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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to make interns-central members who directed a change the nature of the conception of professional development in an online peer-led dialogue. My focuses were what pedagogical aspects in an online peer-led dialogue contributed to intern’s professional development (i.e., professional knowledge development and professional identity formation), how an online peer-led dialogue could create new pedagogical discourses in relation to teacher’s professional development, how interns took different perspectives and created new images of teacher, how this online peer-led dialogue promoted deepening understanding of the practice of teaching, and how social transformation and teachers empowerment were undertook in dialogue.

In terms of these research purposes, the research was conducted an online discussion forum in a rural area of Central Pennsylvania during the 2008 academic year. A research method used in this study was participatory action research, which could bring about critical consciousness through dialogic interaction, changing the nature of learning knowledge about teachers and the role of teachers, and teacher empowerment. Data collection was from written dialogue from an online discussion forum, forum design, and activity reports. Data analysis was focused on interns developed their critical consciousness through dialogic interaction among other interns, whether such critical consciousness contributed to intern’s empowerment and constructing critical selfhood.

By conducting this research, I discovered that online peer-led dialogue had a great potential which made possible for interns to re-discover a meaning of professional development and to construct critical selfhood. I also discovered that not all of interns could have critical consciousness toward their professional knowledge development and professional identity formation. Despite some unprecedented consequences and results,
online peer-led dialogue brought about the possibility of envisioning a new way of a teacher education from a professional development school’s sense.
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Chapter One

Introduction

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to make interns central members who directed a change the nature in the conception of professional development. Through practice teaching, interns have different views of their experiences and knowledge related to student learning and learning to teach. In terms of changing the view of a teacher education, both teacher educators and interns have to use a new pedagogical platform, which is online. In this regard, online is of growing importance in a teacher education. In an online peer-led dialogue, all professional development is carried out through dialogue among participants (Burbules, 2006).

Despite a value of online dialogue in a teacher education, the current teacher education programs are often unwilling to use it to develop teacher’s professional knowledge and to constitute teacher’s professional identity. It is because if a teacher educator uses online dialogue in a teacher education, they are concerned about losing control over intern’s quality as a teacher. With maintaining control of what knowledge interns must have, most teacher education programs tend to undertake professional development in both formal institutional settings and direct contact with so-called experts-teacher educators, educational researchers, mentor teachers, and university associates. Within a formal teacher education, interns are considered no more than as a student of teaching and an object of study. Interns can find it hard to become active participants to develop their own professional knowledge and constitute their own professional identity.
The aim of using online dialogue as a pedagogical platform is to create a new space for professional learning and to reinvent professional knowledge and professional identity through understanding the nature of knowledge production and identity formation. As a university associate in a professional development school, I can share many different concerns with interns who are participating in developing knowledge about teaching and identity as a teacher. Sometimes, when interns have different ideas and perspectives associated with classroom teaching, they cannot reflect on their ideas and perspectives on their practices of teaching. It is not because they have lack of knowledge about teaching but because they have lack of experiences and lack of understanding the situations that they have never experienced. For interns, it is important to understand contexts, cultural differences, and social relations, which enrich their pedagogical knowledge about teaching and cultural and social agencies.

An online peer-led dialogue in a professional development school provides an opportunity for learning from other intern’s experiences, ideas, perspectives, and thoughts. Unlike a formal teacher education, professional development becomes conducted by interns. Exchanging different experiences, ideas, perspectives, and thoughts with other interns construe the process of developing professional knowledge and constituting professional identity. This process is very helpful to identify the problems of practices and formulate collective solutions for the problems of practices.

Therefore, In this study, I focus on what pedagogical aspects in a dialogue contribute to interns’ professional development, which is represented as professional knowledge development and professional identity formation and how peer-led dialogue can produce new pedagogical discourses in relation to teachers’ professional development. At the same time, I also focus on how interns take different perspectives and create new images of teachers and how an online community promotes deepening understanding of the practices of teaching.
In addition, I focus on both social transformation and teacher empowerment through dialogic inquiries among interns.

**Problem statement**

The current teacher education has little to do dealing with the issues of intern-intern professional development so that intern might have less chance to work with other interns. Interns were not considered as a important member in a professional community, so only teacher educators and educational researchers were qualified enough to deal with the complexity of teacher’s professional development. At the same time, the current teacher education programs ignored the fact that a formation of a professional development school imposed on interns both time and institutional constraints, limiting the opportunity to build a professional learning community for interns.

Of course, interns have a lot of different types of opportunity to improve their competences and qualifications working with university supervisors, mentor teachers and consultants. Yet, they feel insecure or vulnerable in the development of professional knowledge and professional identity through having dialogue with university supervisors, mentor teachers, and consultants. Interns recognized that interacting with these people gave a clear sense of what they had to do and where they should go. Every single day interns faced totally different kinds of concerns and problems, which they had never experienced. University supervisors and consultants wouldn’t face those concerns and problems and mentor teachers were preoccupied with their own direction to deal with those problems.

From a pilot study in which I overviewed tensions that interns encountered at a institutional level, pedagogical level, curricular level, and classroom level, I found that most interns were less concerned about relationships with their students but more concerned about
relationships with their mentor teachers, consultants and others. It indicated that interns desperately needed a space for themselves to lessen their concerns and problems. Instead, interns recognized it as the pre-given task that they ought to do. For this reason, it is important for interns to see the consequence of growing their competence and qualifications in terms of professional development and professional identity as a teacher.

Within an online peer-led dialogue, interns undergo the development of professional knowledge and the formation of professional identity. I assumed that it would be different from the formal way of professional development. However, educational researchers and teacher educators hardly noticed the possibility of intern-intern professional development. They also left out online as a pedagogical space and mediational space for dialogic interaction among interns. Four important constructs of online dialogue, peer-led dialogue, professional development, and professional identity. These constructs are my thematic analysis presented in this thesis.

**Research Questions**

As stated above, in this study I explored how online peer-led dialogue contributes to interns' professional knowledge development and professional identity formation that cultivated new cultural understanding of interns’ lives in schools, why dialogue is important for interns to work with other interns and learn from them, and finally how, in the process of intern-intern professional knowledge development, interns perceive themselves as professionals who are able to identify and challenge assumptions imposed on them in the current set-up of school and professional development school. These questions were examined in online discussion forum for professional knowledge development and professional identity formation.
**The overarching question**: How do interns construct professional knowledge and professional identity in online peer-led dialogue?

**Sub-questions**:

1) What aspects of pedagogical knowledge and teacher identity are engaged in dialogue?

2) How does dialogue foster interns’ critical consciousness by exposing them to multiple perspectives proposed by other interns?

**Significance of This Study**

The central focus of this study is to investigate how dialogic interaction between interns contributes to the development of interns’ professional knowledge and professional identity. For this reason, this study is important in several aspects. First, the result of this study will identify interns’ concern and how they solved their problems with other interns’ help. Secondly, participating interns can identify and challenge the underlying assumptions regarding their professional knowledge development and professional identity formation through dialogic interactions between interns. Third, interns will be able to distinguish difference between the requirement of certification and professional knowledge development. Professional knowledge development can include the concept of the process of certification endorsement. At the same time, interns must be able to get a sense of professional consciousness, which foster interns to reset the relationship between students and teachers and create a new learning community where interns can help each other to get beyond their own limitation in relation to their classroom teaching. Moreover, interns go over the process of transforming their student selves into their professional selves, which encourages them to
rethink their cultural and social agency that they can negotiate differences generated by their prior experiences and knowledge from the college education.

Within a particular professional community, interns may be able to acquire the different pedagogical discourse in relation to their professional development and they can turn their perception of professional consciousness through their experiences and inquiry. Interns not only undertake developing their problem-solving skills in order to improve their practice of teaching and detect their problems of practice by exchanging their observations and reflecting on their experience of students teaching with other interns. More importantly, interns can think of where they are now and where they should go. It means that they can locate themselves in the current dominant educational discourse and acknowledge what they ought to do in order to change the purpose of education based on changing the perception of their professional consciousness. In addition, having professional consciousness, interns will be able to get a sense of becoming a teacher, neither ending up with their student teaching nor endorsing certification. Rather interns can become sensitive to the change of the purpose of education due to the demand of the particular time and space. Through the process of professional knowledge development and professional identity formation, interns may develop collective reflection on the practices of teaching and they can link their personal understanding of teaching learning and the role of teacher to the professional need of educational changes within the particular teacher education program.

The most important part of this study is to develop professional knowledge and construct professional identity through intern-intern dialogic interaction. At the same time, another important thing is whether interns think an online discussion forum is a pedagogical space for professional development. If they consider this pedagogical space, interns will be able to actively participate in the process of changing their perception of teaching and being a teacher. Interns also think through other interns’ concerns and struggles as an important
source of their professional development and rethink cultural, historical, political, and social knowledge about teaching by recognizing the existence of difference within the same learning community.

In consequence, the central goal of this professional knowledge development and professional identity formation, in terms of dialogic interaction, helps interns to change their points of views and investigate conflicting values of the current educational realities and institutional discourses in order to transform it and transform their student selves into teacher selves which bring schools into new pedagogical knowledge suitable for the new generation.
Chapter Two

Review of Literature

The current teacher education literatures focused much on the improvement of vocational qualifications and occupational competences (Usher & Edwards 1994). This notion of vocational qualifications and occupational competences reduced a meaning of professional development as a degree of intern’s preparation for teaching. Under this condition, an intern was required to learn disciplinary knowledge and disciplined inquiry (Dewey, 1938; Foucault, 1979).

To challenge a meaning of professional development as a degree of intern’s professional development, many teacher educators brought dialogue in the center of professional development (Burbules, 1993, 2006, Darling –Hammond, 2006; Freire & Faundez, 1989; Freire, 1970, O’Hanlon, 1996, Shor, 1992; Shor & Friere, 1987). In particular, combination between online and dialogue was growing important in a teacher education (Burbules, 2006). Banathy (2002) asserts that dialogue in an online environment provides opportunity for learning …. They share their ideas freely and they learn from each other”. They develop a shared mind, and think and search together in new and creative ways. They awaken to their collective intelligence. (p.42)

It implies that interns can think together in order to find a new idea of the problems of practices and make a meaningful connection of their practices of teaching to those who have different ideas about them. At the same time, Banathy (2002) consistently indicates that shared meaning and understanding offers “a unique opportunity for learning from each other,
nurturing collective intelligence, and developing social competence” (pp.42-43). According to her, she makes three important aspects of dialogue: (1) “Dialogue is culture building, (2) dialogue fosters the power of collective creation, and (3) Dialogue can transform conflict into cooperation” (Banathy, 2002, p.43).

Burbules (2006) points out that an online peer-led dialogue may create a new culture in a professional learning community. This new culture facilitates the development of collective intelligence by sharing experiences and understanding the difference between interns. Banathy (2002) insists that interns are able to “transform existing patterns of thought and thinking together” (p.43). Interns can develop an ability to enhance the power of collective creation. More importantly, Yankelovich (1999) asserts that “long-standing stereotypes are dissolved, mistrust is overcome; mutual understanding is achieved; visions are shaped and grounded shared-purposes; new perspectives and insights are gained and bond of community is strengthened” (p.16). In other words, professional development was not merely taken place in an individual level but rather in a more collective and creative way to challenge long-standing stereotypes and assumptions. In terms of the power of collective creation, Britzman (2003) emphasizes that learning to teach is to learn professional knowledge from others and to think together for reaching mutual understanding the issues of the practices of teaching. This collective creation contributes to develop critical consciousness about the consequence of professional development and to develop transformative experiences. Joyce and Tutela (2006) insist, “these transformative experiences helped interns to realize the potential damage of a restrictive environment to the human potential of teachers as well as students” (p.63). At the same time, they lead interns to “seek multiple ways to address that situation” (p.63)

**Key Features of Dialogue**
In this study, understanding key features of dialogue is important because this study focuses on online peer-led dialogue. Dialogue is 1) collaborative, 2) democratic, 3) participatory, 4) reflective, and 5) transformative (Shor & Freire, 1987; Shor, 1992; Roberts, 2002; Anderson, Baxter, & Cissna, 2004).

Dialogue is collaborative (Burbules, 2006). Collaboration means “a process of how to relate to people” (Horton & Freire, 1990, p.53). Professional knowledge development and professional identity formation would not only occur in an individual level but would also occur in a collective dimension of dialogic interactions between people (Kincheloe, 1992; Britzman, 2003). Dialogue is a reciprocal educative process (Dewey, 1938). In a collaborative learning environment, the equality of conversation partners is important because without mutuality, teachers cannot continue on co-exploring and co-developing the way they construct professional knowledge and identity. Freire and Faundez (1989) pointed out that “in order to discover ourselves, we need to see ourselves in the other, to understand the other in order to understand ourselves, to enter into the other” (p.14). The process of collaborative learning in this sense makes us become richer understanding of ourselves and the others.

Dialogue is democratic (Freire, 1970; Shor & Freire, 1987; Shor, 1992). The democratic nature of dialogue cultivated students’ ability to think critically about learning and teaching in school. It encouraged students to “deeply explore ideas, to make meaningful connections, and to imagine possibilities” through true participation in the process of producing democratic tendencies in student learning and teacher teaching within a school (Hyttten, 2004, p.149). According to him, students became aware of how undemocratic education “exacerbated student passivity and disengagement in school” (p.149). Without participation, it is impossible for a teacher to learn and experience the practices of teaching. The democratic nature of dialogue fosters teachers to participate in the process of collectively
developing professional knowledge and professional identity. Gergen, McNamee, and Barrett (2002) claimed that teachers could have “ample opportunity to share view that were important to them” (p.88). Guinier shared the same thought with Gergen, McNamee, and Barret. Guinier (1994) explained it,

Public dialogue is critical to represent all perspectives; no one viewpoint should be permitted to monopolize, distort, caricature, or shape public debate. We cannot all talk at once, but that doesn’t mean only one group get to speak. We can take turn. (pp.19-20).

She stressed the significance of democratic aspects of dialogue in the learning organization. Teachers could see the possibility of mutual respect for the voices of others. Within a limitation of learning organization, as I understood, “each individual must be willing to let the other’s stance challenge his or her own, to test ideas, while still affirming the personhood of challenger” (Arnett, 1986, p.152).

Dialogue is reflective (Burbules, 1993). Reflection is a necessity for changing the nature of teaching and teacher. Dewey (1934) insisted that interaction and continuity was the most important element of dialogue. Rogers made an important point about grasping the deep sense of a dialogue as a means of reflection between one and another. Rogers (2002) notes that

Without interaction learning is sterile and passive, never fundamentally changing the learner. Without continuity learning is random and disconnected, building toward nothing within the learner or in the world. (p.847)
If dialogue was not grounded in interaction and continuity, there was no reflection and no change in the learner and the world. To make dialogue as an educative experience, Dewey (1938) indicated that teachers became aware of their reality, established constructive direction, and broadened the field of experiences. Schon explained that there were two types of reflection: “reflection-in-action (at the moment of experiences) and reflection-on-action (thinking back on an experience)” (Schon cited in Wade, 2008, p.402).

Dialogue is participatory (Shor & Freire, 1987). Professional knowledge and professional identity were constructed through participation. In dialogue, participation was a form of interaction with other teachers, to exchange the experience of teaching, and to share the difference among teachers within a classroom and outside a classroom. The role of participation could constitute the role of teachers and the relationships with students who were engaged in the process of learning through critical voices.

Dialogue is reflective. Lyons (2002a) defined reflection as an intentional act of mind, engaging a person alone or in collaboration with others in interrogating one’s teaching, especially a compelling or puzzling situation of teaching or learning to construct some understanding of it. Through dialogic reflection, teachers would develop collective understanding of the problems of practices. Dialogue is critical to foster interns to collectively “revisit and inquire in their own teaching” so that interns can develop alternative approaches to their practices of teaching at schools (Lyons, 2006, p.156).

Dialogue is transformative (Gergen, McNamee, & Barret, 2002; Shor & Freire, 1987). Within a transformative dialogic self, “it is necessary to clarify a point” of view and difference from one to another (Horton & Freire, 1990, 131). The importance of transformation is to understand the culture of a professional institution, which provides teachers with a deep sense of being a teacher and forming critical consciousness about them within a school (Giroux, 2001). Kincheloe (1992) informed that transformative force in
Dialogue allow teachers to develop critical consciousness which fostered teachers to gain an ability to ask unique questions and problem detecting related to their teaching practices and the experience of teaching. For teachers, they encounter the inevitable conflict once they reside in the particular discursive orientation. Dialogue as a transformative forces is to make the meaningful experiences in the process of constituting a professional self within a particular learning community where interns would be able to learn something that they develop the abilities to negotiate with and mediate to the problem of building professional relationship with their students. At the same time, transformation of teacher consciousness encouraged teachers to take “responsibility for education” and for their own learning to teach (Shor & Freire, 1987, p171).

**Dialogue as a Community of Practice**

Bellah et al. (1985) defined that community is

A group of people who are socially interdependent, who participate together in discussion and decision making, and who share certain practices that both define the community and are nurtured by it (p.333).

Within this community, they imply that profession development is to promote collective thinking about the issues of teaching and to learn from others by sharing different perspectives on the issues of the practices of teaching. Ellinor and Gerard (1998) informed that this collective thinking process lead interns to a new culture of sharing meanings and experiences. Husu and Tirri (2007) emphasize that it helps interns to “share the sense of identity and common sense knowledge of pedagogical practices” constructed by the socially
interdependent nature of teaching practices (p.393). This new culture of a professional
learning community may create new ways of interaction between interns and encourage
interns to engage in a collective reflection in their and our everyday life (Faundez & Freire,
1989, p.28). Moreover, Ellinor and Gerard (1998) claim that dialogue is a process of
embracing a socially interdependent relationship between all participants who contribute to
building new pedagogical knowledge in relation to developing intern’s professional language
about teaching. a nature of interdependent relationship promotes and embrace more of our
human potentials by keeping the quality of cooperation and balance between interns and a
process of socialization which enriches communal and institutional values about the
collective thinking within a professional learning community. Weil (2004) emphasizes that
this collective thinking allows us to “see why we believe what we believe and why we act as
we act” (p.65). In dialogue, the collective thinking comes out of collaboration. Within this
learning community,

Collaboratively they develop a plan of action that is responsive to the multiple
ways of approaching and understanding the situation. (McNamee & Shotter,
2004, p. 103)

By sharing meanings and experiences, interns can develop action plans. This action plan
enables interns to take different approaches and understand the situation in the multiple and
creative ways. In order to accomplish collaborative learning and collective thinking about the
practices of teaching, Deetz and Simpson (2004) assert, “dialogue requires both forums—
place for occurrence—and voice—the capacity to freely develop and express one’s own
interest” (p.142). According to Burbules (2006), online is a pedagogical space for developing
professional knowledge and shifting perspectives from stereotypical ways of learning and
new and creative ways of learning. More importantly, sharing meanings and experiences are based upon the voices of the participation. Britzman (2003) claims, “voice permits participation in the world. In her view, voice is another form of participation in the world. In terms of voice as a form of participation, she makes a very important point which learning to teach is not an individual reflection to think about other people’s thinking but rather a collective reflection in order to deepen understanding of the consequence of the collaborative learning and the collective thinking. Bakhtin clearly explains how we know what we know is correct and appropriate in a collective and collaborative dimension.

I achieve self-consciousness, I become myself only by revealing myself to another, through another and with another’s help. (Bakhtin, as quoted in Todorov, 1984, p. 96)

He argues that both development and learning is only possible when a person shares his/her views with other people. It helps interns to articulate who they are and what they are doing (Slater, 2004). In other words, sharing oneself with others offers an opportunity to get a clear sense of self and reframe a way of knowing about oneself. Sharing oneself with others is “able to test one’s own views and experiences against those of other similarly motivated to solve a common problem” (Linder, 2002, p.63). In this regard, a person can resituate his/her understanding into the new context and culture and clarify his/her value claim appropriate. Bakhtin (1996) emphasizes that this collective thinking and collaborative learning enhance a person’s capacity to learn new knowledge and to understand the limitations of an individual reflection on the practices of teaching.

We accent each other in a way that we have a lot to learn from each other…I am learning a lot about how somebody else view the world…It keeps me with an open
mind and make me more understanding of other people (quoted in Baxter & Montgomery, 1996, p.31).

Talking together and thinking together cultivate the culture of sharing and the culture of collective learning (Bohm & Peat, 1987). They are helpful for interns to consider other interns as sources of knowledge so that they can “learn from each other and produce a deep shift in our understanding of the power” (Banathy, 2002, p.41). It also provides more opportunities to “engage in further growth and development in order to better serve the needs” of developing their professional knowledge and shape their professional identities which pertain to understanding their social positions (p.247).

