, simply believing that all challenges associated with sponsor teachers are similar does not acknowledge the differential effects these challenges have on students. Challenges tend to be more structural in nature (i.e., a problem of the program) for those with initially low teacher identities. For others with high initial teacher identities their challenges with sponsor teachers were a result of the interference with their role transformation. Understanding these differences may contribute to knowing how the program should respond to these challenges:
whether to create a solution or know that these are "wanted" challenges that should be experienced by all.

**Suggestions for Future Research**

Various follow up studies are relevant as an extension to this investigation. In fact, continuing to utilize the study’s methodology to probe the findings in more depth is recommended. For example, a deeper investigation of the challenges associated with becoming a teacher might illuminate in more detail other types of challenges that face both primary and secondary preservice teachers during teacher education. Another direction within this same framework would be to explore themes other than challenges associated with becoming a teacher. It would be possible to explore journeys in terms of successes, connections between the practicum and program, and/or students’ descriptions of themselves ‘as teachers’ in relation to themselves ‘in action’. Moving beyond a discussion of challenges, future research could explore journeys in terms of these or other issues.

Further investigation needs to expand the application of the matrix analysis. For example, the findings are slightly misleading in that the movement between Time 1 and Time 2 portrays a linear journey. This was due to the fact there were only two points of data collection and movement was therefore traced between just two points in time. A way to extend these findings would be to collect data at several intervals during a teacher education program. As such, future research may help expand these findings to understand journeys in a less linear fashion and provide a more comprehensive illustration of movements within the program.

Since this study simply focused on preservice teachers in a secondary specialization, extending this research to primary education could be another future consideration. Future
research may also include the application of this framework to other professional programs (e.g., lawyers, doctors, nurses, etc.). The current study's design would be specifically applicable to post-graduate programs which connect directly to practice. It would be interesting to test the design in these other post-graduate programs to determine if similar findings arose. In addition, it might also be useful to examine identity and commitment transformations within other training programs (e.g. firefighters, police officers, paramedic, etc.) that provide vocational training and to foster the development of professional identities.

**Conclusion**

This study helped explain how individuals experienced the journeys toward becoming teachers, challenges they experienced during the program, and the impact of prior perspectives on their journey. Analyses of the TPI data revealed that participants' Developmental Perspective scores increased at the end of the program. As well, two perspective shifts were evident at the end of the study: many participants ended with no dominant teaching perspective, while others moved away from their initial dominant perspective to another perspective. The multidimensional nature of these movements was reinforced by the 'journeys' and 'challenges' analyses. The journey analysis revealed the importance of participants' perceptions of their teaching identity and their commitment to the profession at the start of their teacher education program. Participants began with various levels of teacher identity and a variety of reasons for why they began teacher education. Similarly, participants ended the program with different perceptions of themselves as teachers and wanted different teaching careers options (e.g., teacher-on-call). The challenge analysis revealed three themes: structural, professional, and role challenges. Initial perceptions of teacher identity seemed to be strongly related and differentiated how
participants experienced the challenges of the teacher education program. Since these findings suggest that prior experiences and self-perceptions impact the experience of becoming a teacher, it is evident that teacher education programs need to understand how to incorporate these issues into their program. Suggestions for incorporating these findings in a constructive manner are provided to assist program developers in supporting preservice teachers in their journeys toward becoming teachers.
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Appendix A - Cohort Descriptions
The secondary program permits students to be eligible for teacher certification in 12 months. This results in a very heavy course and student teaching load. Because of the highly integrated nature of the program, full time study is expected. Part-time study is only by permission of the Associate Dean, Teacher Education.

**Winter Session**

*Program Specialization*

Students are admitted to secondary education with a specialization in one or two teaching fields. Students may not change these specializations without approval from the Teacher Education Office.

**Orientation**

On the first day of classes, Tuesday, September 5, 2000 students are invited to meet the Dean and Associate Dean along with staff from the Teacher Education Office at an orientation session from 9:30 am to 10:30 am in the Old Auditorium. At 10:30 am some students will attend an EDUC 311 lecture followed by an orientation session specific to your cohort while others will move directly to their orientation session. Specific instructions follow each timetable description.

**Practica Placements**

Every student is required to complete the enclosed "Practicum Placement Request Form" and return the form to the Teacher Education Office. These requests submitted on this form will be taken into consideration when selecting schools for practica placements. In addition, as space permits, students who are not participating in specific integrated project options will register in a standard timetable relating to one of their geographic requests for practica. If the timetables for your preferences are full, please register in available space. This will not preclude your placement in your preferred area as requested on the request form.

**Secondary Integrated Options**

**Humanities and Social Justice Integrated Project:** For students with one teaching field in *English or Social Studies* or any combination. The focus is on social justice issues, predicated on the notion that schools and faculties of education can be agents of social change. Students select timetables #94023, #94031 or #99427 according to their teaching field(s). Since the timetable is complete, students do not add any other courses to the timetable. Until July 20', preference will be given to those students with both English and Socials as teaching fields, after that date the timetables for English only and Socials only will be made available for registration. On Tuesday, September 5, 2000 following the general orientation in the Old Auditorium, students will meet faculty and other students at 10:30 am in Scarfe 201, for an orientation specific to this project cohort.

**Langley Community of Learning:** The Langley Community of Learning project offers a unique opportunity for secondary student teachers to undertake their practica in a cohort that includes a variety of curricular areas. Student teachers will work closely with subject specific sponsor teachers but the focus of this project is to include student teachers in the overall community of learning that exists in a Langley secondary school. Students will support each other regardless of subject area and will have the opportunity to take advantage of the many professional development opportunities facilitated by the school district. Timetable #92211. On Tuesday, September 5, 2000 following the general orientation in the Old Auditorium, students will meet faculty and other students from 10:30 am to 12:30 pm in Scarfe 310, for an orientation specific to this project cohort.
Home Economics Integrated Project: Students preparing to teach Home Economics in secondary schools must register in timetable #92607 which includes HMED 314, EDUC 311, EDUC 315, EDUC 316, EDUC 319, EDUC 329 and EDUC 420. In addition to the standard timetable students need to register in the C & I course(s) for their second teaching subject or a Home Economics elective, EDST 314, EPSE 306 and EPSE 317. In addition students will register in HMED 465B section 301 in Term 2. This course is being offered on a pilot basis and will assist students with their preparation for the extended practicum. The 3 credits earned for HMED 465 will count towards the 9 credits of professional development electives required in the Summer Session. On Tuesday, September 5, 2000 following the general orientation in the Old Auditorium, students will meet faculty and other students from 10:30 am to 12:30 pm in Scarfe 1022, for an orientation specific to this project cohort.

Mathematics, Science and Technology Studies
Registrants in the teacher education program who are preparing to teach mathematics, science or technology studies will be able to chose from the following options:
- the Secondary Mathematics Integrated Project,
- the Secondary Mathematics, Science and Technology Integrated Project,
- the Secondary Science Integrated Project,
- the Secondary Technology Studies Integrated Project.

The choice will have implications for the kind of education received. The Secondary Mathematics Integrated Project will focus exclusively on issues in mathematics education, with a significant amount of time being spent in schools during the first term. The Secondary Science Integrated Project will focus exclusively on issues in science education. The Secondary Technology Education Integrated Project will focus exclusively on issues in technology education with a significant amount of time being spent in schools during the first term. The Secondary Mathematics, Science and Technology Integrated Project will highlight issues of integration across the three subjects. Preference will be given to students with teaching fields in two of the three areas. Students with teaching fields in Mathematics and Science must register in the Secondary Mathematics, Science and Technology Integrated Project.