Through collective thinking and collaborative learning in a professional learning community, they can synthesize information, generate interpretations, and revise and sophisticate those interpretations at the site the inquiry takes place (Kincheloe, 1991). Wade et al. (2008) concluded that a community of practice could help interns “reframe problems from multiple perspectives,” “seeking collective solutions,” and “evaluating proposed solutions in reflective and critical ways” (p.403). She continually contended that collective reflective thinking was “locating the problem, which occurs after teachers have observed and described a problematic experience” (p.403). Horton and Freire (1990) insisted that we could not work alone but we always worked together with others. They suggested, “we have to go beyond the common sense of the people, with people. My quest is not to go alone but to go with the people” (p.101). In the community-base practices, people had to work together in order to overcome their initial difficulties in the classroom and collectively solve the problems of practices. Dewey (1938) clearly explained that the understanding of groups provided insights into how to create more educative environments and communities for individuals learning in social groups. Dewey continually argued that the learning experiences
were not focused in skills that were deemed useful in raising a family, getting a job, or preparing a meal. As Dewey pointed out, the learning experiences turned to other opportunity to rethink the value of experiences which must be connected to the foreseeable human potential that led teachers to reach a new level of professional responsibility which induced professional spirit in order to change the way teachers approached to their student learning and their own learning about learning to teach.

**Dialogue as critical questioning**

Britzman (2003) argues, “the repetition of activity desensitizes teachers and undermines the critical capacity to transform it into something more than going through the motions” (p.50). It implies that learning to teach has to cultivate the culture of critical reflection in the sources of knowledge and the underlying assumptions about the definition of professional knowledge. Having a critical capacity “equips interns with a special kind of expertise for verifying claims about the world and their society” (Linder, 2002, p. 63). One of the many ways of bearing critical capacity began with the questions about thinking. Posing problems (Freire & Faundez, 1989; Freire, 1970; Shor & Freire, 1987; Shor, 1992) and unique questions (Kincheloe, 1992) were to problematize the underlying assumptions about professional development in a teacher education and to challenge the trans-historical beliefs about a definition of professional development.

In a formal way of asking questions, it was calling for the right answer and one true solution for the problems of practices (Kincheloe, 1991, 1992, 2001). At the same, it required to develop the best method of teaching in order to improve student performance and student learning within a classroom. To overcome the given limitation of the formal way of question, it is necessary for a teacher to invite students asking questions about what they already knew
and what they didn’t know (Freire & Faundez, 1989; Kincheloe, 1992, Steinberg, Kincheloe & Hinchey, 1999). Faundez and Freire (1989) asserted, “all knowledge begins from asking questions” (pp.34-35). According to them, producing shared meanings was an entry point to critically explore the underlying assumptions about the consequence of knowledge development. Weil (2004) claimed that critical questioning could develop a human potential to challenge the idea of the best methods and the right answer to the pre-given question. He also claimed that critical questioning helped interns “identifying and challenging assumptions which ask us to look at how we are behaving towards our colleagues, friends, families, and community, and why we chose those behaviors” (p.63). Learning to make sense of our assumptions helps “us genuinely appreciate other points of views and to reassemble our sense of the world” (p.64). Through critical questions, interns are able to “make complete critical inventory of what we think we know and how we come to know it, and develop a new relationship with the world in terms of what we don’t know” (p.64).

Establishing a new relationship with the world offered an opportunity to be “aware of how we create our reality through our thinking process” (Ellinor & Gerard, 1998, p.39). Questioning as a thinking process require that one does not try to argue the other person down but that one really considers the weight of other’s opinion…. to question mean to lay open, to place in the open. As against the fixity of opinions, questioning makes the object and all its possibilities fluid (Gadamer, 1989, p.367). It implies that “interns have alternative points of view about the world available, especially marginalized points of view that are often left out of dominant narratives and the mainstream, and those points of views should be provided an atmosphere of collaborative inquiry and civility within which the exchange of controversial opinions of personal and social is safe” (Weil, 2004, p.65).

Openness to the other’s opinion was to promote the process of de-socialization or subverting the long-standing stereotypes and assumptions about the thinking process which
was presented as a way of knowing (Avery, Sullivan, & Wood, 1997; Foucualt, 1979; Gergen, McNamee, & Barret, 2002; Giroux, 2001; Shor, 1992; Steinberg, Kincheloe, & Hincheay, 1999; Weil, 2004). This new way of knowing is to widen interns’ “understanding of teaching beyond narrow technical concerns to the broader socio-political influence” on professional pedagogical knowledge development (Roskos, Risko and Vulkelich, 2000, p.113). In addition, it involves our ability to reason, “especially our ability to solve problems, to think critically sensibly toward conclusions, to weigh competing considerations, and to choose reasonable course of action” (Burbules, 1993, p.11). At the same time, it offered interns to challenge ‘a technical modes of rationality’ (Britzman, 2003) and develop an ability to “listen to learn about key issues in the community, dialoguing on these themes, and figuring out ways to act on problem” that interns identified through critical questioning” (Shor, 1992, p.43). In addition, Weil (2004) emphasizes that constructive critical questioning is the best way to externalize assumptions within a dialogical and dialectical setting. Critical questioning is not only critically examining what works but also what doesn’t. Critical questioning is a new version of epistemology within a particular teacher education program (Thayer-Bacon, 2001). In terms of critical questions as a new way of knowing, it implies that interns start from the everyday to know and overcome it. The way that interns cope with the problem of practices through critical questioning “to marry critical thought to everyday life by examining everyday themes, social issues, and academic lore” (Shor, 1992, p.44).

**Dialogue as a mode of inquiry**

Ellinor and Gerard (1998) define inquiry as a way of knowing about something that a person doesn’t know. Inquiry is used “for the purpose of digging deeper into one another’s assumptions and underlying thinking and to clarify and expand what we know about
something” (p.25). By definition, a way of knowing is dialogic (Shor & Freire, 1987). A 
dialogic nature of inquiry offers some perspectives for the purpose of collective reflection on 
the various educational issues. In terms of dialogue as a way of knowing, Freire (1990) assert, 
“in the process of teaching, there is the act of knowing on the part of the teacher” (p.57). 
Based on the definition of inquiry, interns may understand the process of inquiry in different 
ways. In this regard understanding inquiry stances are important. Cochran-Smith and Lytle 
(1999) argued that an inquiry stance can be supportive for all teachers.

Teaching is a complex activity that occurs within webs of social, historical, 
and political significance. Across the life span, we assert that an inquiry stance 
provides a kind of grounding within the changing culture of school reform and 
competing political agendas…Teachers and students who take inquiry stance 
work within inquiry communities to generate local knowledge, envision, and 
theorize their practice, and interpret, and interrogate the theory and research of 
others. (pp.288-289).

In their view, teaching is not value-neutral but rather it always associates with social, 
historical, and political values (Beach & Myers, 2001). In order to change the nature of 
education, interns should understand the complexity of teaching in a professional learning 
community. At the same time, they have to consider them not only as a teacher and learner 
but also as a researcher and scholar (Kincheloe, 1991; Mullen, 2004). By changing the 
perception of a teacher, Chochran-Smith and Lytle (1993) indicate that

Knowledge of teaching that is “inside/outside,” a juxtaposition intended to call 
attention to teachers as knowers and to complex and distinctly nonlinear
relationships of knowledge and teaching as they are embedded in the context and relations of power that structure the daily work of teachers and learners in both the school and the university (p.xi).

In a sense of a teacher as a researcher, they have “ownership for making significant changes”, build a new relationship of knowledge and teaching, and stimulate other to think and act (Mullen, 2004, p.355). To help propel change, a teacher’s way of knowing and a sense of ownership for knowledge of teaching can “serve as a starting point” for improving the quality of education (p.356). In Dewey’s (1938) sense, the significance of inquiry is to learn more and grow further through the exploration of underlying assumptions and thinking which affected the construction of professional knowledge. In critically examining underlying assumptions and thinking, inquiry may help intern to “develop the capacity for taking actions” and making a vision for the future (Mullen, 2004, p.356). This capacity for action and making a vision for the future are reframing the practices of teaching and reconceptualizing the meanings of experiences by sharing different perspectives about the way of knowledge acquisition. Furthermore, it is inevitable that interns have to participate in the process of learning and the diverse cultural and social discourses, which influence constructing different points of views and promote active involvement in knowledge production. Participating in the process of learning and the diverse cultural and social discourses helps us to see the ideas of others by drawing out their reasoning through questionings as well as developing an insight into our own thinking through critical reflection (Weil, 2004).

In an action perspective, voice is important. According to Britzman (2003), voice was a form of participation and of action for changes. For interns who were conducting inquiry, they had an effort to continually come to voice-with
By definition, it is important for an individual to make sense of his/her personal identity, which enables them to engage other’s point of view, insisted Henry. In this sense, a voice is a process of critical consciousness of one’s every day life and de-centered the dominant point of view (Anderson, Baxter, & Cissina, 2004; Britzman, 2003; Ellinor & Gerard, 1998; Freire, 1970, Giroux, 2001; Kincheloe & Berry, 2004; Robert et al., 2002). Giroux (2001) emphasized that a voice made possible for a teacher against the authoritarian pedagogy. Hook (1994) and McLaughlin and Kelly (2009) tried to illuminate a voice as freedom of practice and democratic participation.

Student teachers do not set out to collude with authoritarian pedagogy. Nor do they desire to suppress their own subjectivity or those of their students. Just the opposite: they usually begin with intentions of enhancing student potential and find this intention thwarted by socially patterned school routines.

(Britzman, 2003, p.237).

To create a democratic learning community is to challenge the notion of authoritarian pedagogy. Voice as freedom of practice “seeks to maximize participation in the process of inquiry” (Shor, 1992 p.136). Inquiry in a democratic authority is “a process of open communication and mutual governance in a community of shared power, where all members have a chance to express ideas to reframe purposes, and to act on intention” (p.136). By
expressing ideas to reframe purposes, and to act on intention, an ultimate task of dialogic communication as a form of inquiry is “to prepare people for life and for change” (Zilvermit, 1993, p.17). In this regard, inquiry is not only a vehicle for social change but also for the development of the professional knowledge and of a sense of agency which led interns to rediscover other’s intentions and to figure out human potentials (Carson & Sumara, 1997; Cohen, 1998; Ellinor & Gerard, 1998, Noffke & Stevenson, 1995, Schon, 1987; Zeichner, 1992, 1993). To increase human potentials is only possible through an act of knowing. Horton and Freire (1990) explain teaching as an act of knowing about what they don’t know.

In the process of teaching, there is the act of knowing on the part of the teacher. The teacher has to know the content that he teaches. Then in order to him or for her to teach, he or she has first of all to know and, simultaneously with teaching, to continue to know why the student, being invited to learn what the teachers teach, really learns when the student become able to know what it really means to know. (p.57)

He emphasize that teachers not only teach students but also learn the content that they teach and about the way their students learn and the way that their students make meanings. Teaching as an act of knowing and an act of inquiry is useful to know what teacher should teach and why they should teach. In having the pedagogical purpose of teaching as an act of knowing, it enables teachers to “overcome years of socialization” and fixed assumptions about the role of teachers (Hook, 1992, p.14).

**Dialogue as a Transformative Process of Constructing Critical Selfhood**
Slater (2004) defines identity as “the way people view themselves and is reflection of the ways in which they interact with the people in their extended community” (p.239). According to her definition, identity was socially constructed through interacting with the people rather than self-aware of who they were and what they could become. Slater indicated that “teacher often shape behavior to be consistent with the acceptable rules and regulations that govern the climate of schools” (p.239). These rules and regulations took control of teacher’s behaviors and attitudes toward what extent teachers change the way they teach in the classroom and how they contextualize the perception of self and other through understanding socially acceptable ways of understanding the process of learning to teach (Faundez & Freire, 1989). Under the limitation of institutional rules and regulation, teacher identity refers to the consequence of perceiving it, not as permanent truth of human existent but rather partial truth of human existence, which is consistent with the idea of becoming (Slater, 2004)). It means that a teacher is a person who has an ability to identify human potentials. For this reason, understanding the nature of social construction is important because it can explain the condition of human existence. Slater (2004) asserts that the condition of being “structures the way people see themselves and they act” (p.240). In this regard, dialogue may become a condition of being in the world.

Freire (1970) seems to think that human beings cannot exist outside dialogue. Dialogue is an important aspect of human existence. Burber (1992) suggests that “dialogue expresses an essential aspect of human spirit: dialogue is a way of living” (cited in Banathy, 2002, p.41). A dialogic being has an attempt to “gain new understandings and insights as to who we could become” (Kincheloe, 2001, p.388). These new understandings and insights offer an opportunity to be aware of realities in schools, which lead a teacher to construct a new selfhood and new consciousness. Kincheloe (2001) claims that this new selfhood and new consciousness make “possible to critically examine our understanding of the nature of
individualism and interdependence” (p.345). Understanding the nature of interdependence helps a teacher “analyze his/her consciousness construction and allow him/her to turn his/her focus outward to more textured understanding of the interior experiences of others” p.345). Gergen, McNamee, and Barret (2002) insist that understanding the interior experiences of others lead a teacher to “see not as a singular individuals but as representatives of groups, traditions, families, and so on” (p.87). In this sense, a teacher is a cultural and social being. Dialogue plays an important role in building relationship between people. At the same time, it is necessary for a teacher to communicate with others for the purpose of knowing oneself and evaluating one’s own point of view. Friere (1970) insists that “human existence cannot be silent nor can it be nourished by false words, but only by true word” (p.69). According to him, dialogue contributes to deepen understanding a significance of relationship and an importance of dialogic communication between people. He goes on discussing the condition of human existence in a dialogic community. He claims that “to exist, humanly, is to name the world, to transform the world” (p.69). In his view, dialogue not only defines the condition of human existence but also an active role, which provides a teacher to see a reality of a person and to change it. Freire (1970) illuminates

If it is in speaking their word that [humans], by naming the world, transform it, dialogue imposes itself as the way by which [human] achieve significance as [human]. Dialogue is thus an existential necessity. And since dialogue is the encounter in which the united reflection and action of the dialoguers are addressed to the world which is to be transformed and humanized, this dialogue cannot be reduced to the act of one person’s “depositing” ideas in another, nor can it be a simple exchange of ideas to be “consumed” by the discussants. (p.77).
He seems to think that illuminating the reality of other people increases the possibility of changing the condition of human existence in a more democratic and transformative way. It can create a new environment for building mutual and reciprocal relationships between people who do not favor the privilege of meaning participation in the process of constructing the reality of other people. Gergen, McNamee, and Barret assert that these mutual and reciprocal relationships allow people to “recognize forms of dialogue that foster “way of going on together,” “ways of coordinating activities as opposed to discursive forms that foster alienation, hostility, and violence” (p.79). Such relationships nourish an environment for identity shift by accepting other’s point of view.

The teacher is no longer merely the-one-who-teaches, but one who is himself taught in dialogue with the student, who in turn while being taught also teach. They become jointly responsible for a process in which all grow. (Freire, 1970, p.61)

He contends that a teacher is a person who is the only responsible person for student learning rather than who can learn from his/her students. More importantly, he indicates that students and teachers are jointly responsible for a process of learning and knowing about the world around them. This notion of joint responsibility within a community of learning changes the nature of school and the practices of teaching. It is only possible in dialogue. McNamee and Shotter (2004) emphasize that “dialogue can bring about change in us that nothing else can” (2004, p.92). They claim that a change is required in a dialogic communication between people. Horton and Freire (1990) stress an importance of change.
You have to change. You cannot grasp the interest of the people while speaking with this language we spoke. It is the language you have to speak at university but not here. (p.65)

They recognize the necessity of change. If a teacher refuses change, it is almost impossible to build a mutual and reciprocal relationship between students and teachers. At the same time, it makes difficult for accepting a difference between students and teachers. When a teacher accepts a difference, he/she “learns how to respect their knowledge, their beliefs, their fears, their hopes, their expectations, their language” (Horton & Freire, 1990. p.57). By respecting for knowledge, beliefs, fears, hopes, and expectations, a teacher can appreciate a difference within a community of learning and construct critical selfhood against the unilateral relationship between students and teachers.

In appreciating a difference between students and teachers, a teacher can discover a new possibility of transforming the existing realities of their own into the new realities for the future. Shor and Freie (1987) discover those possibilities in a dialogic communication. In schools, it begins to illuminate the realities of both students and teachers, which make possible for going beyond the pre-given limitations of schooling. To overcome such limitations, Freire (1998) insists that students and teachers have to have open dialogue and open their critical selfhood that is sensitive to others, life, and the world.

To live in openness toward others and to have an open-ended curiosity toward life and its challenge is essential educational practices. To live this openness toward other respectfully and, form time to time, when opportune, critically reflect on this openness ought to be an essential part of the adventure of teaching.
For them, openness is important because it encourages teachers to develop intellectual curiosity as well as to recognize a conception of being in a process of becoming. Openness increases a possibility for taking control of one’s own life and re-establishing a relationship between a person and the world. Slater (2004) insists that openness makes teachers be aware of “the habit of past may not be useful today to accomplish current goals and to view themselves in new ways” (p.241). By viewing themselves in new ways, teachers actively take risks and fully participate in the ever-changing world. Moreover, openness cultivates a democratic culture of schooling and teaching as practice of freedom (Hook, 1994; Shor & Freire, 1987). In terms of teaching as practice of freedom, it requires defining democracy. Dewey (1966) defines democracy as “more than a form of government; it is primarily a mode of associated living, of conjoint communicated experiences” (p.87). By definition, teaching as freedom of practice is to increase teacher’s ability to re-conceive of their role and their action towards student learning and performance and to understand modes of freedom. Fromm (1964) indicates

…freedom to create and to construct, to wonder and to venture. Such freedom requires that the individuals be active and responsible, not a slave or a well-fed cog in the machine…it is not enough that men are not slaves; if social conditions further the existence of automatons, the result will not be love of life but the love of death (quoted in Freire, 1970, p.68).

He remind us to perceive a significance of human existence. In his view, freedom must have active participation and responsibility, which cultivate a sense of agency for bringing out the change of the world. In a teacher education, freedom means building trust between students and teachers. Once teachers were authoritative figures, it made difficult for students to share
their ideas, opinions and thoughts. At the same time, teachers began to use unilateral power, which destroy the democratic culture of schooling (Shor, 1992).

In order to change a unilateral relationship between students and teachers, teachers need to develop a sense of agency and critical consciousness, which helps them to jointly explore the possibility of changes. This sense of agency and critical consciousness helps teachers “to be active participation and to link awareness with the practices of teaching” (Hook, 1994, p.14). It rebuilds teacher’s relationship to the world and students and turns its focus towards a role of teachers not as an information deliverer but an agent for social change. Changing a perception of teaching and teachers brings about a new way of knowing and a new way of living. It also plays an important role in constructing critical selfhood. According to Britzman (2003), teachers could be significant social change agents and that teacher education should encourage a more equitable and democratic society (p.45)
Chapter Three
Research Design

Context

I was a doctoral student only having Korean educational background so that I couldn’t fully understand how the U.S. teacher education had been established and what this program mostly focused on. In Korea, my study was largely relevant for teaching English as Second Language (ESL) and English as Foreign Language (EFL). These areas of study paid me more attention to develop language proficiency rather than creating the value of reading literature and constructing the meaning of those literatures. In other words, my educational background was limiting my capacities to develop my professional knowledge as teacher educator so that I was reluctant to remain engaged in professional conversations, remain open-minded, and discuss and express the diverse issues of the U.S. teacher education. Peer-led dialogue helped me get beyond my limitation and reconnect my different educational background to my professional development as a teacher educator.

Having these experiences, I, as a consultant in a professional development, broaden my understanding of myself and interns. Just as I felt a doctoral student, I, working as a consultant in PDS, discovered that interns were reluctant to discuss and express their feelings about university supervisors, mentor teachers, and PDA and they were barely considered them as knowledge producers and researchers. These attitudes led me to think how hard a professional development led interns to be conscious of them as knowledge producer and researcher regarding their problems related to classroom teaching and student learning. I assumed that interns might need a space to discuss and express their difficulties and concerns related to their lives in schools. Another issue was time constraint, limiting intern’s full participation in the diverse professional learning community. In terms of avoiding time
constraints, securing their conversation, promoting sharing experiences and ideas, and entertaining many interpretations of his or her experiences and experiences of others.

For this reason, I chose an online space as new platform for developing interns’ professional knowledge and dialogue as a means of communication between interns. At the same time online space used interns create a space to construct teacher identity by accepting many different views and perspectives on the various issues of teaching practices. Based upon Schon’s (1989) idea of reflection-on-action, interns could get an opportunity to deeply and critically think about issues of knowledge, issues of power, and issues of identities. To promote intern-intern professional development, I intentionally exclude university supervisors, mentor teachers and consultants from online discussion forum. It was because teacher educators and educational researcher were too much influenced on discussion issues and led the whole conversation. Interns were too much dependent on so-called professional expertise about teaching. And also teacher educator-led discussion might be narrowed intern’s perspectives, reflective processes of their experiences, and curiosity of inquiry into the practices of teaching. Furthermore, teacher educators tended to consider interns as student of teaching rather than their colleagues and partners. Under this circumstance, interns had been viewed as objects of study and of teaching rather than their colleagues and partners collaboratively contributing to student learning, changing the culture of schooling, and redirecting the value of their experiences as interns.

Within this online space, interns could see them as knowledge producers and researchers who were able to solve their own problem. To fully discuss and express their concerns and difficulties I designed that were not required to participate but they chose to do it. Along the same line of creating and online space and using dialogue as a means of communication, I informed that participating in a PDS interactive inquiry was not graded. It was because interns was hard to remain open-minded and to fully share their difficulties and
concerns related to issues of intern-mentor teacher relationships, the culture of schooling, modes of knowing and interpretations of his or her experiences and experiences of others. Increasing the possibility for reconsidering interns themselves as important sources of knowledge rebuilt a relationship between interns and mentor teachers and between interns and consultants. This new relationship changed the way interns made conversation with mentors and consultants.

**Design of an Online Discussion Forum**

This online discussion forum designed eight different forums such as *myths and assumptions*, *deconstructing myths and assumptions*, *reconstructing pedagogical imagination for social transformation*, *formulating inquiry questions*, *inquiry follow-up*, *inquiry-claim-value*, *teachers as participatory democratic agents*, and *inquiring into curriculum*.
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*Figure 1 Course-PDS Interactive inquiry*

Figure 1 outlined what topics were in a PDS interactive inquiry. Each topic in this discussion forum had a special purpose for intern’s professional development. *Myths and assumptions* was to explore the underlying assumptions and myths in terms of the deeper understanding of what experiences and knowledge were valued in a context of a professional development.
There were guiding questions: 1) How do interns’ experiences and theories help them to develop their teacher identities which enable them to reconceptualize the value of teaching practices?; 2) What assumptions do interns have? Where do these assumptions come from?; 3) How do these assumptions affect intern’s pedagogical decision-making and meaning construction of their experiences?; and 4) How can interns make these assumptions meaningful in the context of teacher’s professional development?

Figure 2 Myths and Assumptions

Figure 2 was designed to identify myths and assumptions regarding teacher’s professional knowledge development and identity formations. Four guiding questions were to remain interns engaged in active participations and to understand theoretical constructs and cultural and social constructs of how exclusion and misrepresentations occurred in a teacher education and to use the various theoretical frameworks to rename the patterns of exclusions and misrepresentation. Deconstructing Myths and Assumptions was designed to challenge the identified underlying myths and assumptions and to explain why interns are doing the way they were doing. There were five guiding questions: 1) Why should interns need to teach particular knowledge?; 2) Whose knowledge is worthwhile to teach? What counts as knowledge?; 3) How do interns define themselves as teachers?; 4) What make them to see themselves as teachers as well as learners?; and 5) How does interns’ inquiry lead them to
recontextualize their experiences of teaching as social practices that shape their identity and mark their ideological location?

Figure 3 Deconstructing Myths and Assumptions

Figure 3 was designed to challenge the underlying assumptions regarding teacher’s knowledge development and the value of particular knowledge. Five guiding questions showed how interns could reframe the consequences of theoretical constructs and cultural and social constructs as well as be aware of their professional consciousness. This awareness of the various constructs was broadening the diverse issues of knowledge constructs, deepen understanding of the consequence of those constructs, and reshape the pedagogical functions of their experiences of teaching. Reconstructing Pedagogical imaginations for social transformation was designed to envision interns’ pedagogical orientations toward reconstructing and reorganizing the culture of schooling and the process of professional development, restitute their practical experiences of teaching into the contexts of others’ experiences and foster interns’ democratic impulse which lead them to share their insights, thoughts, and ideas and which negotiate many interpretations of their experiences and experiences of others as well. There were five guiding questions: 1) How do interns make
their experiences as democratic experiences that enable them to re-theorize their works against modernist reductive thinking and positivist epistemology?; 2) How does teaching practices remain students engaged in democratic participation and connect the larger social context?; 3) How does experiences of teaching in English classroom help redefining the value of the presupposed constructs?; 4) How can interns transform empowerment experiences into their students lives in schools?; and 5) How do interns use their experiences increase the possibility of changing the culture of school and the culture of a professional learning community?

Figure 4: Reconstructing Pedagogical Imagination for Social Transformation

Critical educators are able to envision students come to understand the nature of acting which is not transmitted particular knowledge as legitimated knowledge but rather encourages students to produce their own knowledge through inquiry process and formulating very specific questions in relation to power and domination that inhibit their social imagination. In the process of reconstructing pedagogical imagination, teacher should be capable to facilitate students to realign their own social imaginaries to be emancipatory, because, in the presence of critical education, narrative offers students a deep understanding of the nature of education which cannot promote social transformation. Therefore, critical teachers need to create open spaces for the students who can share their thoughts and ideas which help them to embrace more possibilities to foster democratic nature of education. More specifically, through this practice of imagination is produced and how meaning should our teaching be served, how both student and teacher negotiate meanings which would not be agreed upon yet.

1. How do we make your experiences as democratic experience which enable teachers to theorize their work against modernist reductionism and positivist epistemology. How does teaching help student experience democratic participation in a larger society? How does literacy particie in English classroom help redefine the meaning of literature which promote social justice?

2. Through recontextualizing the meaning of pedagogy in a particular context, literacy teacher can find their alternative or revolutionary pedagogical approach to social transformation. Some of these articles can help teachers empower themselves, come to have own voice to speak to themselves and their students. How can you transform your empowerment into an authentic logic that teachers can re-locate and re-align things, expand the possibilities of hope? How does the teacher re-identify language of critique and language of possibility making their students understand how they go about social transformation through literacy practices?

Figure 4 was designed to invent alternative or revolutionary pedagogical approaches toward social transformation and teacher empowerments. Formulating Inquiry Questions was designed to raising inquiry questions in order to solve the problems of practices and to improve the practices of teaching. Inquiry Follow-up was designed to extend conversation with consultants which largely serve to share interns’ concerns, difficulties, and experiences, fostering critical thought about inquiry topics and questions.
Figure 5 Inquiry Follow-up

Figure 5 was to promote sharing experiences of teaching, formulating inquiry questions, asking critical questions about the practices of teaching. Inquiry-Value-Claim was to illustrate the process of inquiry from January to April. In January, all interns come up with inquiry ideas, share their inquiry ideas with other interns, make claims to inquiry questions, gather evidences to support their claims. In February, interns talked about data that they collected, and the way they interpreted data from field notes, journals, and interviews. In March, interns started to write the draft of inquiry papers. In April interns should prepare for inquiry presentations. Teachers as Participatory Democratic Agents were designed to illuminate how interns’ participations in the community of practices led them to enact social transformation and foster cultural and social changes.

Methodology

I used participatory action research in this study. Participatory action research was defined as “a social process of collaborative learning realized by groups of people who join together in changing the practices through which they interact in a shared social world in which, for
better or worse, we live with the consequence of one another’s action” (Kemmis and McTaggart, 2005, p.63). According to Shaffer (2004), “new technologies make easier for interns to learn about the world by participating in meaningful activities” (1402). Participating in meaningful activities was to enhance critically reflective thinking and willingness to take risks for expressing a contradictory view (Brookfield & Preskill, 2005; Mitchell, 2003; Wells, 1999).

In participatory action research, participation was the most important component to identify participant’s action and reflection toward developing knowledge, constituting identity, and making sense of agency for change. Wade, Fauske, and Thompson (2008) and Hook (1992) claim that online is a reflective space about professional learning practices and participatory spaces for the sharing of knowledge. At the same time, online gives participants “time, space, and the freedom (within limits) to post whenever” whenever they wish, participants are more likely to express an “individual, thought-out position” (Brookfield & Preskill, 2005, p.232).

As opposed to intern’s office where undertook face-to-face interaction between interns and consultants, an online discussion forum had many different features which were collaborative, dialogic, reflective, and participatory. These key features contributed to developing professional learning practices. Shaffer (2004) described them threefold: (1) “uncover the structure of learning practices as they are currently constituted: the relationships among activity, pedagogy, and epistemology that different learning practices embody, (2) map the relationships between epistemologies of practices and kinds of understanding (cognitive, social, moral and practical), and (3) develop techniques for adapting extant learning practices to create environments that are true both to the ways of knowing and to the central skills, habits and understanding” (p. 1405). Uncovering the structure of learning practices helped participants understand the different perspectives of professional learning practices and know how professional learning practices work and how they relate to student
learning and performance in a classroom teaching. Mapping relationship between epistemologies of practices and kinds of understanding created a new environment for deepening understanding of a way of knowing and of a way of being as a teacher in schools. Developing techniques for adapting extant learning practices helped participants construct critical selfhood, which was sensitive to the ever-changing contexts of the practices of teachings and promoted critical questioning which helped rethinking question-answer relationships between students and teachers.

Participants

The participants responded to my request for volunteer for two consecutive semesters from Fall 2008 to Spring 2009. 15 interns all volunteered. As a researcher, I asked interns voluntarily participate in online discussion forum. Throughout this study, most interns actively participated in online discussion forum in order to create their own community of practices. All intern participants attended a brief orientation meeting with me, in which participants would part of their internship program.

At the same time, 15 interns constantly met with consultants, mentor teachers, and university supervisors on the weekly basis. At the same time, interns continually involved in online discussion forum where they shared their experiences, practices, problems, and concerns. The noticeable difference between female interns and male interns was that female interns were more responsive than male interns. At the beginning of conducting this research, there were 15 interns: 13 females and 2 males. All of interns were white upper-middle class background. These participants were racially homogenous groups. More than a half of participants were Italian family backgrounds. They had different educational experiences from the various universities. 13 interns were undergraduate students in a university in central
Pennsylvania. The rest of 2 interns enrolled in graduate schools. In the nature of PDS program, interns were not necessarily English majors. Only two students were in middle schools. 13 interns were in a high school in the State college high school district.

In the second semester, there was one noticeable change that one intern was dropped out of this program. The total numbers of participants were 14: 12 females and 2 males. One interns dropped out of this problems because she had a personal reason not continuing on her internship. The noticeable distinctive feature of participants was that those who were engaged in consultant meetings always actively involved in online discussion forum. Female interns were more involved in online discussion forum than male interns.

**Researcher**

As a doctoral student in a secondary language art, I had at least two different cultural and social experiences in terms of teacher professional development. In Korea, teacher education programs in a secondary Language Art aimed to develop language proficiency rather than literacy practices. Such a difference widened a gap between my knowledge about a teacher education and other doctoral students’ knowledge about it.

As a teacher educator, my concerns were mostly about how I used my cultural and social experiences in terms of both intern’s professional development and my professional development as teacher educators. Despite my efforts to incorporate an international doctoral student experience into the U.S. school cultural and social experiences, there were a remaining problem of my experiences as an international doctoral student and a teacher educator. It was because I was lack of awareness of my cultural and social experiences from the Korean language education environment. It caused confusion to distort the reality of educating students of teaching and broaden differences by stereotypical views of my
educational background. In addition, these confusions and differences were not allowed me to reach my students and to become a professional teacher educator. Instead, it was discouraged me to continuing dialogues with interns who sought practical advices of the practices of teaching. Unable to continue dialogue with these interns meant that I couldn’t embrace the various forms of the sources of interns’ professional knowledge and enhanced interactions among interns.

Therefore, making meaningful and valuable experiences for interns, as I experienced, how different educational systems was possibly accountable to the degree of changing the notion of teacher professional development and redefining the roles of teacher. Furthermore, it was important for me to re-interpret my own experiences so that interns came to realize that they were able to promote their problem solving skills, based on the reflective inquiry into their own experiences.

Just as I was relocating myself into the new cultural and social context, interns were putting them into a professional learning community which fostered dialogic interactions between interns and other interns. Within an online community of practices, interns had an opportunity to have inter-cultural communication that allowed us to reexamine my previous experiences and prior knowledge to teacher basic conversations with my students.

Creating an online space for a professional development was to promote intern’s active participations and negotiate the meanings of experiences that allowed them to challenge the existing epistemic vision for the teacher education. Changing the way I represented myself in the different social world expand awareness of my experiences as an international doctoral students and international teacher educator.

Data collection
For two semesters from September 2008 to 2009, I collected data for this research in interns’ online discussion forum in central Pennsylvania. All the data collected were automatically restored. These data were also possible to be deleted and edited by the participants whenever it was necessary. There were three sets of data collected from this research: (1) the structure of an online discussion forum, (2) participants’ postings and responses to other participant’s postings and (3) activity reports which presented participants’ numbers of participation and patterns of participation.

In the first set of data, it was about the structure of an online discussion forum which included eight different small discussion forums such as myths and assumptions, deconstructing myths and assumptions, reconstructing pedagogical imaginations for social transformation, formulating inquiry questions, inquiry follow-up, inquiry-claim-value, teachers as participatory democratic agents, and teacher stories. Myths and Assumptions aimed to explore how professional learning practices worked without any questions. Deconstructing myths and assumptions aimed to navigate whether participants could change the idea of taken-for-granted knowledge of the professional learning practices. Formulating inquiry question aimed to generate questions for conducting inquiry during participant’s PDS internship. Inquiry follow-up was about feedbacks from the consultant meetings. Inquiry-claim-value was a plan of action for inquiry. Teachers as participatory democratic agents aimed to apply participant’s insights and understandings into the larger community. Teacher stories was to explore what we (think about) are teaching, learning, and performing in the classroom and elsewhere. In the second set of data, it was about topic discussion related to participants’ experiences, practices of teaching, the problems of practices, the proposal of the alternative practices, feedbacks from the consultant meetings and free writings regarding participant’s concerns, interests, and worldview. In the third set of data, it was activity reports,
which included participant’s numbers of participation in an online discussion forum, patterns of participation, period of times that participation was access to an online discussion forum.

**Data analysis**

A method for analysis that I used in this study was qualitative content analysis, which could explain new phenomena in a teacher education. Grneheim and Lundam (2004) claimed that qualitative content analysis revealed “historical point of views and various beliefs of the nature of reality” (p, 105). It was useful to analyze how participants illuminated the reality of professional learning practices and transformed it. Qualitative content analysis sought “to provide knowledge and understanding of the phenomenon under study” (Downe-Wambolt, 1992, p.314).

An analysis of the collected data consisted of three parts: (1) exploring the structure of an online discussion forum and patterns of participation and uncovering the underlying assumptions about professional learning practices, (2) uncovering perspective shift and stretching the boundaries of consciousness, and (3) uncovering the role of teacher in shaping the way a teacher established a relationship between him/her and his/her students and between him/her and other participants (Steinberg, Kincheloe, and Hinchey, 1999, pp.67-80).

Uncovering the structure of an online discussion forum and patterns of participation was informed how participants involved in a process of developing professional learning practices in a dialogic community. It could also explain how the structure of an online discussion form affected patterns of participation. It was helpful to discover the hidden assumptions constructed by the traditional teacher education. Uncovering perspective shift and stretching the boundaries of consciousness made possible to detect the possibility of reshaping teacher identity and to recognize how perspectives of oneself and others were
changed over the time. Uncovering the role of teacher was to show how teachers constructed
critical selfhood, which made teacher understand the situation that they confronted. It was
helpful to see how critical self built mutual and reciprocal relationships, which could make
participants appreciate the differences and respect for those difference within a community of
professional learning practices.
In this chapter, I described the forms of participation and meaningful construction for pedagogical engagement with intern’s professional development by analyzing formations of online discussion forums. There were three important components with respect to the process of a reflective practice such as a role of a professional learning community, modes of participation, participation as a pedagogical engagement in the diverse perspectives on the practices of teaching.

Overall participation in an online discussion forum

Analyzing the patterns of participation in an online discussion forum could provide opportunity to understand how interns were involved in the process of learning from others, in particular, other interns. As a teacher educator and researcher, I looked up categories and characteristics of an online discussion forum. Most interns were concentrated on feedback for their consultant meeting on the regular basis. This professional development was designed to promote intern’s inquiry mind and to conduct inquiry not only direct contact with university supervisors, mentor teachers, and consultants. In inquiry meetings, consultants and interns tried to collectively come up with alternative ideas and solutions for the problems of practices and to comprehend and recognized the process of developing professional knowledge.

I found that interns were not willing to share their ideas and thoughts, not only with their mentor teachers but also their consultants. I believed that they needed a particular space for supporting each other by sharing experiences, ideas and thoughts. I designed this online discussion forum to promote intern-intern professional development. Based on the idea of
changing the culture of a teacher education, this online discussion forum had eight different categories such as myths and assumptions, deconstructing myths and assumptions, reconstructing pedagogical imagination for social transformation, formulating inquiry questions, inquiry follow-up, inquiry-claim-value, teachers as participatory democratic agents, and teacher stories. The first three discussion forums were designed to challenge the underlying assumptions in knowledge of teacher professional development. At the same time, I attempted to make interns identify the underlying assumptions, to critically analyze where these assumptions and myths came from and how they were played out in a classroom teaching, and to reinvent new pedagogical knowledge through critical reflection on the practices of teaching. Through critically examining the consequence of teacher’s knowledge development, I wanted interns to formulate inquiry questions in order to deepen understanding of the various situations and to invent creative pedagogical experiences and practices. In addition, I created inquiry follow-up for replacing the pre-existing inquiry follow-up with a university associate in a professional development school. Furthermore, inquiry-claim-value was to see the consequence of how inquiry was conducted. In teachers as participatory democratic agents, I wanted interns to take actions toward changing the nature of pedagogical practices in schools and expanding it into a larger community. The last one was to collect the diverse ideas of how teachers felt about teaching and how they could manage the complexity of social relationships with students, other interns, and mentor teachers. For this reason, it was important for me to see patterns of participation in each category. It showed what categories interns were more actively engaged in and what pedagogical aspects were related to an explanation of intern’s participation. According to Britzman (2003) participation was an important indicator to comprehend and recognize the process of learning to teach. All learning and development were taking place in a particular
community, which included the diverse cultural and social discourses, which influenced the formation of value judgment regarding professional development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forum</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Discussion/participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Myths and assumptions</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Deconstructing myths and assumptions</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Reconstructing pedagogical imagination for social transformation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Formulating inquiry questions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Inquiry follow-up</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Inquiry-claim-value</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Teacher as participatory democratic agent</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Teacher stories</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Overall participation in an online discussion forum

Table 1 displayed how interns frequently participated in each different category. The overall numbers of participation were 123 in all categories, myths and assumptions (2), deconstructing myths and assumptions (3), reconstructing pedagogical imagination for social transformation (1), formulating inquiry questions (1), inquiry follow-up (105), inquiry-claim-value (0), teacher as participatory democratic agents (2), and teacher stories (11). Through carefully examining the numbers of participation in each category, I recognized that lack of participation in some categories was due to misunderstanding of the purposes of an online discussion forum. My intention was to deepen intern’s understanding the issues related to their practices of teaching which helped interns to understand other intern’s perspectives and to learn from them.

Ironically, most interns were participating in inquiry follow-up, which was designed to use as a space for the feedback from their consultant meetings. In inquiry follow-up, interns were not only giving feedbacks from their consultant meetings but also they included the purpose of all categories. Comparing other categories, teacher stories were little higher than others. In teacher stories, interns discussed the issues of contradictory reality, which was
a gap between their theoretical knowledge about teaching and practical knowledge acquired through the experiences of teaching. Interns were struggling with their social status, which was related to constructing professional selfhood.

What I learned was that too many categories were disoriented intern’s involvement even if each category had its own purposes. As a teacher educator, I had to carefully consider the fact that interns were not interested in some categories and to clearly explain the purpose of why he/she designed it and what for in order to promote intern’s participation.

**Understanding Interns’ Modes of Participation**

Participation was consisted of reading and posting. Reading was contributed to understanding situations. Posting was contributed to raise questions about the practices of teaching and reflect an individual point of view about other intern’s practices of teaching and problems of practices. In this regard, understanding modes of participation was important because a teacher educator and interns were able to identify other intern’s intention through reading and to make themselves think about the consequence of improving the practices of teaching and solving the problems of practices. Other important point was that it offered an idea to identify an individual intern’s preference whether they preferred to read and to post.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Posting</th>
<th>All activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jenny</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Readings</td>
<td>Postings</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megan</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauren</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natalie</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nina</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackie</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2: Interns’ modes of participation**

There were fifteen interns who participated in an online discussion forum. Each intern had an individual difference between readings and postings regarding the degree of participation. In general, all interns were involved more in readings than postings. It implied that interns were wondering about how other interns thought about the issue that they were struggling with and what new ideas other interns had.