Mathematics Integrated Project: Students with Mathematics as their major or as one of their teaching fields may register in timetable #90161 which includes MAED 314, EDUC 311, EDUC 315, EDUC 316, EDUC 319, EDUC 329 and EDUC 420. Students with Mathematics as their only teaching field must also register in MAED 372. Students with a second teaching field must also register in a C & I course in the second field. All students need to register in EDST 314, EPSE 306 and EPSE 317. On Tuesday, September 5, 2000 following the general orientation in the Old Auditorium, students will meet faculty and other students at 10:30 am in Scarfe 1214, for an orientation specific to this project cohort.

Mathematics, Science and Technology Integrated Project: Students with one teaching field in either Mathematics, Science or Technology or in combination, may register in timetable #98191 which includes courses in Applied Studies curriculum and instruction. The project will provide students with preparation to teach in their particular subject(s) while emphasizing applications and integration across subjects. The timetable includes CUST 314, CUST 416, EDUC 311, EDUC 315, EDUC 316, EDUC 319, EDUC 329 and EDUC 420. In addition to the standard timetable students need to register in EDST 314, EPSE 306 and EPSE 317. On Tuesday, September 5, 2000 following the general orientation in the Old Auditorium, students will meet faculty and other students at 10:30 am in Scarfe 1211, for an orientation specific to this project cohort.

Music Integration Project: This program is based on the notion that in the process of musicians becoming music educators. Students will benefit from development and support in a sustained community of learners who come together to explore issues of music learning and teaching, and engage in critical discourse of personal and group growth processes in becoming secondary school music specialists. It will bring together education and music learning theories and practice for student musicians becoming music educators. The participants will experience more coherence between courses and be encouraged to develop through continual discourse with all the instructors in the music education program.
Students preparing to teach music in secondary schools must register in timetable 96855 which includes MUED 314, EDUC 311, EDUC 315, EDUC 316, EDUC 3198, EDUC 329 and EDUC 420. In addition to the standard timetable students need to register in the Curriculum and Instruction course(s) for their second teaching subject or Music elective(s), EDST 314, EPSE 306 and EPSE 317. On Tuesday, September 5, 2000 following the general orientation in the Old Auditorium, students will meet faculty and other students at 10:30 am in Scarfe 1317, for an orientation specific to this project cohort.

**Science Integrated Project:** Students preparing to teach any fields in Science may register in one of the following timetables:
- #92013, #95387, #98171 or #99753. The timetables include SCED 316, EDUC 311, EDUC 315, EDUC 319, EDUC 329 and EDUC 420. Students must also register in the specific course or courses for their first science teaching field and the C & I course for their second teaching field or in the case of students with one science teaching field, an elective. All students need to register in EDST 314, EPSE 306 and EPSE 317. On Tuesday, September 5, 2000 following the general orientation in the Old Auditorium, students will meet faculty and other students at 10:30 am for an orientation specific to these project cohorts.

- Timetable 92013 meet in Scarfe 1204
- Timetable 95387 meet in Scarfe 1207
- Timetable 98171 meet in Scarfe 1210
- Timetable 99753 meet in Scarfe 1128

**Technology Studies Integrated Project:** Students preparing to teach Technology Education may register in timetable #91959 which includes TSED 314, EDUC 311, EDUC 315, EDUC 316, EDUC 319, EDUC 320 and EDUC 420. In addition to the standard timetable students need to register for a C & I course for their second teaching field or an elective. All students need to register in EDST 314, EPSE 306 and EPSE 317. On Tuesday, September 5, 2000 following the general orientation in the Old Auditorium, students will meet faculty and other students at 10:30 am in Scarfe 1130, for an orientation specific to this project cohort.

French immersion, Core French, French schools: This is a cohort of a maximum of 36 students who have the opportunity to take many of their courses together in French. Learning content in French allows them to continue to develop their French skills during the year. In addition to the French methodology course, students take their core courses such as Educational Psychology, Educational Studies, Principles of Teaching, and Communication together. These courses are offered in French as long as there are qualified bilingual instructors to teach them. In classes taught in French, assignments are done in French and students have the choice of writing their exams in French or in English. Students register in timetable #91109 which includes EDUC 311, EDUC 315, EDUC 316, EDUC 319, EDUC 329 AND EDUC 420. In addition to the standard timetable students need to register in the Curriculum and Instruction course(s) related to their teaching field(s), EPSE 306, EPSE 317 and EDST 314.
Appendix B - Consent Letters
If you decide not to participate, you may withdraw at any time. If you decide to withdraw you may request that any information provided be withheld from the study.