According to Table 2, interns were reading 3277 postings, Jenny (117), Carol (342), James (573), Sue (122), Kate (159), Megan (141), Lauren (290), Paul (78), Judy (141), Natalie (73), Nina (300), Joan (45), Ann (575), Maria (153), and Jackie (204). The most predominant participants in reading were James and Ann. James and Ann were reading 573 and 575 respectively. It implied that they were interested in other intern’s ideas and concerns related to the practices of teaching and that they wanted to get a clear sense of their own situations by identifying others’ intentions. The least participants in reading were Paul, Natalie, and Joan. Paul, Natalie, and Joan were reading 78, 73, and 45 respectively. It implied that they might not be interested in knowing about other’s intentions and perspectives. In terms of posting as participation, there were 272 postings, Jenny (33), Carol (17), James (13), Sue (9), Kate (6), Megan (27), Lauren (12), Paul (10), Judy (13), Natalie (5), Nina (28), Joan (4), Ann (49), Maria (29), and Jackie (17). The most predominant participants in postings were Jenny and Ann. Jenny and Ann were posting 33 and 49 respectively. It implied that they
might have many ideas, interests, and thoughts about not only their own practices of teaching as well as those of others. The least participants in posting were Kate, Natalie, and Joan. Kate, Natalie, and Kate were posting 6, 5, and 4 respectively. It implied that they might not have any interest to involve in an online discussion forum but rather they favored face-to-face consultant meetings on the regular basis.

In terms of a degree of participation, an interesting point that I found was that some of interns paid more attention to reading than posting and vice versa. In face-to-face consultant meetings, all of the interns were actively involved in inquiry meetings with consultants even though there were individual differences in to some degree. I also noticed that those who were not so much involved in an online discussion forum used other multimedia applications in order to prepare for their classroom teaching. It made me think that they might consider an online discussion forum as homework but not as pedagogical practices and experiences for the development of professional knowledge and professional identity.

For a teacher education, I realized that understanding modes of participation provided an opportunity to recognize individual preferences in an online discussion forum and how interns learns from each others. I also realized that an individual intern had the very different patterns of participation. It would come out of a personal personality towards knowledge generation and identity formation. These different patterns of participation determined the forms of engagement.

**Pedagogical aspects of participation**

Two sets of collected data from this study demonstrated that patterns of participation. Modes of participation must be different, depending on the way to engage in the process of
constructing professional knowledge and professional identity. Participating in an online discussion forum was presented both in a physical domain and a cultural and social domain. In the physical domain, a pattern of intern’s participation were represented as postings and viewing. In contrast, a cultural and social domain stressed the significance of sharing ideas, experiences, and expertise with other interns. Table 3 displayed patterns of participations within a physical domain as well as a cultural and social domain.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interests</th>
<th>Classroom (11)</th>
<th>Curriculum (29)</th>
<th>Pedagogy (40)</th>
<th>Inquiry (25)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Month</td>
<td>Classroom (11)</td>
<td>Curriculum (29)</td>
<td>Pedagogy (40)</td>
<td>Inquiry (25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2008</td>
<td>Helping student too much? (3)</td>
<td>Group work (6)</td>
<td>Discussing discussion (2)</td>
<td>How do I use creativity in the classroom? (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student-teacher writing conference (0)</td>
<td>Abstract ideas with seventh grader (2)</td>
<td>The importance of community building (0)</td>
<td>What is learning? (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vocabulary building (0)</td>
<td>Unit Planning</td>
<td>Teaching philosophy (0)</td>
<td>Why do you want to be a teacher? (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Homework</td>
<td>Fear of Writing Standard, IEPs (0)</td>
<td>Stressing diversity</td>
<td>Can ideal really be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Connections in reading (0)</td>
<td>Teacher Wait-time (1)</td>
<td>SES(1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>Utilizing Technology (0)</td>
<td>Setting rules from the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2008</td>
<td>Learning through play (3)</td>
<td>Classroom Setup (11)</td>
<td>Balancing work and life</td>
<td>Inquiry about Drama (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Biased with certain students (1)</td>
<td>Classroom management (1)</td>
<td>Personal teaching philosophy (3)</td>
<td>What is a quality teacher? (0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| November 2008 | • Conferencing with students about writing (2)  
• Connecting classes with literature circle | • Discussion  
• Boring is easy  
• Discussion in relation to critical thinking (0)  
• End result (0)  
• Different Literacies (2)  
• Differentiating learning (1) | • The subjective nature of teaching (0)  
• Engagement VS Resistance (0)  
• The control of social reproduction Vs student autonomy (0)  
• Role as a teacher (2)  
• Act and React (2)  
• Problems with students associating themselves with social class (2) | • What should I put my unit? (2) |
| December 2008 | • Using example (1) | • The Kitchen Table Kid (3)  
• Motivation (0)  
• Effective teacher voice | • Magical Thinking (3)  
• Multicultural VS. Anti-Racist | • Motivation level not reflective of class? (0)  
• How do we
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>January 2009</th>
<th>February 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization</strong></td>
<td><strong>Respect (1)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Drama, anyone?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>You gotta be the book (1)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Challenging the status quo (2)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Feeding VS. encouraging interpretations (0)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Small Groups (1)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Studenting (1)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Critical (0)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>education (0)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Gender in the classroom (0)</strong></td>
<td><strong>The elusive inquiry (0)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social control (0)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Gender, inequality in both classroom and society (1)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Inquiry project (0)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Miseducation, false consciousness, and social justice (0)</strong></td>
<td><strong>This thing called school (0)</strong></td>
<td><strong>The beginning of inquiry about drama</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Empathy, Sincerity, Justice (3)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Power? (1)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Democracy, ethics-the Illusive inquiry question (1)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Freedom in the classroom (1)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Power Struggle again (1)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Inquiry: the basic problem (0)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Our responsibility and technology (0)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Our responsibility and technology (0)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Conducting research (1)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 illustrated how topics of interests had been changed over time. It was important to notice that the number of participation was different, month-by-month. From September 2008 to December 2008, interns in a broader sense were consistently participating in an online discussion forum. Interns’ areas of interests were equally distributed throughout the categories of interests. From January 2009 to April 2009, a number of participation was rapidly decreased in comparison to the previous semester. I could see that issues of interests were changed, due to their pedagogical task-pedagogical task in this period was focusing on doing inquiries for their practices of teaching with their own curriculum and unit plans. In the first three months, interns equally exposed them to classroom issues, curricular issues, pedagogical issues, and inquiry issues. Later on, interns paid more attention to pedagogical issues and inquiry issues than classroom issues and curricular issues because intern acquired particular experiences through their internship experiences and exposure to the various indirect experiences from other interns.

In September 2008, interns were willing to respond to the discussion topic, which was mostly focused on curricular and pedagogical issues. Interns had little interest in
classroom practices because at this time, intern spent most of their time to observe their mentor teachers’ teaching. In October 2008, interns began to directly connect to students so that they paid more attention to classroom teaching as well as pedagogical issues. In November 2008, comparing to other months, interns might rarely participate in online discussion forum, except March and April 2009. In December 2008, interns began to search for their inquiry interest and formulation of inquiry question. In January 2009, interns came up with the discrete inquiry ideas such as pedagogical issues, curricular ideas, and classroom practices. They began to use discussion topics such as “inquiry”, “power struggle,” “democracy”, and “conducting research”. From February to March 2009, interns engaged in data collection and data analysis. In April 2009, interns were preparing for presentation so that they framed their outline for conducting inquiries. The nature of participation embraced collaborative learning process and collective understanding to foster “the multiple ways of approaching and understanding the situations” (McNamee & Shotter, 2004, p.103). Interns were able to make sense out of the other person’s comments and actions. They opened themselves to the sort of inquiry that invited alternative meanings.

This table addressed that interns were more involved in curricular issues, pedagogical issues, and inquiry issues than classroom issues. In particular, this table showed that they were more involved in pedagogical issues. Based on an activity report, I noticed that interns were highly engaged in “classroom set-up(11),” “grading(15),” “teaching mannerism(6),” and “group work(6)”. I believed that these issues were directly connected to interns’ classroom teaching and the forms of student learning within a classroom. Specifically, grading was considered as the most important aspect of maintaining standards in school so that they had to understand school grading policy and individual teachers’ approaches to grading within a classroom. In addition, based on the number of responses, I speculated that interns considered understanding teacher mannerism as an important aspect for a beginning teacher or intern to
shape the way they act, speak, and teach with their students. Classroom settings are another important aspect of teaching. As a new teacher, an intern attempted to bring a new pedagogical idea in the classroom so that their students could feel comfortable with this new teacher.

As I mentioned in “overall participation,” interns identified an importance of a cultural and social domain of participations, which offered grasping a deep sense of the impact of social relationships and power dynamics within a classroom. By examining their cultural and social locations, interns could identify where they were now and where they should go as a teacher. In this regard, I found that some interns made connection their cultural and social location to establishing relationships with their students, understanding the impact of students’ cultural and social realities within a school, and negotiating difference between students and themselves. From this perspective, intern discussed many different social issues—for example, authority community building, democracy, freedom, gender inequality, multicultural education and anti-racist education, power struggle, resistance, social control, social justices, social groups, social reproduction, changing education, and challenging the status quo. These issues not only broadened individual interns’ understanding the culture of schooling but also widened interns’ pedagogical knowledge about teaching. Through participating in this discussion, interns could learn to negotiate their cultural and social values and belief and to engage in the values of others that influenced the formation of professional identity and that shaped their point of view in relation to teacher as a professional practitioner.

Within interns’ posting, I discovered that interns attended to the pedagogical discussion that interns had a chance to critically interrogate the values of discussion, discourses, social relationships, and teaching strategies. I noticed that interns considered discussion as a means of changing the structure of power dynamics between teachers and students. A discussion format in classroom teaching reorganized interns’ perception of power
that a relationship between student and teachers was linear and hierarchical. It also informed that interns had an opportunity to reorganize the structure of experiences in terms of changing the nature of school culture and teacher professional development. Interns were able to establish a democratic environment in order for them to rethink the possibility of having democratic participation and democratic learning. At the same time, interns were able to re-establish the cultural and social conditions of human existence as a teacher in the new school environment.
Chapter Five
Professional Development and Learning Community

There were many different ways of understanding the construction of professional knowledge in teacher education. Interns had to understand what aspects of pedagogical knowledge helped them prepare to be a qualified and competent teacher. The most learning in teacher education was related to the experiences of student teaching and practices of teaching. In addition, interns might have a chance to gain insight into the process of professional knowledge development by conducting inquiry within a professional development context.

Professional development was two-sides of coins. One is socialization—“socialization, which is a long process by which newborn individuals become adult members of their society” (Shor, 1992, p.114). Interns were required knowing about the general norms of the notion of teaching and the concept of teachers. In learning to teach, interns become an adult member of teacher society, interns tended to observe what behaviors and social experiences were helpful for them to shape new teacher images, to create a community of learning, and to situate their professional development into the context of classroom teaching. At the same time, interns should know the process of de-socialization, which helped them to challenge their long-held assumptions about the image of teacher and a concept of the community of learning. Shor (1992) defined de-socialization as a process of “questioning the social behaviors and experiences in school and daily life that make us into the people we are” (p.114). For interns, it was necessary to know what behaviors and social experiences were taken as an important component to being a professional practitioners and how they brought new ideas and thought into the process of shaping a new teacher image by observing other teacher teaching within a classroom.

Developing New Teacher Images
I recognized that stereotypes in teacher’s images discouraged interns to have individual preferences, expanding choices of teaching styles in accordance with a teacher’s pedagogical purposes for student learning. Many different pedagogical experiences and practices from other interns created new teacher’s images and to reframe the consequence of developing new pedagogical knowledge. Such experiences and practices could make intern deeply understand how these stereotypes were constructed and where they came from. They were also a very useful pedagogical tool that a teacher was rearticulating the value of experiences and practices from others. At the same time, this pedagogical tool presented how stereotypes in teacher’s image came out of cultural and social beliefs that teachers usually carried with. Under the influence of stereotypes, interns understood that they were merely recipients rather than cultural and social actors who were able to bring a change into the world of a teacher education.

Changing the fixity of teacher’s images was only possible through unlearning what they knew of the images of teacher and reinventing the way teachers taught in schools. This unlearning and reinventing was relying on observation and reflection that galvanized interns, challenging those stereotypes in teacher’s images. Observation and reflection let them know patterns of stereotypes: preoccupied perceptions in teaching and teacher’s images.

Stereotypes as preoccupied perceptions didn’t allow interns to see themselves as teachers. Instead, they merely perceived them as students of teaching. Britzman (2003) indicated that such a phenomenon was a contradictory reality in learning to teach. Faundez and Freire (1989) described it as ‘bureaucratization of mind’. Under this circumstance, interns were merely adapting new environments and accepting the pre-given cultural and social beliefs about teacher’s images. Such behaviors and attitudes created a problematic nature of shaping teacher’s images as well as of developing knowledge about teaching as
technical advances in teaching skills and pedagogical techniques, judging the quality of teachers.

In “teaching mannerism, interns tried to understand the nature of constructing images of teachers and describe the situations that they faced. They also tried to show how they were struggling with this preoccupied perception of teaching and teacher in order to reinvent new images of teachers and develop new teaching styles, which were different from their mentor teachers and other interns. It indicated that interns needed to reorient their pedagogical direction to reframe images of teachers. This new pedagogical direction offered an opportunity to think about the social consequence of shaping teacher images and taking different teaching styles fitting them into the context. Ann tended to specify what aspects influenced reframing teacher images.

In terms of shaping teacher images, movement, gesturing, and tone of voices were important. I work with two different teachers (for CP11 and CTI). Therefore I’ve been fortunate to witness different classroom styles and mannerism. (Teaching Mannerism, September 8, 2008).

She believed that movement, gesturing, and tone of voices were important aspects for her to shape teacher images. She also informed that for her, observing the practices of other teachers were valuable assets in shaping her teacher images. Actions that teacher had taken were directly affecting students’ learning outcomes. Therefore, the observed teaching styles and mannerisms provided interns opportunities to reshape Ann’s images as a teacher and to enrich knowledge bases for the context-specific teaching practices. In her view, observation could contribute to growing teacher’s competences on the pedagogical knowledge of teaching. In terms of growing competence of pedagogical knowledge about teaching, she attempted to
explain why observations were important in teaching practices. She went on to say, “I wish I could speak as fluidly and clearly as I see my mentor teacher teaching” (September 8, 2008). She thought that she was lack of knowledge about classroom management skills and instructional strategies. It was evident that interns needed more experiences and knowledge in order to reduce a gap between theoretical knowledge about teaching and practical knowledge about teaching. For the need of appropriate knowledge about classroom management and instructional strategies, Britzman(2003) emphasized that interns had to have experiences of diverse teaching styles so as to gain the clearer sense of what worked and what didn’t. These experiences led interns to have an ability to clarify whether their teachings worked or not in the particular context.

Just as Ann believed, Megan also realized that observation had an significant impact of growing teachers’ competence. She, however, took slightly different position regarding reframing teachers’ images and teaching styles. She was more attentive to establish her own teacher images and teaching styles drawing out from her observation. She wrote,

What I have been trying to be to oppose her. Not always, but during class discussion, if she is standing in the front, I stand in the back. When she moves clockwise around the classroom, I follow and make sure that we are always 180 degree apart (Teaching Mannerism, September 8, 2008).

As part of her plant to establish a new teacher image and teaching styles, she tried to challenge her mentor teacher’s way of teaching and of managing her class. An attempt to extend the range of observation was to take the opposite direction so that she could enhance her understandings of students’ attitudes and behaviors toward the consequence of learning knowledge from their teacher. With having the deeper understanding of students’ attitude and
behaviors, Megan discovered that learning to teacher was part of imitation and reinvention. To grow professional competence, interns had to think about recontextualizing their knowledge into their own context of practicing teaching. In the line of growing profession competence concerning teacher images and teaching styles, Carol tried to see the pedagogical contribution to reconstitute the value of observation and imitation. She believed that the value of observation and imitation enabled her to see how teachers’ attitudes and behaviors were connected to the pedagogical consequence of student engagement into the process of student achievement. She clearly described her own situation:

It is so interesting how little things like where we stand and what we do with our arms is suddenly a big deal. Right now, one of my favorite ways to teach is sitting in a desk along with the students. I'll pull the desk around so I can face all of them and can ask questions. I tell myself that this makes it easier for them to speak because I'm not standing in an authoritarian position at the front of the class. But really, I think it just makes me more comfortable to be on an equal level with them. I don't quite feel like I'm qualified to speak as an expert yet. (Teaching Mannerism, September 17, 2008)

Based upon her description of her own classroom, it taught her to see how small things made a big difference. It also taught her to see how changing classroom layouts contributed to changing ways of interactions and engagement into students’ learning. Changing forms of interactions and engagement brought student-teacher relationship and the process of learning and teaching. In student-teacher relationship, she was expected to establish reciprocal and mutual relations which created more comfortable learning environment for students to ask
questions and for teachers to avoid the authoritative nature of teaching. Within this comfortable learning environment, Carol could reinvent an image of a teacher who was not an authoritative figure. Rather, a teacher had to be very supportive of students who are willing to participate in the process of learning and to help teachers to revalue their experiences of changing classroom layouts and attitudes toward establishing a new relationship between students and them.

From the perspective of changing teacher images and teaching styles through careful observations and imitations, interns should revalue their experiences, acquired by observing other teachers’ teaching and managing classrooms. Interns had to be exposed themselves to a variety of teaching styles and teacher mannerism as many possibly as they could. These experiences led them to get the better understandings of classroom situations, students’ attitudes and behaviors which largely affected the way interns constructed their images as a teacher and resituated their experiences of observations into the real context of classroom teaching. At the same time, interns were able to reduce a gap between their theoretical knowledge about teaching and practical values of teaching practices in the particular context. They could redefine the meaning of what teachers they could become and how they implement classroom teaching without excluding students who were not actively engaged in the process of learning knowledge from their teachers.

Establishing a Learning Community and Changing the Meaning of Authority

A community was a space for learning from others who had different views of the particular issues of education. Within this community, both students and teachers must be able to perceive how social relationships were constructed and what values they were pursuing. In terms of building a learning community, it was inevitable that interns were able to recognize
what pedagogical aspects this learning community provided. In this regard, a classroom setting was part of an important aspect for building a learning community. It was because a classroom setting was closely related to student performance and the effect of pedagogical practices in a learning community. **Ann** tried to show how a particular classroom setting contributed to implementing pedagogical tasks in the classroom. She expressed that,

> I like the idea of pods. In both classrooms I’m in (234 N and 106 S), the desks are set up in a type of semi-circle or two rows facing each other. I like when student can see each other easily, not just the teacher. In the English classroom, I think it helps conversation. (Classroom Set-up Change Learning, September, 8, 2008)

In this learning community, Ann wanted to promoted student interaction not only with a classroom teacher but also with other students. By changing a classroom setting, a teacher was not the only person to teach but students could also become a teacher who might help other student learn from each through conversation. Ann seemed to think that changing a classroom setting might establish a new community of learning where a teacher was not merely delivering particular types of knowledge but students and a teacher frequently asked questions about what they learned from a teacher and other students. **Judy** emphasized that establishing a learning community was important.

> It invites those students who might not want to participate to blend into the back rows (if the teachers doesn’t request assigned seating). The sense of community a pod style or circular set up creates almost demands that students communicate with each other-making discussions more intimate and hopefully
making the teachers’ position a facilitators for discussion rather than a lecturer or disciplinarian. (Classroom Set-up Change Learning, September, 9, 2008)

She noticed that this learning community could invite students who were unwilling to participate in a process of learning. This learning community was to promote discussion and to change the role of a teacher who was considered as a lecturer or instructor. Judy thought that this new learning community viewed a teacher as a facilitator who mediated student learning in a classroom. Both students and teachers got a clear sense of how a learning community changed the nature of learning and how it promoted both students and a teacher actively involved in discussions. Maria further developed an idea of a community of learning where both students and a teacher were working together with each other and were connecting individual understanding of knowledge to collective understanding by sharing different perspectives on the process of constructing meanings. She asserted that,

the classroom set-up shapes the classroom community….I’ve also found that the classroom set-up has affected the “barriers” I create or breach when I am instructing the students. There is a table in the front of the classroom with a podium on it, and my mentor teacher sometimes lectures from behind the podium. I tried that with the first lesson I taught the students, and I just felt more natural to sit on the front of the table or to walk around the center of the U. the desk creates a barrier between the teacher and the student, and while I think it can help portray authority, I can also feel like a safety net, or a way to “hide”. (Classroom Set-up Change Learning, Maria, September, 15, 2008)
Maria recognized that a classroom setting played an important role in establishing a learning community. She also noticed that a classroom setting built the barriers between students and a teacher. She described how a particular classroom setting affected the mode of teaching in a classroom. In other words, a particular learning community offered a teacher more authority to control student learning. It seemed to me that a teacher believed that authority was natural as if a teacher was born with it. I understood that teacher authority might be established in its classroom setting.

Unlike Maria, Lauren was concerned about lack of authority, which made difficult for intern to manage classrooms and student learning.

As a very young female student teacher only a few years younger than me, I feel as if some sort of boundary must be established. Assigning seats are a great way to execute this. If a teacher doesn’t assign seats, I think that it gives students the signal that he or she is easy, too laid back, or able to be walked all over. (Classroom Set-up Change Learning, September, 17, 2008)

She thought that gender and age were important determinants to develop teacher authority. She was a young female student teacher who was hard to implement classroom teaching without authority. In her learning community, she wanted to establish a boundary between students and a teacher by assigning seats for each individual student. Based upon her experience of teaching, she might have a problem with her students. Her students would not see her as a teacher but rather a student of teaching.

Through Ann, Judy, Maria, and Lauren cases, ways of establishing a learning community become important to determine a role of teacher, ways of teaching, and a role of authority. If a teacher had too much authority, students were unwilling to engage in the
process of learning. If a teacher had little authority, students might disrupt classroom teaching. When a teacher was establishing a learning community he/she had to consider what they wanted to accomplish. Therefore, a learning community “allows for both the teacher and student to become jointly responsible for learning” (Horton and Freire, 1990, pp.58-66).

Teaching Students within a Discussion Format

In dialogue, learning was taken place through discussions. A discussion helped interns to support and challenge different points of views on the same issues and the same situation. In addition, a teacher and students collectively explore and build knowledge about teaching. In a previous discussion, I understood that a learning community enabled a teacher to establish a particular form of social relationships between students and a teacher. They had to take jointly responsible for learning. I realized that it opened a possibility for changing the consequence of knowledge development and provided an opportunity to rethink teacher authority. In terms of participation as a way of knowing, I recognized that a discussion was not an act of individual learning but rather it was collective learning from each individual who was participating in a discussion. For this reason, understanding teacher authority and a student-teacher relationship was centered on the discussion of increasing professional capacity and of re-conceiving a potential of professional knowledge development. In this regard, a teacher should know how different students took different positions for changing the way they learned and the way they were participated in. Jackie wanted to talk about how a discussion affected a way that a teacher used an authority and how it promoted student’s engagement with a process of learning.
We all have assumptions about what discussion should be like in the classroom, but how do we know we are using it effectively? Well, we need to ask our students…but how do we do this? (Discussing Discussion, September, 30, 2008)

She claimed that teachers thought they knew about discussion. Obviously different teachers took a different way to conduct discussions in a particular classroom. As an intern-a student of teaching, she was more concerned about the way a teacher used it as a pedagogical tool for student learning. She also thought that a teacher found an effective way of using discussion by asking their students. She was, however, doubt about a way to do it with her student. For her, it was important to increase the effectiveness of student performance through participating in a discussion and to invent its pedagogical commitment and pedagogical practices. Ann developed further a notion of discussion in its pedagogical use. She expects,

I suppose at the different levels we are teaching there are different perceptions of discussions. My 11th graders have been members of discussions for many years. I don’t want to assume I can’t change their perceptions or feeling about discussion, but I know they know what to expect when it comes time to discuss. I think the approach I’ll take is just to try out different styles of discussions (small group, whole group, discussion leaders, online, etc) and see what they respond to it. (Discussing Discussion, September, 30, 2008)

Based on her view, discussion must be different from what grade level a teacher taught and years of experience made that difference. She also mentioned that she was unable to change the perception of discussion. To understand what perceptions students had was to use many
different forms of discussion styles. It would help her to figure out what forms of discussion might fit into and what types of discussion teacher had to take. Through this process, Rachel found that both students and a teacher could recognize that there were many different types of discussions and such a perception was shaped by their experiences. In this regard, knowing the different types of discussion was important for a teacher. **Ann** wrote,

> I was thinking about this more. Maybe you could survey listing the different types of discussions that could take place in the classroom. You could also ask how the students perceive themselves in a discussion. Additionally, you could explore students’ feelings about discussion (hate them, love them, unfamiliar with them). (Discussing Discussion, October 1, 2008)

She would like to know the type of discussion and to understand how student perceived a discussion. She also wanted to know students’ feeling about discussion. As a teacher educator, I assumed that her intention was to articulate how student’s perception affected a discussion-based classroom learning. I thought that understanding student’s perception and feeling was important when a teacher used it in a classroom teaching. Maybe some students favored a discussion-based learning. Maybe some students didn’t like to learn through discussion. In terms of a pedagogical goal of student learning, conducting the list of the different types of discussion formats and emotional responses to a pedagogical practices of discussion was to understand the characteristics of individual learners. **Ann** seemed to know an effect of a teacher’s pedagogical purpose. She got a clear sense of how a particular pedagogical purpose determined student’s activities and responses.
Teachers who ask predominantly “one-right-answer-question” may be looking to make sure all the students understand the plot of the text. Teachers who broaden the discussion with bigger, open-ended questions may be seeking to hit on larger elements of the story such as themes, symbolism, language, etc. (The Critical Questions, October 29 2008)

In terms of a pedagogical purpose of discussion, she made a very important point. I thought that she knew how a formal classroom teaching was carried out. I also thought that she could use a discussion, different from the predetermined pedagogical goal, which was to find one true answer. Rather, Ann claimed that a discussion should be open-ended dialogue, which dealt with stories about teaching and teachers. Such open-ended dialogue helped students to accept the differences. It implied that a teacher tried not to find one true answer to the question that he/she asked. It would provide many different answers, which came from sharing different ideas, perspectives, and viewpoints to both students and a teacher.
Chapter Six

Sharing Ideas and Experiences

Sharing ideas and experiences helped interns to develop new conception of professional
development, which promoted interns intellectual growth in relation to having alternative
ideas of new teaching strategies and situating others’ understanding of teaching into their
own contexts. Interns found that their perception of teaching influenced on other interns’
view of professional development and conceived the consequence of how they dealt with the
problems of practices. At the same time, interns made a clear that such individual difference
came from how they considered the condition of professional knowledge development and
the definition of knowledge in terms of becoming a professional. Interns were learning to
teach through their ideas and experience in order to develop new knowledge about teaching
such teaching strategies and making conception of what they should do as a teacher.

Student participation through activities

Interns had shown a peculiar tendency to bring a positive impact of a new teaching strategy.
A new learning environment and activities could change the way both students and teacher
engaged in learning and actively participated in these diverse activities. In “learning through
play,” Jenny shared her ideas about the importance of a learning activities and active
participation. She stated, “I feel that the classroom provides a really great learning
environment depending on activities teachers involve their students in class” (Learning
through Play, September 8, 2008). She thought that an idea of learning through play offered
both students and teacher to create a new learning environment and the various activities,
which promoted students’ engagement in the process of learning. Rebecca shared the similar
thought about the impact of learning activities. She says, “learning through play seem like a
great way to encourage students to participate” (Maria, September 15, 2008). It implied that
both Alison and Rebecca tried to figure out how new learning strategies encouraged student
to participate. At the same time, new learning activities increased the possibility of student
engagement and participation in the process of learning.

Despite the great impact of new learning activities on students’ learning and
engagement, Jenny still felt difficult to elicit her student engagement. She said, “I don’t have
the right mindset-or attitudes of volunteering within my classroom just yet to really
effectively and positively enforce these activities in the classroom” (Jenny, September 8,
2008). She thought that she was not yet to deal with a problem of student engagement. It was
because she didn’t have the right mindset as a teacher. It implied that she was struggling with
teaching students and developing herself as a professional. Maria gave a slightly different
approach to resolve the problem of participation. She notes,

I know students are sometimes embarrassed or scared to answer questions in
front of the class, but I found it useful to walk around and see the answer
students have written” (Learning through Play, September 15, 2008).

Based on her observation, Maria informed that not all students had the same way to engage in
the process of learning. Changing a means of communication was a way to make student
engage in learning. In her sense, it was writing. It implied that lack of student engagement
was not always teacher’s fault and new learning activities were not always a solution for the
lack of participation. Rather, a teacher should always observe her student’s attitude toward
student’s own learning. She suggested that a teacher must be sensitive to student’s mode of
communication, which led a teacher to figure out student’s personality and tendency toward learning.

Ann turned its focus towards students who had little or no interest in English class. She states “I wonder how learning through play would work in a classroom with students who are there just to get-by as those students in a lot of my CP classes” (Learning through Play, September 15, 2008). She thought that it didn’t matter whether this activity was useful or not. The matter was how a teacher motivated their students and what practical use it had in her classroom. Jordan made a very important point about student engagement in learning. Along Ann’s point of view, Paul seemed to think that lack of engagement was not a matter of lack of motivation but it was an act of resistance. He says,

I have a strong belief that these kids are resisting their education rather than a lack of motivation. When I ask a student why he or she is not doing her/her work, the response is usually the same: This is stupid. It is boring and it had nothing to do with my life. There is no point doing this.” This statement in itself seems like a state of resistance. (Engagement VS Resistance, November 7, 2008)

In his view, a lack of engagement didn’t come out of a lack of motivation. It implied that new activities could not mobilize students engage in learning. He believed that some teachers misunderstood the reason why their students weren’t actively involved in learning. Such misunderstanding increased the fear of embarrassment while students were in the classroom. Whatever the means teacher brought in the classroom, it had nothing to do with student engagement. Student seemed to think that knowledge that they learned from school was of no use for their future life. In this case, it was almost impossible to make students who had no
visions from schools to find why they should be in school. In this regard, teachers should have an ability to identify whether a lack of participation was due to lack of motivation or due misunderstanding what students wanted.

As a teacher educator, I realized that a teacher looked at the situation carefully and thoroughly. Careful observation and genuine dialogue with students prevented teachers from misunderstanding why their students were unwilling to participate in learning. In this sense careful observation and genuine dialogue were important because students could have ownership of their learning and establish new relationship between students and teachers and between student’s life and schooling. By having ownership of their own learning, students took responsibility for their own learning. By establishing a new relationship both students and teachers took their particular role when they participated in learning activities. At the same time, accepting an individual responsibility for their own learning affected teachers’ role in the classroom. Teachers were not knowledge deliverers but a facilitator who encouraged students actively involved in learning. Through exploring ownership of their learning, interns came to realize that interactive communication helped them not only to develop their professional knowledge about rethink the meaning of ideas, experiences, and sometimes expertise but also to understand the situation that teachers encountered in the classroom. Jenny initiated a discussion in relation to the increase of student participation. Maria suggested that interns should look at the diverse forms of students’ participation in the classroom activities. Ann attempted to see how Jenny’s idea worked at the classroom context and what it looked like. Through this discussion, they learned the significance of practices. The experiences of teaching are meaningless unless teachers recognized the importance of a sense of the ownership of learning and a sense of a meaningful connection to the life. The next step is to situate other interns’ ideas and experiences into their own context.
Thinking through Sharing Experiences

Knowing oneself and others was only possible through understanding other’s intention and appreciating a difference. Knowing was about evaluating what one believed as true. In this regard, other point of view was an important source to evaluate my belief and perspectives on the particular issues in education. Dialogue provided an opportunity for learning from others. In the nature of schooling, both students and teachers had partial knowledge but not as a whole. For this reason, sharing knowledge was important which led a teacher to see how each individual dedicated to build knowledge in a collaborative way and to learn from others about the same issue, which was about how a teacher kept a balance between lives and works.

Ann displayed how a meaning of balance between lives and works was constructed.

I know the balance between work and life is a fine line that many people have trouble traversing. Today, I talked about how, in the future (as in next year and the beginning years of teaching), I will be able to perform that balancing act. I already see the amount of work pilling up this year; each time students hand in their work it had to be graded. Grading alone can take a few hours a night and we haven’t started paper yet…. In subsequent years I know that as much as I love teaching English, I won’t want to be my entire life. (Balancing Work and Life, September 15, 2008)

It was about workload as a teacher. She seemed to think that a boundary between life and work blurred. Her concern was too much workload declining her passion for teaching English. It was not a choice for her but it was about life being in school. She thought that maintaining a balance between life and work was the most difficult part of teaching. It would affect the
way she worked with her students and living her life as a person. As a researcher, I believed that she still had a choice to make. Maria approached it from student’s perspectives.

My mentor teacher and I have been utilizing a lot of in-class time. I feel like this is almost necessary with my two CTI classes, because a lot of these students don’t even have access to computers and internet at home. In addition, they may have other things worry about-taking care of younger siblings, working 5 hours at night, etc-and even though they would do homework, they just don’t have time to do it. (Balancing Work and Life, September 22, 2008).

As a teacher, Maria tried to see how work affected student’s live in school. She understood that some of her students had to work after school. For her students, studying was not only thing to be taken care of but they had to take care of others, which made them not to concentrate on studying at schools. As opposed to teachers, these students didn’t have a choice but it was a way to live their life. Maria suggested that a teacher had to use in-class time as much as he/she could. She thought that it would help her students to keep going on their school life.

In terms of maintaining a balance between life and work, these two different examples made teachers think about a meaning for life in schools and what teacher did for themselves as a person and for their students as a human being. In this regard, both Ann and Maria understood that home life constantly affected school life and school life also affected home life. In Natalie’s sense, overcoming a difficulty of unbalancing between life and work as a teacher was that teacher had to have ability to separate school life from home life. She says, when I teach a new year I want to be separate my home life from my school work” (Balancing Work and Life, Natalie, September 16, 2008). It implied that she didn’t want her
home life to affect her school life. But what she didn’t know was that it was almost impossible to separate home life from school life unless she gave up one of them. It was because home life and school life were interdependent. Maria’s approach was different from Natalie. Maria suggested that teachers had to use in-class time as much possibly as they could.

In the first class, a mentor teacher tried to use class-time as much as she could. I’ve actually found that a lot of these students really appreciate the in-class time, and as long as they are given objectives and assignments, they get the work done without too many added distraction. (Balancing Work and Life, September 22, 2008)

Although home life and school for students had an interdependent relationship, using in-class time reduced workload for the students. She understood that a teacher acknowledged an interdependent relationship between home life and school life. A teacher should invent alternatives rather than consider home life and school life as a separate category of human life.

Sharing experiences about a balance between life and work helped a teacher go deeper into the lives of others and to grow intellectual capacity for taking different approaches to the problematic nature of human life-world. It would also help a teacher to think about how they acted upon the situation that they confronted.

**Rethinking a System of Evaluation**
One of the most predominant issues in a teacher education was a way of evaluating student performance. Evaluating student performance was a process of justification for what students and teachers achieved. Through evaluating student performance, a teacher got a clear sense of how students learned and how teacher taught in schools. In this regard, a system of grading was an important pedagogical tool not only to invite students learning activities but also to locate where students were. Understanding a system of grading allowed teachers to see a way that schools worked. According to Kincheloe (1992), grading was a sorting out process to distinguish who were successful and who weren’t. As a researcher, it was important for to know how interns viewed a system of evaluation for student performance. Ann mentioned, “I always thought that grading was necessary, at least for feedback” (Grading, September 8, 2008). She seemed to think that grading was a feedback regarding student performance and that grading mobilized student learning at schools. Maria was questioning about if there was no grading, was it possible for the students engage in learning?

I suppose it is possible to give student feedback without grading them but if students learn not to expect grades, will they still do their work? At the same time, I don’t want my students to get caught up in the extrinsic motivation of receiving letter grades. (Grading, September 8, 2008)

She had a mixed feeling about a system of evaluation. One was that grading was a pedagogical motivator, which promoted student performance. The other was that as long as student engaged in learning, a grading was a necessary means to motivate student’s engagement in learning. Such a mixed feeling resided in schooling. To avoid the dilemma, discrete plans for student academic performances were necessary. Megan proposed, “teachers should clearly explain their plans and policy before they executed their teaching”
(September 8, 2008). For her, teachers had to present their plans and policy, which helped students know what they had to do with grading on their performance. Presenting plans and policy were part of damage control.

However, Ann believed that grading was not a sole purpose of teaching but rather it was than evaluating the degree of student performance. Ann defines “teaching is all about how teachers present their materials to their students….I don’t think everything should be graded because student will rely solely on that grade” (Grading, September 8, 2008). By definition, teachers had to consider what other pedagogical aspects were related to student performance. Teachers also had to think about the effect of grading on student learning and performance because Ann thought that grading shared both negative and positive effects on student learning. She goes on to argue that,

I know I would have found it extremely frustrating if my hard work didn’t count for something. We are preparing them for either college (whether there are plenty of graded assignments) or the real world whet job require constant assessment, even if they don’t follow the typical classroom grades. (Grading, Ann, September 8, 2008)

Regardless of teacher’s intent, a larger social system continued to request evaluating individual capability of whether people were qualified. In this regard, she pointed out that grading become a proof of one’s qualification of whether one fitted into a job and a college one went to. In addition, Nina made an important point about grading. She seemed to think that students would put effort in order to meet the basic requirement for the class objectives.
I think when students know that they will be graded on something they tend to work harder and give it more thought. On the other hand, when I was a student if a teacher said it was not graded, I would just as hard. (Grading, September 15, 2008)

It was hard for her to think of the world without grade. She believed that grading promoted student learning and performance in schools and deepened student thought process related to learning knowledge from teachers. Based on her personal experiences, she would not work hard enough if there were no grade. She felt the same way that students acted to the grade in schools.

Sue turned her focus towards the general consensus of a grading policy in schools. In a co-teaching situation, two teachers had two different criteria to evaluate student performance. Sue noted,

we had to discuss quickly and come up with a consensus. I have found it to be a bit a struggle because I don’t want to feel as if the students can marginalize my place in the classroom because they know that although we each grade half of the papers, my mentor teachers looks over the ones I graded. I understand that for all intents and purposes it is her classroom but I want to be on an equal level in everyone’s eyes. I think that as time goes on we will mesh our grading styles together so that when I grade something she doesn’t feel as if she has to look at what I have done. (Grading, September 15, 2008)

Her concern was that, without consensus between two teachers, students were puzzled when they got their grade so that these two teachers had to reach an agreement on how they graded
student performance. She also noticed that one who had less power was not being trusted. In the light of her experiences, grading was an issue of power relationships between students and teachers and teachers and interns as well. The reason that her mentor teacher looked over grading was to see her not as her colleague but as a student of teaching who was qualified through apprenticeship of observation. Along the issue of consensus, Sue continued to discuss,

I think that it is important to establish grades in the classroom because it is the system that had been put into place in the education system in order to gauge where students fall. I understand that more progressive ways of thinking would say that it’s better not to give students grades and look at the bigger picture…in my humble opinion the school districts all over the world have care-givers who want to see where their kids are in. (Grading, September 15, 2008)

In a system of evaluation, an issue of accountability was important. Stakeholders wanted to know about how children performed well in schools. Regardless of teacher’s views, teachers had to be sensitive to the issues of accountability. She also presented contrary views between in school realities and an ideal situation of schooling. In her view, teachers could not ignore the fact that care-givers wanted to see the progress of their children. In terms of the issues of accountability, teachers always prepare for negotiating between school realities and the ideal condition of schooling.

In a discussion of a system of evaluation, three things were important which were how teachers viewed a system of evaluation, and how teachers negotiated a process of value judgment on student performance, and to what extent teachers should accept social demands
and school realities. In order to change the venue of a system of evaluation, interns “attend to their voice other than their own and to include in their judgment other point of views” (Gilligan, 1994, p. xvi). It would help interns to make a clear sense of their own realities. It also suggested that interns should be “sensitive to the need of others so that interns were able to validate their ways of knowing” (Joyce & Tutela, 2006, p.64). By validating ways of knowing about student’s progress, it might help interns develop new conceptions of accountability, which contributed to build mutual consensus. This mutual consensus was a result of negotiation and of building a new value judgment for student learning and performance within a system of evaluation.
Chapter Seven

Critical Questioning

Critical questioning was not simply seeking on true answer but rather it was to uncover the taken-for-granted nature of knowledge and to identify and challenge hidden assumptions about professional learning practices. Those who were participating in an online discussion forum attempted to see how their ways of teaching and of professional learning practices were constructed.

In an inquiry-oriented professional development, university supervisors, mentor teachers, and consultants were primarily challenging the way that interns perceived the reality of school systems. In this regard, the development of professional knowledge was occurred in a particular community. This particular community might have particular cultural, political, and social values which embedded in an institutional discourse.

Practices of Critical Questioning

During two semesters from Fall 2008 and Spring 2009, I found that interns were struggling with many different issues such as how they could formulate inquiry questions based on critical reflection on their practices of teaching, how authority affected building a new relationship between students and teachers, in particular, interns, and how they reconstructed a system of value judgment about their practices of teaching. In this regard, critical questioning was not only to solve the problems of practices but to challenge the fixed assumptions and long-standing beliefs about the practices of teaching. Moreover, it might invoke to get beyond the limitations of the formal culture of a professional development.

Faundez and Freire (1989) insisted that teachers learned “other people’s experiences and take
It implied that teachers created an environment to cope with a tension between such cultural differences within the same learning community. It also implied that acknowledging cultural differences stimulated a person’s intellectual curiosity. This intellectual curiosity was important because it might help interns to detect the problems of practices and to identify the assumptions related to the practices of teaching.

Ann asked a general question which usually happened in the classroom teaching.