Sincerely,

Dan Pratt  
Educational Studies  
Psychology  
and Special Education

John Collins  
Educational Studies

Sandra Jarvis  
Educational and Counseling
Consent Form

This is an extra copy of the consent form and has been included for your personal records.

NAME: ____________________________________________

ADDRESS: ____________________________________________

PHONE NUMBER: ____________________________________________

EMAIL ADDRESS: ____________________________________________

I have read and understood the study description of "Assessing Changes and Stability in Orientations to Teaching Among Novice Teachers."

_____ Yes, I would like to participate.

_____ No, I would not like to participate.

SIGNATURE: ____________________________________________

DATE: ____________________________________________

Course: ____________ Section: ____________

Identification Number: ___________________
** CONSENT FORM **

Consent Form

Please return this form signed, dated and with all pertinent information completed.

An extra copy of this form has been included for your personal records.

NAME: ____________________________

ADDRESS: __________________________

PHONE NUMBER: __________________________

EMAIL ADDRESS: __________________________

I have read and understood the study description of "Assessing Changes and Stability in Orientations to Teaching Among Novice Teachers."

______ Yes, I would like to participate.

______ No, I would not like to participate.

SIGNATURE: __________________________

DATE: __________________________

Course: ____________ Section: ____________

Identification Number: __________________________
This inventory will help you identify the actions, intentions, and beliefs that make up your perspectives on teaching or facilitating learning. While you may not see yourself primarily as a teacher, you may have educational responsibilities that involve the teaching or instruction of others. If you are a teacher/instructor/facilitator, think of a specific content and a set of learners as you consider the following statements. If you are not a teacher/instructor/facilitator, think of a situation in which you usually have some educational or instructional responsibility.

**ACTIONS - What do you do when instructing or teaching?**

For each statement circle the letter code that best represents how often you do each action when teaching or instructing people.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I cover the required content accurately and in the allotted time.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I link the subject matter with real settings of practice or application.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I ask a lot of questions while teaching.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I find something to compliment in everyone’s work or contribution.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I use the subject matter as a way to teach about higher ideals.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. My teaching is governed by the course objectives.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I model the skills and methods of good practice.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I challenge familiar ways of understanding the subject matter.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I encourage expressions of feeling and emotion.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I emphasize values more than knowledge in my teaching.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I make it very clear to people what they are to learn.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I see to it that novices learn from more experienced people.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I encourage people to challenge each others’ thinking.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I share my own feelings and expect my learners to do the same.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I help people see the need for changes in society.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**INTENTIONS - What do you *try to accomplish* in your instruction or teaching?**

For each of the following, circle the letter code that best represents how OFTEN you set out to accomplish each intention when instructing or teaching people.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16. My intent is to present content so as to prepare people for examinations.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. My intent is to demonstrate how to perform or work in real situations.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. My intent is to help people develop more complex ways of reasoning.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. My intent is to build people’s self-confidence and self-esteem as learners.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. My intent is to challenge people to seriously reconsider their values.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I expect people to master a lot of information related to the subject.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I expect people to know how to apply the subject matter in real settings.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I expect people to develop new ways of reasoning about the subject matter.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I expect people to enhance their self-esteem through my teaching.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. I expect people to be committed to changing our society.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. I want people to score well on examinations as a result of my teaching.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. I want people to understand the realities of working in the real world.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. I want people to see how complex and inter-related things really are.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. I want to provide a balance between caring and challenging as I teach.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. I want to make apparent what people take for granted about society.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Please go on to the next page.*
BELIEFS - What do you *believe* about instructing or teaching?