How have you been able to break outside that “small box”? Do you find you’re developing a “front-of-the-classroom-style”? Does anyone have any suggestions of what had worked for them in terms of movement, gesturing, or tone of voice? (Teaching Mannerism, September 8, 2008)

This question was about requesting suggestions in relation to teachers’ location. It implied that teachers were usually not moving from the front to the back but rather they were always sitting on the desk. In her sense, small box was part of the body of the classroom. Depending on teacher’s location, the styles of student learning would be different. In this sense, the way she asked question was not a critical question but it demanded a specific answer about movement, gesturing, and tone of voices in the classroom. As a researcher, I usually saw that interns sought out practical advices rather than theoretical understandings of what happened and how it happened.

Asking question as a means of gaining practical advices was also well presented in Jenny’s questions. She asks, “What is the best way to achieve good classroom management with those students?” (Classroom Management/Community, September 8, 2008). This question presented that Jenny seemed to think that there was the best ways to manage
classroom. In this question, she didn’t give any contextual information to understand what situations she encountered. Rather she might believe that other interns could understand her intention because they taught in the same school. Maybe some different ideas would be presented but it was still trying to an idea of one-shoot-one-kill.

Ann’s questions were different from those two interns who sought.

What happened a classroom when teachers make compromise, such as don’t bother other people and you can do whatever you want? …How do our assumptions or experiences from previous years affect how we teach this year? What exactly is the benefit of what my mentor teacher does, allowing more responsibility and freedom to the students? What works and what doesn’t? Do we always have to be instructing students, all the time? is this an assumption about teaching? (Balancing Work and Life, September 22, 2008)

These questions were more about understanding situations and an attempt to provoke new issues and intellectual curiosity. In her question, she knew that there was a difference between compromise and negotiation. It was related to the issue of power between students and teachers. She began to challenge knowledge that she learned from the previous institution and to connect theoretical understanding to the next questions. Without socio-historical understanding and knowledge about power relations between students and teachers, it was hard to come up with the ideas and perspective on these questions. As a result of practices of critical questioning, interns could deepen understanding the nature of knowledge construction, rethink their experiences of teaching, and allow them to challenge the assumptions were behind knowledge that they already had. Practice of critical questioning could create new perspectives on the various issues related to intellectual growth, which promotes jointly
responsible for learning. They would become a basis of negotiating authority between students and teachers.

**Challenging Assumptions about What Interns already Knew**

In practices of critical questioning, I realized that interns might believe that a way that teacher taught was a natural way, although it was not natural. This common perception was prevailed in teacher’s professional knowledge development. It was usually used to understand and perform the practices of teaching. In this regard, challenging the common perception was important because it offered interns to reconstruct the way they taught in classroom. When interns faced a difficult situation, they came to realize that knowledge about teaching what they knew of wasn’t working in some contexts. Britzman (2003) defined it as a contradictory reality. Jenny encountered such a contradictory reality. She noticed that her common perception and way of interpretation was used to make a sense of reality. Her question was simple but insightful: Can “ideal” every really be real? (Can Ideal Every Really Be Real?, October 6, 2008) My challenge began asking questions such as “who’s ideal?, how can you make it real?, and do you think a real really exist? These questions were the way that challenged the common perception of the way teacher thought. But Jenny still was inside this common perception. In her question, I found that Alison was struggling with to what extent she could help her students.

Despite my frustration with those who just don’t get English, I still am determined to help them get it. I don’t think you should force them to do so, but I think it’s important to show the person, by pulling from relevant issues
that really call to them, how English is everywhere. (Can Ideal Every Really Be Real?, Jenny, October 6, 2008)

In Alison’s ideal sense, she believed that teachers shouldn’t push their students in the name of supporting and helping. So she chose her student to make meaningful connection to the relevant issues in student’s everyday life. She believed that it brought them back into gaining an interest of learning English. It was an ideal for Alison’s social imagination being a teacher in an English classroom. Her imagination came back to the question: whose ideal is it?

Lauren showed a good example of an contradictory reality between the ideal and the real.

My favorite teacher from my high school who started my passion for English was hated by my best friend. She was a nice lady and all, but my friend hated her teaching methods, assignments, styles, etc. (Can Ideal Every Really Be Real?, October 6, 2008)

In her reflection on her high school experience, I found that her beloved teacher assumed that her goals, teaching methods, and assignment could touch upon every single student in her classroom. According to Lauren, it was not quite tapping into students’ perception of a good teacher and a good class. Some of students could reach what her teacher was expected to do. Some students couldn’t transform her intention into their performance in the classroom. She made clear how the preplanned ideal was unable to reach their students. She continually accounted for the problematic nature of ideal. She said,

this is why I believe that the ideas of an ideal lies in the hands of students or the individual. This may seem negative, but I don’t think that one single
teacher can have a profound effect on every single student they teach throughout their entire career. (Can Ideal Every Really Be Real?, Lauren, October 6, 2008)

Joan went on further questioning about the relationship between the idea of an ideal and the idea of a real.

I am wondering if the real and the ideal can be combined. As a teacher and as an individual, I feel that it is important to get to know what is truly real for someone else. Everyday, I work on creating what is “real” for me. However, what is “real” for me is not “real” for someone else. Therefore, I feel that the “ideal” teacher is able to understand that their “real” may not be their student’s “real”. (Can Ideal Every Really Be Real?, October 7, 2008)

She made a very important about misconceptions of the idea and the real. In the underlying assumption, it would be possible to combine the ideal with real. She thought that it was impossible because each individual might have a different sense of the meaning of ideal and the real. This was the way to challenge the common perception of a good teacher and a good class. In this regard, interns must be able to be sensitive to the fixed value and assumptions related to practices of teaching which led interns to uncover the misconception of knowledge that they learned without critical reflective thinking and challenging what they believed as true.

Uncovering Natural as Unnatural
Nina revealed her trouble to treat her students equally regardless of her preoccupied perception of social categorizations due to students’ ability to learn in schools. She perceived her own problems with her students,

Grading for me had been very hard because I have a natural tendency (along with many others) to grade harder on my advanced classes and easier on my other classes. (Biased with Certain Students, September 17, 2008)

She thought that it was not fair for the advanced class student. For this reason, she was struggling with how she had to admit the reality of classes she taught. When interns dealt with the issue of diversity, they tended to misunderstand it. Diversity was important because it offered an opportunity to understand the difference among students and teachers. For this reason, interns felt difficulty when they were not in the diverse group. Therefore, a new teacher must be sensitive to the diverse population of students in the classroom. These students might have different ways of learning and ways of understanding knowledge provided by teachers in the classroom. Paul states,

As I am sure most of you (interns) have witnessed, State College High is full of diversity. The High School possessed just about every type of ethnicity in culture. This extreme diversity is much different than the high school that I attended. One thing I have learned is that people from various cultures tend to experience different situations in the classroom, and as we as teachers need to be very aware of this. (Stressing Diversity in the Classroom, September 23, 2008)
For the future teacher, Paul suggested that teachers had to identify the significant meaning of cultural differences and ethnic differences in the classroom. According to his personal experience, a school he worked at had diverse ethnicities and cultures so that he came up with the idea of how teachers were dealing with this diversity in the classroom with their students. His personal experiences implied that mono-cultural and mono-ethnic context made simple teachers’ work at school in comparison to a school in which had diverse cultures and ethnicity. Teacher had to appreciate these cultural and ethnic differences. Without appreciating these diverse cultures and ethnicities, teachers might easily dismissed the culture of others who still believed that their culture was centered on their ways of knowing and of understanding the culture of others. In the classroom context, teachers who hadn’t had any experiences of the culture of others and ethnicities would face the difficulty of understanding other interns and their students who had different cultural knowledge and ethnic background which determined their pedagogical orientation. Paul stated,

a high school is a place where stereotyping and racial discretion are very prevalent, whether students want to believe it or not. They are constantly being judged and stereotyped which can actually lead the student into living up to the stereotype. (Stressing Diversity in the Classroom, September 23, 2008)

Eventually, students’ cultural knowledge and ethnic background became an important criterion to justify their action toward those who had different cultural knowledge and ethnic background. Teachers had to decide what is right, what is real, and what is appropriate. He questioned, “What issues are off limits and how does the students make up affect the lesson?” (Stressing Diversity in the Classroom, September 23, 2008). This question gave an insight for him and other interns to think about how teachers brought the diverse issues into the
classroom. Paul raised a very important question related to social class in the school. He thought that a school was supposed to set up for all students to succeed. Ironically, school was not supposed to make all students succeed but rather designed to sort out who were supposed to be successful or failed to accomplish their desire to succeed. He proposed,

Let us face it, the school system is not set up for every child to succeed. Can you imagine being in high school and not planning for college? Probably not, but this is exactly how most of my students feel. I understand that after years of teachers and administrators labeling these students as “lower-level” that the stigma sticks. (Problems with Students, Paul, November, 19, 2008)

From his perspective, teachers might not understand how students felt about the school system that they involved in. Rather teachers seemed to think that students needed to put their all efforts to fit into this school system. For this reason, students felt that schools and school personal didn’t want to make all students succeed. This school system reinforced the passive nature of schooling rather than active participation in learning to know something about what school intended to learn from the classroom activities. Paul explained the passivity of the school system.

I also see how these kids take it upon themselves to fall into this category. Instead of showing how they can become positive contributors, many of them decide on playing the victim and falling into the “I’m not good enough anyway” mentally. (Problems with Students, November 19, 2008)
The passive nature of this school system wouldn’t allow student to think themselves as active contributors to change the nature of schooling. Rather, they took advantage of social categorization in relation to what intention the school systems were for. According to him, students had an ability to directly challenge this notion of school. He raised question in terms of overcoming the passive nature of school such as “why do we have to do this? Once they acknowledged their ability to understand the nature of schooling, they might feel that this school system prevented them from perceiving themselves as intellectuals who were able to recognize the consequence of how this school system affected the way of learning something from classroom activities with their teachers. Along the passive nature of schooling, he indicated that society expresses that not going to college classifies you as an uneducated and unsuccessful person” (Problems with Students, November 19, 2008). James didn’t agree to the idea of the social categorization based on the level of education. He said,

the stigma that someone has to go to college in order to be successful is totally wrong. We educate our students not only to become future teachers, lawyers, and scientists but also future carpenters, mechanics, and plumbers who are very important for our everyday life. (Problems with Students, November 20, 2008)

James insisted that teachers must be able to rethink the concept of success. He mentioned that college entrance didn’t guarantee student success for their future. Rather people had to change the value of choosing their future occupations. If his idea applied to the teacher education, interns took different courses of their professional development in terms of the situation that they involved and the goal they set up for their own classroom. In other words, teachers could situate their goal of educating students depending on students’ interests rather
than on social categorization. In addition, both Paul and James were wondering how they could make their students feel sense of intelligence without considering their future career choices.

Somehow we need to show these kids that they are smart. (Problems with Students, Paul, November 19, 2008)

I think that we just have to make these students realize that they are smart. They are simply smart in totally different ways than other students in their same grade level. It is important to emphasize to them that they have the ability to do certain things that other student wouldn’t know where to begin with (Problems with Students, James, November 20, 2008)

Paul and James knew that students felt that they were smart even though they didn’t go to college. Although a common sense of success approved its social categorization, they attempted to change the definition of success. They proposed a new way of engaging in the process of learning through project-based activities. To make it successful, teachers needed to identify what abilities students had have and to promote how they maximized their ability to implement their personal objectives of project-based activities which made them understand the development of their personal intellectual capacity that became their commitment to the larger social goal. The central goal of project-based activities was part of enlarging students’ choice of interests in order for them to get a sense of how freedom in the classroom change the way student were thinking about their learning and the notion of success generated by social norms.
The complexity of understanding the relationship of being, knowing, and acting is connected to the constituting of teacher identity (Slater, 2004). If interns didn’t understand this complexity, they might not perceive the significance of their action toward student learning and classroom activity. Human agency played a very important role to mobilize human actions in terms of shaping teacher identities through student teaching. The given the fact that teacher identity is a key player for interns to understand the meaning of their experiences and the value of their relationship with their students and colleagues. Teacher identity could explain that interns involve the process of becoming professional practitioners who were able to teach and conduct inquiry into their practices of teaching in order to identify his/her own limitation in relation to their practices of teaching in the classroom (Britzman 203; Schon, 1987).

The most important thing that intern considered was that they had to know the condition of being within their own social world, which seemed to be a school and a classroom (Beach & Myers, 2001). Based on Freire’s idea, teacher identity should be consistent with the concept of becoming which facilitates the further growth of their ability to teach and their capacity to understand the nature of knowledge and the formation of teacher consciousness toward the improvement of their practice of teaching and the reshaping of their relationship with their students and colleagues.

**Key Questions of Teacher Identities**

The most professional literature related to teacher identity focused on the ideological aspect of teachers’ beliefs and values about teaching. I understood that it was almost impossible for
me to distance myself from my cultural and social beliefs about teaching. Whether I denied or not, I still possessed particular forms of cultural and social beliefs about teaching which was called the common perception of teachers’ identity. When dealing with teachers’ identity, I knew that I had to be very careful about the political aspect of the formation of such beliefs and values.

Typical questions to study about teachers’ identity were what does it mean to be a teacher? Why do interns want to be a teacher? These two questions implied the ideological and political aspect of shaping teachers’ identity. Depending on intern’s cultural, political, and social beliefs about teaching, these questions would be changed such as what it meant to be a good teacher. What made interns effective teachers? Along this argument about constituting teachers’ identity through internship, I found that interns had an attempt to connect their social status to the practices of teaching. Interns were concerned about whether their teaching was effective or not and whether they could make their students successful learners. James expressed his idea of the meaning of teachers.

Personally, I want to be an effective teacher so that all of students learn something from me. An effective means someone who is well prepared for teaching content knowledge and classroom management. Classroom management is a huge factor for me to deal with my student behaviors and attitudes toward my teaching and classroom activity. But I don’t want to merely become a lecturer and disciplinarian who transfer pre-given knowledge to my student. (Relationship as a Building Block for Education, September 17, 2008)
His perception of becoming a teacher was to make their teaching effective and relevant to student’s real life situation. In his view, an effective teacher was able to deal with the content knowledge and classroom management. For him, knowing about content knowledge and dealing with student’s behavior and attitudes might be a huge factor for me to be considered. On the contrary, he didn’t’ want to become a lecturer or disciplinarian. In this regard, there were two contradictory positions for interns to define the meaning of becoming a teacher in a professional domain. If a teacher focused too much on predetermined content knowledge and classroom management, he or she could not set free themselves from the control mechanism. If they paid much attention on dialogic interaction without particular standards regarding the evaluation of student academic performance, a teacher hardly knew what students were supposed to learn. James might think that knowledge about contents and classroom management were an important factor to determine who they are and what they can become. He indicated that the legitimacy of teachers’ qualities includes: “good classroom management skills, knowledgeable about content areas, and building a strong community of from the start in the classroom”(Relationship as a Building Block for Education, September 17, 2008).

However, this was not the only aspect of making a teacher as a professional. Rather interns should get a sense of cultural, political, and social aspect of identity politics in student teachers. Maria expressed her feeling about teacher as professional in terms of cultural, political and social aspect.

I’m with students who are not similar to the way I was in high school. Many of them hate school and sometimes it’ hard to relate…I don’t regret liking school and I’m certainly happy with the great experience I had in school growing up but sometime I wish I had been that rebellious, disillusioned, down-with-the man student who I find so intriguing now. It would be
awesome to have that background and then to come into the school system and shake things up a bit and give a new perspective from the typical teacher responses. (Studenting, February 6, 2009)

She clearly mentioned that she became aware of who she was in the past. Knowing about the past helped her how to see the change of school systems and teacher professional responses for students who hated school. From her perspective, teachers could be sensitive to the changing culture of schooling and socio-cultural nature of teachers in schools. She mentioned that her experience as a high school student was different when she became an intern in school. For her, understanding the cultural, political, and social aspects of their identity was important because it affected interns’ ways of teaching, process of knowing, and building a community of learning with their students. Ann remarked how cultural, political, and social influence changed the way they decided to become a teacher. She said, “I brought up my concerns with being able to justify my choice of teaching as a career” (Ann, February 6, 2009). She implied that her choice to be a teacher could not separate from her personal cultural, political, and social beliefs. She continually went on arguing about teachers’ social status. She mentioned,

When I think of teaching and its status in society, I see two contradictory perspectives that are, ironically, often meshed together. Teachers are widely respected for what they do and have a lot of clout in their community. However, at the same time, their lambasted in the media for not living up to NCLB standards and foreign statistics, their intelligence is questioned and their choice to live on $35,000 a year is laughed at. (Why the Heck Do You Want to Be a Teacher?, Ann, February 6, 2009)
She indicated that there were contradictory realities to become a teacher. Although she thought teaching as rewarding jobs, many of young professionals left job due to other reasons. By raising a question of a new education policy and teachers’ salary, She tried to reveal the reality of teachers with respect to the conditions of teachers’ life in schools. I found that interns faced difficulties neither having professional knowledge about teaching nor the compassion for their job. Instead, interns proposed that they were respected from the important stakeholders.

**Building Reciprocal Relationships between Students and Teachers**

Building relationships between students and teachers were the most important part of teaching. Without having a reciprocal relationship, teachers could not convince students to invite their social worlds. This reciprocal relationship led both students and teachers to reach the point that they were about to understand how they resolved the tensions. Paul indicated, “the relationship building process was what break the wall of tension and increase interns’ classroom morale” (September, 16, 2008). He still believed that teachers had to conceive that there was “a fine line that teachers have to walk in order to maintain a balance between a student’s friend, and their disciplinarian” (September, 16, 2008). In his perception, teacher played two important roles in a classroom such as students’ closest friends and their teachers who was looking for students’ learning performance. Based on his view, he seemed to think that teachers had to develop a reciprocal relationship with their students. Jordan also noticed that the process of building relationships between teachers and students took time. Paul describes,
It is hard for me to speak wisely here for I have only been in the school for two weeks and I have not built strong relationships with my students yet. A relationship is something that takes a long time to build, but once my students realize that I am making an attempt to help/educate them, their mind, and spirits become open. (Personal Teaching Philosophy, September 16, 2008)

For him, building this relationship informed students to perceive what teachers intend to do with them. Not only did the teachers understand the meaning of relationship but also this relationship could make their students get a sense of the possibility of openness toward others who were involved in the process of learning and teaching. Nina supported Paul’s ideas, which were building trust and increasing the level of comport with their teachers. She said,

Throughout the first three weeks of school, I have watched student’s slowly become more comfortable with me as a student teacher, but most importantly, as someone that they can come and chat with. The comfort level with the student’s take time, but if I don’t shy away from the student, they feel at ease with me. (Personal Teaching Philosophy, September 17, 2008)

She reinstated that like Jordan, a relationship building took a long time. She noted that comport level with students were very important because it determined how classroom activities were proceeded. More importantly, intern could recognize the role as a student teacher as part of a plan for getting a sense of their existences. Both students and teachers would acknowledge that they were able to see the meaning of existence within their own community where they were interactive and attentive to something that they were really cared about. James illustrates,
Developing good relationships with my students is very important to me, and I feel like my relationships with my students are slowly getting better as each day goes on. As this progress, I can also see how students become more interactive and attentive in class. As their comfort level rises, they tend to participate more often in class, and they also ask specific questions about material that may otherwise be afraid or nervous to. (Relationship as a Building Block for Education, September 17, 2008)

For him, he could see how a comfort level with his students were progressed and how their students were engaged in the process of learning through interactions with him and his other students. In the regard, a relationship is very important for interns to be aware of their selfhood as supporters and facilitator in order for his students to put themselves into the new level of social relations with their teachers. Students would change their point of view in relation to developing interns’ teacher identity-identity something that teachers increased the level of comfort with students in order to get to better know each other and to better work interns’ educational objectives within a particular classroom. Lauren was very supportive of the idea of building a reciprocal relationship as part of getting to better know each other. She called it “ice breaker activities” (September 17, 2008). She brought her school experience to explain how she felt about building a relationship with her teacher.

When I was a student, I hated these types of stupid things we were required to participate in. I would always have a good time, but I figured it was just my teachers trying to force friendship between us. Now, being on the other side of
the educational spectrum, I see that these little activities are necessary. They help in creating a welcoming atmosphere, and allow the teacher to become familiar with their students’ various personalities. (Relationship as a Building Block for Education, Lauren, September 17, 2008)

For her, it was important to build friendship between her and her student even though she thought it was stupid things to do when she was student. She argued that teachers had to considered activities in the classroom even if it appeared to be unexpected results of her activities. She believed that such activities gave students an opportunity to create a welcoming atmosphere and teachers were able to deeply understand what students’ personalities were. She might use this information and experience to lay out what she was supposed to do with her student. At the same time, teachers could measure up who their students were and what they were capable of. Sometimes, student might feel that activities she provided were unnecessary, but unnecessary meant that it was not always meaningless activities for her students. Instead, teachers had to consider the understanding of student personalities which influenced on shaping their teacher professional identity. Carol indicated that she could struggle with her own identity as a person who was not ready to being called her name with a different social title.

My students occasionally get lazy and call me Mrs. Bricker. Mrs. Bricker is my mother and my grandmother…not me. But I wonder what would happen if I became the teacher who was so concerned with how she was addressed. (MS. Thiry, October 9, 2008)
Carol thought that she was entitled to being Amanda than being Mrs. Bricker. She refused to accept when her student called herself as Mrs. Bricker. It was not a matter of how her student called her name but rather she concerned more about how she was addressed within her own classroom. I thought that she might have a choice to designate her name but a cultural and social institution determined her professional venue as a teacher. She had to think about why her student called her Mrs. Bricker because she would have a similar cultural and social knowledge and experiences just like her mother and grandmother. It was part of her personal identity, which affected her ways of building relationship with her students. Interns had to deeply consider their personal identities as person constantly affected the formation of their professional identity even if interns wouldn’t think it was part of their lives in school. Interns had to develop a new conception of a role as a teacher derived from their personal life as human being who was continually connected to communities that they belonged to. Along Carol’s argument about the personal venue for the teachers’ identity, Paul stressed a building relationship between students and teacher, which was more related to an obstacle relevant to possible tensions that he might encounter. Reciprocity between students and teachers could be a possible alternative to decrease a tension between them. He expressed,

During the first couple of weeks of school, I have realized how important it is to build relationships with my students. This building process is, what breaks the wall of tension and increase my classroom morale? (Relationship as a Building Block for Education, Paul, September 16, 2008)

Through his writing, I found that building a relationship between teacher and students reduced tensions and resistances and kept the balance between student and teacher. He noted that relationship building gained trust from the students and recovered authority as teachers.
He thought that authority became an obstacle to build a relationship with his students. He tried to seek to find the way he could break the tension between him and his student.

**Socio-economic and social-cultural status and professional identity formation**

A person would have different views of the world based on where he/she was grown up. He/she would also have a different point of view based on what cultural and social experience he/she had had. In teacher professional identity formation, a teacher educator had to carefully look at the diverse socio-economic and socio-cultural knowledge and experiences. A teacher attempted to reduce a tension and/or resistance from his/her students. For this reason, I tried to figure out how socio-economic and socio-cultural knowledge and experiences affected the formation of teacher professional identity. It was helpful for interns to identity their social location as a teacher and educational discourses generated by their different social position in terms of their professional identity formation.

However, I found that it was also problematic for interns to reposition themselves into the new school setting. I noticed that interns might not understand how their students were raised and how they learned to understand other people’s culture. It was undeniable that these two pedagogical aspects influenced on teachers’ relationship building with their students. It was interns that were able to conceive the impact of their socio-economic and socio-cultural values as a mean of justifying students’ performance in schools. **Ann** described her difficulty with regard to the affair of her social position in the classroom.

It was difficult for me to think of the social groups that I belonged to and consider ways in which they may affect the classroom. It really takes a lot of
thought to categorize myself; groups that I interact with everyday do not pop into mind as one may think they should. (Social Groups, September 22, 2008)

She recognized that her social positions could affect her teaching and her students' learning but she didn’t know how her social position connected to developing her knowledge about her students and other interns around her. Different social groups might have different social values and beliefs so that teacher would take different ways to interact with the members of groups. Ann also realized that she had to consider what social groups she belonged to because it was tightly related to her decision-making and modes of interaction with other people. At the same time, for her, there were possibilities for teacher to expand their social discourses in relation to the formation of their teacher identity. Through recognizing different social groups having different social values, she started off categorizing herself as

a middle class, college friends, Christian group on campus, learner, school personal, educator, and college students. Certainly each of these social groups makes up who I am as a person and it would be unnatural for them not to play a role in the classroom. (Social Groups, Ann, September 22, 2008)

She located herself as a middle classroom, which presented her socio-economic status, Christian group, which was her religious belief, school personnel and educator, which represented her profession, and college students, which presented her current social location.

I acknowledge that one person had many different social worlds, which constantly influenced on his/her professional identity formation and entry point of engagement with other people. In this case, teachers attempted to build a new relationship with their students and to
Maria tried to explain how this diverse social group had the massive impact of her identity formation as a teacher.

"My culture and socio-economic status relate very close to my social groups. I am a white, Anglo-Saxon Protestant. I do not actually have a very strong cultural heritage, because my family has been in America for generations; my heritage is English and German, but my customs are American. (Social Groups, September 29, 2008)"

She knew that her socio-economic status was important to shape her identity and to form her social group. For her, her racial background and religious belief was significant which might determine her as a person and national identity as an American. It was important for her to see how her cultural values determined her ways of engaging in classroom teaching and making connection her to her students. She also mentioned that she would not be English and German even though she had those cultural heritages from their parent generation. It allowed her to "determine the conditions of her own work" and to establish a relationship between her and her student (Kincheloe, 1992, pp.175-176). She doubted that her ethnic and historical background might not strongly tied to the shaping of her identity as an American. She also showed that her English and German background would not affect her American identity as a teacher within a high school classroom. Rather she put it forward to reconnect her cultural and historical background to frame her American identity, which embraced the diversity and complexity of teachers as professionals. I thought that the recognition of interns’ professional identity helped interns come to know multiple realities, and voices, which fostered interns to become attentive to the influence of their cultural and social background in classroom teaching. These cultural and social knowledge and experience were important for the interns
to internalize their professional roles as an English teacher. The most important thing that interns had to understand was that they were able to have an ability to situate their internal complexity as a human being, which led them to reconnect themselves to their professional world. I believed that understanding the internal complexity of interns’ lives at school enabled them to participate in the diverse social worlds around them. They were also able to make their experience of teaching a meaningful enactment of professional identity formation.
Chapter 9

Constructing Critical Selfhood

A way to frame professional identity as a teacher was important because it might help interns shape their professional self and construct critical selfhood within a school and a classroom. Many interns in written dialogue revealed that they tended to focus on shifting their student identity to teacher identity throughout their internship in a professional development school and making sense of what professional meant to them. Without illuminating reality of interns themselves, it is impossible to change it (Shor & Frire, 1987). Life as intern was always full of uncertainty and ambiguity. Intern might assume that these uncertainty and ambiguity made difficult for them to construct critical selfhood. Under this condition, many interns defined being a profession as those who became qualified and certified

In this reductive thinking, interns were unable to see their potential as professional. In an entire year of a professional development school, they invested their time to transit a student to a teacher but not to become both. For this reason, all their commitment was focused on fulfilling requirement for the certification, which was connected to the notion of vocational qualification and occupational competence (Usher & Edwards, 1994).

To challenge a reductive view of being a professional, interns should be able to illuminate their realities in schools and reinvent a meaning of their identity. Slater (2004), Kincheloe (2001), and Thayer-Bacon (2001) indicated that constructing critical selfhood was a transformative process to reframe what interns could become and a sense-making process, which could make interns understand the complexity of human relations to the world. This transformative and sense-making process led interns to reach out the new level of understanding about what being a professional meant to them and it brought change in a direction of classroom teaching and professional learning practices. This new level of
understanding in being a professional turned uncertainty and ambiguity into positive energy which made classroom as a place for performing democracy, freedom, and social justice and to challenge the predetermined values and fixed beliefs about the role as a teacher who was a information deliverer. Intern could change their value of being a student and being a professional, which linked them to the world and people who were talking together and thinking together. They could have a sensitivity to the cultural, historical, political, and social construction of who they could become.

**Consciousness of being a professional**

In reality, having both student identity and teacher identity was difficult. It was because being a professional meant eliminating student selfhood rather than maintaining it to learn from others. It clearly drew a line between students and teachers and between professional and occupational commitment. It created boundaries of consciousness. Recognition of boundaries of consciousness began with the question of what professional meant to them and how they could distinguish professional commitment to student learning from job commitment to student learning. Such recognition might allow interns to redefine a meaning of being a professional and to change a perceptual framework for professional learning practices in a professional development. Redefining a meaning of being a professional and changing the perceptual framework were the basis of understanding the complexity of teacher’s life in schools and the significance of diversity. Kincheloe (2003) described that “life is self-produced in forms of escalating diversity and complexity” (p.48).

In terms of teaching as life-living technology, Nina raised an important question in relation to shaping teacher identity. She asks, “how do we bridge the gap between being a student and considering ourselves as “pre-professional”? (Difference between Professional
and a Job, September 22, 2008) This question indicated that she was not yet to be a student of teaching and not even close to be a teacher. It implied that her student identity was stronger than her teacher identity at this point. Another interesting point made in her question was a notion of pre-professional. Nina seemed to think that she was in an entry point as being a professional but there was something needed to be done to be a professional which was to “execute educational requirements as a teacher and at the same time, conceive of the importance of joining professional organization” (Difference between Professional and a Job, Nina, September 22, 2008). In her sense, professional was a process of fulfilling requirement for certification, which was presented as vocational qualifications and occupational competences and as membership of professional organizations, like school. Carol shared the similar view with Nina. Being a professional was no more than performing requirements for certification. Both Nina and Carol argued that interns might not become professional unless they had expert-knowledge about teaching and learning which ratified qualified and competent teachers. Carol turned her focus towards teachers as professional in a larger social context.

We do require a certification to be able to teach, there are at least four years of required schooling plus additional credits, and teacher belong to professional organizations…It seems that true professionals should not have to ask for respect; it should be a given. And despite all importance of education the younger generation, many still see teaching (especially in younger grades) as glorified babysitting undeserving of the respect we would give a doctor or lawyer. (Difference between Professional and a Job, September 23, 2008)
For Carol, it didn’t matter how teachers viewed themselves as professional but it mattered how others viewed them as a professional. Being a teacher had the enormous commitments, which were at least four years of required schooling plus additional credits and memberships of a professional organization. Carol thought that teacher’s commitment and effort were undervalued comparing to other professional such as a doctor and a lawyer. These fixed stereotypes affected value judgment, which disconnected teachers from other social worlds. Carol’s concern was that such fixed stereotypes framed a system of justification for the educational requirements and professional organizations. She drew out the significance of making sense of close-minded views. Reconnecting her views to significant others was having both student identity and teacher identity at the same time. This dual identity awakened interns to rethink the value of their commitment to educating the future generation and made them be open-minded. Ann describes benefits of being both a student and a teacher.

I think that it’s beneficial to be straddling the line between student and professional. We are able to live a little bit in both worlds and not be pulled from one or thrust into another too abruptly (Difference between Professional and a Job, September 22, 2008).

One-foot-in-and-one-foot-out was important because it gave a clear sense of how social relations and social values were constructed within a different social world. As a student, she could see what her teacher was struggling with. As a teacher, she could see what her students were struggling for. It indicated that living in both worlds remained her open-minded and subverted the long-standing fixed stereotypes which considered a natural way of performing their beliefs and values. In this regard, holding different values of the divers social worlds made possible for interns to develop new pedagogical knowledge and promote intellectual
curiosity that was revaluing the consequence of shaping teacher identity. **Ann** illustrates how her thought processes change in a different social world,

> I find that by the time I enter back into the college lifestyle thought processes have to completely change. I can’t order my roommate to do something—because unlike the 11th graders I teach who are fearful of receiving a bad grade if I don’t comply, my roommates will just be angry at my bossiness. (Difference between professional and a Job, September 22, 2008)

She noticed something was different when she engaged in a different social world. It was a transformative experience that helped her to illuminate her own realities of being a student again at a college. She realized that she was not the same person when she came back into the college lifestyle. She brought her way living as high school teacher to college life and her roommate. In the high school setting, she was a teacher and authority figure who held power to control her students. In the college setting, she was no more than a student who worried about grades. If she tried to control her college classmate, conflicts broke out. It indicated that this conflict came out of fixed stereotypes of being professional as an authority figure.

Nina got, however, a different sense of being a professional. The more experience interns had, the better teachers they became.

> it is hard to separate our lives at this point, but as the year progresses. I find it easier and easier to transit myself into the role of a teacher. (Difference between Professional and a Job, September 22, 2008)
From her perspective, everything depended on experiences. Getting more and more experiences enabled interns to shape their professional identity as a teacher. Experiences tended to judge a degree of being a professional. This unprecedented consequence might misconstrue a meaning of professional. Being a professional was related to many different aspects such as culture of a community, a political nature of professional organizations, a social nature of human relations, expectation of the stakeholders. She ignored the fact that these cultural, political, social aspects could affect the formation of professional identity.

In consequence, interns had to consider many different aspects of being a professional which led them to identify and challenge fixed stereotypes: being professional was to develop vocational qualifications and occupational competences, to fulfill educational requirements for certifications, teachers could never be student again, and everything depended on experiences. Like Ann, back into the college lifestyles provided the transformative experiences, which enabled interns to illuminate the realities of their own as a teacher. Illuminating the realities of being a professional cultivated the culture of constructing new selfhood which could redefine the role of a teacher in the different social world and reconnect understanding the complexity of professional identity formation into a culture of a community, a political nature of professional organization, a social nature of human relations, and expectations of the stakeholder, and envision the possibility of change, and create a new sense agency which considered teachers as social change agents and cultural workers who were able to empower themselves. Changing the condition of teacher existence brought out being a professional as a being of becoming.

**Identity Shifting**
Dialogic interactions between interns helped developing multiple ways of approaching and understanding about the images of teachers and patterns of teaching. The starting point of discussion regarding teacher identity was the question: Why do you want to be a teacher? and What kind of teacher do you want to become? Based on these two important key questions, interns were able to rethink their cultural and social beliefs, which shaped the way they constructed the practices of teaching in the classroom. There were two interns who were involved in a discussion of “personal teaching philosophy”. A starter of this discussion was Judy who had a critical sensitivity to the long-held myth of the successful teaching and a typical response to the formal job interview.

I’d want to say in a formal job interview is the same old story about if I touched one child’s life, I would feel that my success and personal accomplishments as a teacher would be completely fulfilled. (Personal Teaching Philosophy, September 9, 2008)

As a beginner teacher, she expressed how successful teaching was constructed. This stereotypical cliché prevented her from creative imaginations, which could rebuild a meaning of successful teaching. She seemed to think that she didn’t have other answer yet. It implied that having a solidified teaching philosophy was never ended but it was on-going process to build up a new conception of the pedagogical purposes for professional learning practices. Paul defined “a teaching philosophy is something that should be molded, changed, broken down, and rebuilt many times before it solidifies” (Personal Teaching Philosophy, September 9, 2008). By definition, teaching philosophy had an ever-changing mechanism. This ever-changing mechanism brought out a new pedagogical capacity, which cultivated a teacher’s perspective shift. This new pedagogical capacity was the basis of developing one’s own sense
of the practices of teaching. Paul insists, “a teaching philosophy is the backbone of my teaching and gives my own sense of style. It identifies as a teacher, and it gives me a reason to continue teaching” (Personal Teaching Philosophy, September 9, 2008). If a teacher had a deep sense of teaching and reasoning for the practices of teaching, it would help them to shape the way they strived for life-long learning. Having teaching as life-long learning reshaped the way interns looked at the consequences of becoming a teacher and encouraged interns to see them as a being of becoming rather than a completed being. In a sense of a being of becoming, Paul insists, “through my career I will encounter situations that really challenge my teaching philosophy and that it is not negative thing if I have to reshape the way I look at a teaching” (Personal Teaching Philosophy, September 9, 2008). The concept of a being of becoming was consistent with reshaping intern’s perspectives to see the situations and shifting a perspective of a completed being to a being of becoming who had a great potential. This new potential and perspective shift created a new sense of community where both students and teacher were able to co-build the values of learning and teaching in schools and to re-establish a new conceptual framework to understand the condition of human existence.

In terms of a being of becoming, interns were able to recondition the way they lived their life at schools. Stretching a concept of community might provide an opportunity to perform democratic practices in teaching and learning. This democratic practice in learning and teaching put forward to gaining new cultural and social values, which affected patterns of participation and gaining a voice, which spoke for one and for others. As a result of gaining new cultural and social values and having voices enabled interns to overcome the preoccupied limitations of fulfilling requirements for certification. Interns always encountered an important to make a decision. Carol expresses, “as a teacher I will have to make decision about how much of myself I want to share with my students” (Personal
Teaching Philosophy, September 9, 2008). In terms of building mutual and reciprocal relationships between students and teachers, interns had to decide how much they revealed who they are and what they are capable of. The expose of their condition of existences and their capability of teaching made their students consider them competent teachers to teach them in the classroom.

**Moving into transformative self as an actor of freedom**

In forming teacher identity, interns had to perceive their realities and conditions of their existence within a particular educational institution such as a university, a school, and a classroom. This institution would have different realities in terms of its educational objectives and the purpose of education. Teacher would be a representative of this institutional discourse. For this reason, it is important for interns to perceive their own realities which address their intention and which formulate the particular forms of discursive practices for achieving their educational objectives within their own school and classroom. According to Freire (1970), teachers could not be fully human beings but rather sought out for the fullness of their humilities to engage in the process of becoming. The big plan for changing the nature of teachers’ selfhood is to challenge the status quo that kept the distorted perception of teaching and knowledge and of knowledge production in relation to the reshaping of human realities and human identities. Ann tended to question about the teacher-led classroom teaching.

The teacher-led whole group discussion/teacher in-front-of-classroom role are certainly not a metaphoric or symbolic representation of fostering democracy and social justice—a prominent goal of education—so why are these role perpetuated? (Challenging the Status Quo, February 2, 2009)
She profoundly discussed how classroom activities and roles of teachers promoted democracy and social justices within a school. She might express that in reality, teachers could not implement democracy and social justice but rather teachers attempted to keep their traditional institutional values and meanings of education. For her, it was important to elicit the concept of democracy and social justice as part of constituting teachers’ roles in terms of overcoming the current situations of learning to teach which was not related to re-conceptualizing the approach to understand the transformative force that enabled teachers to figure out how school realities were presented in classroom teaching. Understanding the realities of schooling informed that teachers tended to request the more experience and teaching practices because they believed that these experiences and practices allowed them to gain the true realities of their experiences in relation to constituting professional selfhood.

Maria indicated that teachers must become aware of their true realities while they practiced teaching. She described the undemocratic nature of teaching practices as studenting. She says,

> The very nature of teaching and learning is that students are the receivers-they told, lectured, graded. Yes, the student who “students” is a wonderful asset in the classroom full of good “studenters” is a teacher’s dream (at least as far as discipline is concerned). (Studenting, February 4, 2009)

The process of shaping professional teacher identity demanded that interns should acquire particular types of behaviors and attitude toward becoming professionals so that they had to be well-behaved fitting into the presupposed institutional discourses that made up the way teachers taught in the classroom. Of course, teachers still had an opportunity to reconstitute the professional identities by perceiving what the nature of teaching and learning shaped the
concept of being a professional within a professional community. The interesting concept she
made up of was studenting, which aligned to a banking education and teachers as receivers
rather than producers. It meant that teachers should become producers who could invent new
knowledge and create new learning environment where both teachers and students were able
to make meaningful for their prior experiences and knowledge. Interns might not become
aware of a new concept of teacher identity, which of course reflected on who they were and
what they could become. Those who invented their own knowledge got a historical sense of
the meaning of teacher in the professional setting. Jenny expressed it,

We all teach differently, from different perspectives, and all of these views
impact how and what we teach... what I drew out of that, though, is that we all
have a shared consciousness, something that really reminds me of the ESP
book my sister keeps talking about as well as the mantra the women
repeatedly says on my yoga video. (Miseducation, False Consciousness, and
Social Justice, December 12, 2008)

Becoming professional teachers were capable of recognizing individual differences and social
consciousness for the importance of being a teacher. Jenny had a perception of becoming a
teacher in a professional manner. From her perspectives, individual teachers might have
different approaches to teaching their students and with different perspectives, teachers would
acknowledge that there was a shared conception of teaching and teacher as a professional
who possessed different points of views and perspectives on education.

Professional identity allowed interns to have a new kind of experiences so that
teachers might not “duplicate the prior reality of the ones who undergo it, leaving him or her
precisely as before; something must be altered, something new must happen to make the
experience meaningful” (Jay, 2005, p.7). These new kinds of professional experiences provided interns with a deeper understanding of the meaning of becoming professional and the making of their life meaningful based on their own choices. Interns were able to gain more freedom by inventing a new kind of experiences and an open space for shaping their professional identity. At the same time, interns shouldn’t take too much control of the phase of their students’ learning. Sometimes, interns wouldn’t decide how much freedom should be allowed in the classroom. If they gave students too much freedom, students might take advantage of this freedom as a means of distracting teachers from their classroom objectives. For interns who wanted to recover the power of teachers, interns had to show their students how freedom worked out in the classroom. In this regard, Jackie brought a relationship between teachers’ authority and students’ freedom. Freedom and choice were important for interns to decide how much authority they could share with their students and how students took responsibility for their own learning. The same thing happened to the interns who wanted to get more opportunity to engage with their students. Jackie remarked,

I thought about the practice of my own freedom for a while and formulated an answer, but I’m still not really sure how I practice my own freedom. What I do know, however, is that it is important for me to begin to figure out what that means in my own life, so that it spills over into how I teach and manage my own classroom. (Freedom in the Classroom, December 10, 2008)

As she mentioned, teachers’ subjective positions and experiences was important because teachers tended to find the value of freedom that students might practice it with them. Teachers could appreciate what it meant to them choice-making and freedom-practices both as individual and as professional. Freedom must always be a public domain because it always
related to other human beings who wanted to get more freedom both in and outside the classroom. More importantly, she make it relevant to her life which represented teacher identity. In other words, interns attempted to seek out the meaning of becoming teachers within a professional environment, which required particular knowledge, skills, and techniques. Jackie was still struggling with finding definite answer of how she practices the freedom in the classroom.