For each statement circle the letter code that best represents your Agreement or Disagreement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31. Learning is enhanced by having predetermined objectives.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. To be an effective teacher, one must be an effective practitioner.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Most of all, learning depends on what one already knows.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. It’s important that I acknowledge learners’ emotional reactions.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. My teaching focuses on societal change, not the individual learner.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Teachers should be virtuoso performers of their subject matter.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. The best learning comes from working alongside good practitioners.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Teaching should focus on developing qualitative changes in thinking.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. In my teaching, building self-confidence in learners is a priority.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Individual learning without social change is not enough.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Effective teachers must first be experts in their own subject areas.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Knowledge and its application cannot be separated.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Teaching should build upon what people already know.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. In learning, people’s effort should be rewarded as much as achievement.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. For me, teaching is a moral act as much as an intellectual activity.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

... Please continue on to the last page.
BACKGROUND: A few questions about you and your teaching responsibilities . . .

46. Approximately how many years have you been instructing, educating, or teaching? __________

47. In addition to any teaching, about how many years have you practiced your specialty? __________

48. What kind of specialties or subjects do you usually teach? ______________________________________

49. What specific content did you have in mind when completing this inventory? ________________________

50. Describe the learners you had in mind while completing this inventory? ____________________________

51. Approximately what percentage of your normal work routine involves instructing others? ________%

52. Check the category that best describes most of your learners:
   - □ Children   □ Youth   □ Young adults   □ Mid-aged adults   □ Older adults

53. What is your gender? □ Female   □ Male

54. Was there anyone or anything that particularly influenced the way you educate or instruct others? Who or what was/is that, and how did they/it influence you? Please comment below.

More information about the research behind this inventory and these perspectives on teaching can be found in Pratt, D.D. and Associates (1998). Five Perspectives on Teaching in Adult and Higher Education, Malabar, FL: Krieger Publishing. If you would like to contact the author directly you can send an e-mail message to: dan.pratt@ubc.ca
Appendix D - Interview 1 and 2 Questions
**Interview Questions - Interview #1**

**Dissertation**

1. I'm interested in your experience, your journey if you will, from being a student to becoming a teacher. Specifically, I want to better understand the challenges you face as you make the shift from student to teacher. But let's start further back. Tell me, how did you come to decide on becoming a teacher?

2. What's it been like during this first term? Tell me about the term, in general.

3. Draw a time-line for this term and tell me about the 'markers,' those moments or incidents that stand out thus far. (remember to focus back to the central question of becoming a teacher.)

   **Possible Follow-ups**
   a. What is it about them that makes them stand out?
   b. What happened?
   c. Why was that important?
   d. What do you think about that?
   e. How does that connect to your journey from student to teacher?
   f. Does it have implications for the kind of teacher you want to become?

4. What's been interesting or challenging this term? What might that mean for your becoming a teacher?

5. Draw a line (anchor the left side with “completely comfortable” and the right side with “completely uncomfortable”). Mark a spot on that line where you think you are right now in this program.

   **Possible Follow-ups**
   a. Tell me what it means to be there?
   b. Why did you put the mark there?

6. Draw a line (anchor the left side with “Student” and the right side with “Teacher”). Mark a spot on that line where you think you are right now in the program in terms of thinking whether you are a student or a teacher.

   **Possible Follow-ups**
   a. Tell me why you put the mark there?
   b. Tell me what it means to be there?

7. Have you thought about yourself as ‘teacher'? If you have, describe yourself as a teacher. How does your description compare to the picture of ‘teacher’ that you have been taught in this program?
8. Draw a line (anchor the left side with “perfect fit” and the right side with “no fit”). Make a mark where you feel you “fit the vision of teaching” so far, at the end of term one?

Possible Follow-ups
a. Tell me what it means to be there?

b. What is difficult about being there?

9. Is there anything about teaching, as presented in your program, that you take issue with or disagree with? What is it? What's important for you in that comparison?

10. Have you felt pressured to adopt a particular view of teaching? Is that view similar or different to what you thought coming into the program? How is it similar/different?

Ending the Interview

11. Is there anything we haven’t discussed today that you would like to mention.

12. Usually after such an interview people tend to think of things they would have liked to say. I was wondering if you would do me one favour. In a weeks time (or so), could you email me with anything that you thought of after the fact. If there’s nothing you thought of simply email me with a “nothing new” response.

13. I would also like to ask permission to email you if I think of something I might have missed.
Interview Questions – INTERVIEW #2

Dissertation

INTRODUCTION
As you may remember I'm interested in your experience, your journey if you will, from being a student to becoming a teacher. Specifically, I want to better understand the challenges you face as you make the shift from student to teacher.

1. What's it been like during this second term (during your practicum)? Tell me about the term, in general.

2. Draw a time-line for this term and tell me about the 'markers,' those moments or incidents that stand out thus far. (Remember to focus back to the central question of becoming a teacher.)

   **Possible Follow-ups**
   a. What is it about them that make them stand out?
   b. What happened?
   c. Why was that important?
   d. What do you think about that?
   e. How does that connect to your journey from student to teacher?
   f. Does it have implications for the kind of teacher you want to become?

3. What's been interesting or challenging this term? What might that mean for your becoming a teacher?

4. Draw a line (anchor the left side with “completely comfortable” and the right side with “completely uncomfortable”). Mark a spot on that line where you think you are right now in this program.

   ..............................and in terms of your teaching (two marks on the line)

   **Possible Follow-ups**
   a. Tell me what it means to be there?
   b. Why did you put the mark there?

5. Draw a line (anchor the left side with “Student” and the right side with “Teacher”). Mark a spot on that line where you think you are right now in the program in terms of thinking whether you are a student or a teacher.

   **Possible Follow-ups**
   a. Tell me why you put the mark there?
   b. Tell me what it means to be there?

6. Now having completed your practicum how would you describe yourself as a teacher. How does your description compare to the picture of 'teacher' that you have been taught in this program?
7. Draw a line (anchor the left side with "perfect fit" and the right side with "no fit"). Make a mark where you feel you "fit the vision of teaching" so far (either from the program at UBC or from your school – i.e. your sponsor teachers), at the end of 2 terms?

Possible Follow-ups
a. Tell me what it means to be there?
b. What is difficult about being there?

8. Is there anything about teaching, as presented in your program including your practicum and at UBC, that you take issue with or disagree with? What is it? What's important for you in that comparison?

9. Have you felt pressured to adopt a particular view of teaching? Is that view similar or different to what you thought coming into the program? How is it similar/different?

Ending the Interview

10. Is there anything we haven't discussed today that you would like to mention.

11. Usually after such an interview people tend to think of things they would have liked to say. I was wondering if you would do me one favour. In a week's time (or so), could you email me with anything that you thought of after the fact. If there's nothing you thought of simply email me with a "nothing new" response.

12. I would also like to ask permission to email you if I think of something I might have missed.
Appendix E - Teaching Perspectives Inventory – Raw Scores
Dominant perspectives are shown in bold.
Participants are sorted alphabetically.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Time 1</th>
<th>Time 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>,.,.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>,.,.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>,.,.</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>,.,.</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>,.,.</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>,.,.</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>,.,.</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>,.,.</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>,.,.</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>,.,.</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>,.,.</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>,.,.</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teaching Perspectives Inventory - Raw Scores
Concept Map: Challenge Analysis

Me As Student
- Instructors
- Coursework
- Program Messages
- Fit
- Cohort
- Program Experiences
- Issues
- Term Timeline

Making Transitions
- Professional Development
- Fit
- The Journey
- Program Expectations / Impressions

Me As Teacher
- Successes
- Struggles
- Sponsor Teachers
- Faculty Advisor
- Students
- Practicum Experiences
- Practicum Expectations / Impressions
- Impact
- Back to UBC
- Beliefs
- Practicum Messages
- Uncertainties