We talked more about what practicing freedom would look like if it were lived out in the classroom, and the various scenarios that could arise. We discussed the need for an understanding of freedom, and not just freedom in terms of the Declaration of Independence and American History, but instead, in terms of the ability to choose and make decision freely. This way of thinking, especially within the construction of the school system, create tension because it is not how the majority think or live. (Freedom in the Classroom, December 10, 2008)

For her, it is important to understand how she practices the freedom in the classroom, which enables her to justify their actions and legitimatize her goal of education. Furthermore, it helped her to extend the concept of freedom in the classroom, neither did she possess more authority than her students, nor students were objectives for practicing freedom. Rather interns shouldn’t take the whole responsibility for their students’ learning. Touched upon the rediscovery of the meaning of freedom within a political and social domain meant that teachers had more opportunity to gain a deeper sense of themselves as not only a teacher who taught their students with the presupposed content knowledge but also a citizen who was able to make the change of the education and of the world. In the process of transforming interns
into teachers, I was sure that interns should have an ability to connect their everyday life to the larger social context and social issues such as citizenship education and social responsibility for educating the future generation who grabbed a new idea of learning something from schools. The practice of freedom was a good place to start to figure out how interns could expand students’ freedom which prevented interns from performing their stereotypical views of education. At the same time, interns could develop a new perception of teachers who were able to teach particular forms of knowledge as well as to invent new forms of knowledge, which strived for the democratic impulse of pedagogical knowledge in classroom activities.
Chapter Ten

Implication & Conclusion

The existing teacher education programs were mostly based upon experts (i.e., university supervisors, mentor teachers, and professional development associates) supporting professional development. These experts designed to help interns develop teachers’ knowledge and skills for teaching and construct teacher identity by their guidance of pedagogical direction for being a qualified teacher. These experts believed that this type of professional development made possible for interns and first year teachers define teachers’ role as knowledge deliverers and guided professional practitioners in schools and classroom. And also this expert-based teacher professional development might consider teacher knowledge and identity as the given rather than interns could develop knowledge about teaching and construct teacher identity through having practical experiences. Dewey(1916) defined it as a mis-educative experience. According to Rogers (2002), “a mis-educative experience is one that “arrests or distorts growth. It doesn’t lead toward growth nor does it contribute to the greater good of society” as well as student learning (p.847). By arresting or distorting the growth of professional knowledge and professional knowledge, interns’ experience of teaching practice was disconnected from their student learning and fixed student-teacher relations in a hierarchical order. Moreover, interns had rarely been considered as sources of knowledge about teaching and key players for constructing their identity as a professional practitioner. In addition, this mis-educative experience narrowed the field of further experience and limited the meaning-horizon” (Dewey, 1916/1944, p.78).

According to Ferry and Ross-Gordon (1998), “experience generated within the context of action is viewed as playing a key role in the professional expertise” (p.98). Within intern-intern interactive dialogue must be an educative experience that “broadens the field of
experience and knowledge, bring awareness to bear and leads in a constructive direction, toward intelligent actions” (Rogers, 2002, p.847). For this obvious reason, intern-intern professional development was significant because it might increase the possibility for thriving educational reforms in a teacher education. This study paid more attention to make conceptual changes for a notion of professional development, bring actual practice changes, and gain transformative experiences by establishing a collaborative, professional learning community and sharing various experiences taken place in practicing teaching. Conceptual changes bring interns “new perception of bearing or connection which lead to a broadening of one’s understanding of self and the world” (Roger, 2002, p.847). Dewey (1916/1944) defined education as “that reconstruction or reorganization of experience which adds to the meaning of experience, and which increase [one’s] ability to direct the course of subsequent experience. (p.74). As Dewey mentioned above, professional development within a professional development school encouraged interns to reconstruct or reorganize their experiences of teaching through reflective inquiry. Based on Dewey’s definition of education, this study intended to seriously look at how intern-intern dialogue made interns critically think about teachers such as issues of knowledge, issues of power, and issues of identities. Many professional literatures in a teacher education reported that practical experiences led intern to grow their knowledge and to construct identities based on their personal interests. According to Rogers (2002), “an experience is not an experience unless it involves interaction between the self and another person, the material world, the natural world, an idea, or whatever constitutes the environment at hand” (p.846). As Dewey (1916/1944) and Rogers (2002) pointed out, making experience meaningful was to accompany two key elements such as interaction and the continuity experiences. Rogers continually insisted that “an experience means an interaction between oneself and the world” (p.846). As the previous chapters described and explained, this professional development was different from that of other
professional development which was paid more attention to intern-intern professional development that made interns critically think about teachers such as issues of knowledge, issues of power, and issues of identities.

By sharing different experiences from interns and interacting with their students, intern might clearly understand how experiences helped them to construct particular forms of knowledge about teaching, how different relationships had been established between interns and students during their one-year internship, and how such relationship and various cultural and social experiences brought conceptual changes for constituting teacher identities. At the same time, interns could support other interns’ practice of teaching through dialectical reflection and collective critical reflective inquiry that led them to reach particular values of experiences. Since I was working with interns in a professional development, their goal was to develop knowledge, techniques and skills. In other world, interns were largely concerned about issues of classroom management and of grading for students’ achievement rather than about issues of cultural and social changes for “correcting unfair privilege and unfair deprivation, not perpetuate them” (Dewey, 1916/1944, p.119). The value of the continuity of experiences from the practice of teaching was significant because “we make sense of each new experience based on the meaning gleaned from our own past experiences, as well as other prior knowledge we have about the world-what we have heard and read of others’ experiences and ideas” (p.846). This continuity of experiences was undertaken by sharing experiences and ideas with other and reading others’ experiences. This could also increase the possibility for striving for educational changes and school changes and make conceptual changes. These conceptual changes meant that interns could became important sources of constructing professional knowledge about teaching and reframe the role of teachers by building new social relationships with others and the world around them. This world provided interns with many different types of social relationships and cultural experiences which
enriched their personal interests, personal needs, desire, and capacities to create experience (Dewey, 1938, p.44). At the same time, these social relationships and cultural experiences enabled interns to see themselves as professional practitioners who were able to build a professional learning community and a supportive learning community for growing their professional knowledge and constructing their professional identity. Within this professional learning community, interns could rediscover the growth of professional knowledge only possible if education is the means of the social continuity of life (p, 39). In other word, Dewey (1938) writes:

What [an individual] has learned in the way of knowledge and skills in one situation become an instrument for understanding and dealing effectively with the situations which follow. The process goes on as life and learning continue. (p.44)

Both interaction and continuity were key elements for learning new knowledge and skills. As Rogers characterized, these two important elements contributed to changing the learner and reconnecting an individual and collective level of understanding and dealing with many different situations.

Based on Dewey’s ideas of experience and two key elements of experiences as a meaning-making process, interns’ previous experiences and prior knowledge should be connected to the further experiences. According to finding from this study, chapter 4 described interns’ patterns of participation in an online discussion forum as well as changing their pedagogical orientation toward professional development from classroom issues to inquiry and pedagogical issues for the nature of schooling. At the same time, it also revealed that interns recognized them not only as teachers who could provide other interns with
practical advices that enabled to find the solution for the problems of practices but also as learners who were able to build new knowledge by recognizing themselves as sources of knowledge. More importantly, changing their views of schooling and teaching practices made them practical knowledge utilized in a specific context. Within chapter 5, 6, and 7, interns focused on professional knowledge development, particularly, gaining practical knowledge and therapeutic and clinical pedagogy for developing problem solving skills and improving the practices of teaching. In terms of this therapeutic and clinical pedagogy, interns paid more attention to seek the best way to teach rather than critically think about how knowledge the already knew was constructed as the way it was. As interns engaged in critical dialogue with other interns, interns came to realized that this therapeutic and clinical pedagogy narrowly contributed to their teaching practices such enhancing problem solving skills and improving teaching practices. Interns discovered that it was hardly dealing with the cultural, political, and social issues of education and schooling. They felt that they needed to change the current paradigm for building knowledge for teaching. It might help them to rethink the value of experiences of teaching and sharing knowledge and ideas with other interns.

In chapter 8 and 9, interns deeply explored how their teacher identities were constructed by participating in intern-intern dialogue. In constructing professional identity for interns, interns had to have transformative experiences which led them to revalue their previous experiences and prior knowledge by connecting to the diverse social worlds. Interns could see how their experiences and relationships with other interns and their students brought changes not only their student learning but also their social status both students in a higher educational institution and teachers in a secondary school. They realized that their social status was not firm. From the perspective of student-intern relationship, students wouldn’t accept interns as teachers but rather see them as friends. Intern also found that students were attentive to mentor teachers’ teaching rather than interns’ teaching. It meant
that students considered interns as students of teaching and learners for being qualified
teachers and good teachers. Maybe interns would have a guideline of teachers’ qualification
for being qualified teachers and good teachers with the very specific conditions. To avoid the
fixed notion of qualified and competent teacher, interns had to change their view of the roles
of teachers such as cultural and social workers, public intellectuals, and researchers.
Changing views brought informed actions toward becoming transformative intellectuals who
were continually shift a paradigm which teacher professional development met the need of
the primary purpose of teacher credential program from a new or alternative paradigm which
reconstructed or reorganized the meaning of relationship building between students and
teachers.

To be more specific, findings from each chapter had specific contribution to intern’s
professional development. In chapter 4, this study found that there were many different ways
of participations such as “overall participation in an online discussion forum, understanding
intern’s modes of participation, and pedagogical aspects of participation. This chapter
described various characteristics of intern’s participations as well as provided in-depth
understanding of the value of participation which moved interns into the new pedagogical
direction and orientation to intern’s professional knowledge development and professional
identity formation. In particular, pedagogical aspects of participation was shown that interns
was changing their views on the various issues of professional development which were
classroom issues, curricular issues, pedagogical issues and inquiries questions about their
practices of teaching.

Within chapter 5, it explored two important aspects of professional development and
building learning community. This chapter was focused on how intern-intern dialogue
promoted socialization processes for familiarizing the existing institutional discourses
regarding teacher professional knowledge development and building new relationships
between interns and students by having everyday experiences as a teacher. At the same time, it attempted to reveal de-socialization processes for challenging the prior way of knowing and of maintaining relationship between interns and students. Bearing awareness of the formal way of knowing about teaching made interns develop new teacher images, establishing a professional learning community as changing the meaning of authority within student-intern relations. Such awareness changed the pedagogical direction to implement discussion-based learning. This discussion-based learning format valued various opinions, perspectives, and viewpoints.

In chapter 6, it was focused on how sharing experiences and ideas contributed interns to develop new conceptions of professional development and resituated being a professional into the context of experience-generated knowledge and practical values of learning to teach through interacting among interns. Interns were able to reinvent new teaching strategies by using the diverse activities. Sharing the various activities and inducing student active participation provided both students and interns with a great learning environment. Interns could also find that those learning activities in a classroom learning made them change a means of communication and enlarge opportunities for active participation. Moreover, interns could have an opportunity to know themselves and the world around them and to evaluate the value of the diverse viewpoints by sharing experiences. More importantly, sharing experiences provided interns an opportunity to deeply think about the meaning of experiences and the way of knowing related to the improvement of their practices of teaching and solutions for the problems of practices. At the same time, interns could rethink the system of evaluation. The system of evaluation was significant because it directly affected students’ ways of learning and the growth of their intelligent action towards changing the nature of a supportive learning community.
In chapter 7, interns got a opportunity to ask critical questions related to their practice of teaching. Critical questions could promote critical consciousness about the culture of schooling and the nature of education. Within practices of critical questions, interns were able to see how they challenge the prior knowledge about teaching and their previous experiences of learning to teach. In addition, interns were possibly challenging the underlying assumptions about what they already knew and what they already experienced. By challenging the underlying assumptions, interns came to realize that some knowledge and ways of knowing were not taken for granted but rather they were culturally, historically, ideologically, politically, and socially constructed. This taken-for-granted knowledge and experiences led them to construct stereotypical views of classroom teaching and institutional discourses for teachers’ professional development.

In chapter 8, interns got an opportunity to understand the complexity of identity formation related to being a teacher as well as to develop human agency to mobilize human action toward changing the notion of the student of teaching and professional practitioner. In addition, interns deeply understood teacher identity not a fixed notion but rather it on-going growth by expanding their capacity to understand the role of the various social worlds and interns’ social relations with other people and other communities. Interns could have an opportunity to reshape their identity not as student of teaching but as teachers, researchers, and public intellectuals who were able to explore the processes of developing knowledge and subjectivity. Through asking key questions of teacher identities, they could make a new meaning of becoming a teacher and change their perception of what it meant to be an effective way of teaching and valuing cultural, historical, political and social influence on the formation of teachers’ subjective positions toward interpreting experiences of teaching within a particular school context.
By building reciprocal relationships between students and teachers, teachers came to realize that they could learn not only from their experiences of teaching but also from their student learning. This reciprocal relationship made intern use the various learning activities, create a welcoming atmosphere, and solve possible tensions between students and teachers. At the same time, interns understood how the diverse social-economic and socio-cultural knowledge and experiences influenced teachers’ ways of teaching and their lives in school by accepting the different views of professional developments. Understanding such different views encourage interns to make their experiences of teaching and their lives as a meaningful enactment to reshape their identity as interns both to teachers and to researchers.

In chapter 9, interns attempted to construct critical selfhood shifting their student identity to teacher identity throughout their internship and illuminating the reality of interns and to challenge a reductive thinking of teachers’ subjective position towards students of teaching and professional practitioners. Shifting their identity as teachers was transformative processes to reframe what they could become and make sense of their experiences as interns, students, teachers, and researchers. Illuminating the reality of interns reframed the meaning of being a professional. Interns could redefine a meaning of being a professional and resituate their understanding of the reality of interns into the professional teaching context. Transformative experiences in identity shifting enabled interns to move their transformative self as a teacher into an actor of freedom which could help interns remake the practice of teaching and construct critical professional selfhood and reawaken teachers’ consciousness toward challenging the presupposed institutional discourse that shaped stereotypical views of teacher knowledge and the roles of teachers.

As I mentioned above how interns developed professional knowledge and professional identity through five chapters of findings, I could see intern-intern dialogue brought transformative experiences. From September to October, interns mostly discussed
solutions for the problems of practices. Interns were questioning about the problems of practices and providing supportive ideas and experiences. In other words, interns were trying to figure out an effective way of teaching. From October to December, interns-interns dialogue was dealing with the various curricular issues and pedagogical issues. Interns were trying to bring the central goal of teaching about building education for democracy and democracy for education. In Dewey’s (1916/1944) definition of education, teacher education might be considered as democratic practices for social changes. It was dealing with how relationships between students and teachers affected learning to teach as democratic practices. Three interns were raising questions about democracy and questioning the significances of inviting students and other interns to the community for professional learning. Within this professional learning community, interns primarily identified what worked and what didn’t worked. At the same time, they were trying to reconstruct the new meaning of identity.

By changing their conception of developing professional knowledge and constructing professional identity, interns accomplished conceptual frame changes for teacher professional development. Questioning about the underlying assumptions related to issues of knowledge and issues of identity made interns actual practices changes by using ideas and experiences from the supportive learning community. This supportive learning community provided interns with examining what changes mean for learner, specifically teacher identity. This consequence of changing the meaning of teacher identity gave interns “gain greater autonomy in their situation by systematically reflecting on their actions and experiences and modifying them in the light of an awareness of their consequence and make student teaching experience relevant to particular classroom situation” (O’Hanlon, 1996, pp.8-9). Interns’ professional autonomy and awareness of the need of conceptual frame change actual practical changes were appeared in intern-intern dialogue. This dialogue from September to May was shown how interns transformed their view of teachers as professional practitioners-student, teacher,
researcher, and public intellectual. From January to May, intern-intern dialogue mostly focused on reflective inquiry of their practices of teaching. Interns tried to get some help of how they were conducting inquiry based upon their experiences of teaching and formulated questions of inquiry. Interns shared professional literatures related to their inquiries, inquiry methods, and inquiry formats. Intern-intern dialogue from September to May, it revealed intern’s personal interests, desires, purposes, and goals. Throughout this period, most interns had transformative experiences that they were developing the new notion of professional and the new modes of knowing as well as change their personal philosophy of education connected to the larger social context. For enriching their personal philosophy of education, interns could reclaim the value of their experiences reconstructing their identity which led them to reach the significance of building a reciprocal relationship between students and interns and between interns and interns. They were able to overcome a hierarchical order of student-teacher and intern-mentor relationship. The value of overcoming this hierarchical relationship enhanced sharing experiences and ideas as well as modifying the practices of teaching. In analyzing interns’ dialogue experiences of teaching and sharing experiences and ideas, interns could create transformative experiences that brought changes of the way interns learned to teach and built their subjective positions for interpreting other interns’ experiences and ideas.

According to Ellinor and Gerard (1998), dialogue is a process that can help us embrace more of our human potential by learning how to bring the qualities of cooperation and balance between them with our natural urge to compete and the new way of being in relationship that will help all of use “be” more in whatever the situation we confront”. As they pointed out the significance of intern-intern dialogue, sharing experiences and ideas and modifying their pedagogical orientation to teaching practices helped interns’ knowledge embraced practical uses and practical advices. Furthermore, interns got an opportunity to
critically think about their practices of teaching in the process of professional development and the consequence of transformation drawing out intern-intern dialogue. By analyzing interns’ ways of critical questioning about their experiences of teaching, interns realized that their previous experiences and prior knowledge was not epistemic framework for modes of knowing in professional development but rather it acknowledged the values of accepting the complexity of professional development and diversity that made possible for interns to challenge the existing teacher education program. Challenging the underlying assumptions about teaching by sharing intern-intern dialogue could help developing critical sense of self as pedagogical authority with peers. Interns moved their student identity into teacher identity and their teacher identity into being a learner.

In consequence, intern-intern dialogue made possible to change the existing teacher education and the process of teacher’s professional development. As Dewey pointed out, teacher professional development was a process of reconstruction and reorganization of experiences. This process could change the consequence of professional development so that interns became the important sources of knowledge, just as Dewey claimed that all experiences are modes of knowing. Aldous Huxley once wrote, “experience is not what happens to you, it’s what you do with what happens to you” (Cited in Kagan, 1983, p.11). Rogers (2002) concluded that what happens to you is directly dependent on the meant that you make of it (pp.848-849). In a context of intern-intern professional development, individual and collective reflection on their practices of teaching was important because it provided interns an opportunity to challenge acceptance of conventional beliefs. In conventional beliefs, developing professional expertise was resulted from expert-supports rather than peer cooperative professional learning from other interns’ experiences and ideas. For this reason, interns must be able to reconnect their experiences from teaching practices to the next experience that “gives direction and impetus to growth” (p.850). They also needed to
establish interpretive frameworks which “leads to an action, and an action based upon a leap to conclusion. This led interns to “be able to select and apply just what is needed when it is needed” (Dewey, 1933, p.65). Such activities enabled interns intellectualizing or relocating the problems, problematize the practices of teaching, and reframe new and alternative interpretation of their experiences and experiences of others simultaneously. These processes could avoid intellectual dependency from experienced teachers and professional experts. To escape from intellectual dependency, Dewey (1916/1944) insisted that “the experience has to be formulated in order to be communicated” (p.6). He continues,

To formulate requires getting outside of [the experience], seeing it as another would see it, considering what points of contact it has with the life of another so that it may be got into such form that he can appreciate its meaning…one has to assimilate, imaginatively, something of another’s experience in order to tell him intelligently of one’s own experience (Cited in Rogers, 2002, p. 865)

This act of sharing among other interns could help interns acknowledge the value of communication as a means of developing knowledge and constructing identity in a context of professional development. Within intern-intern dialogic professional development, Rogers (2002) indicated three important benefits of collaborative reflection: “1) affirmation of the value of one’s experiences: In isolation what matters can be too easily dismissed as unimportant; 2) seeing things “newly”: others offer alternative meaning, broadening the field of understanding; 3) support to engage in the process of inquiry: the self-discipline required for the kind of reflection that Dewey advocates, especially given the overwhelming demands to a teacher’s day, is difficult to sustain alone” (Roger, 2002, p.857). This collaborative
reflection “allows interns to acknowledge their interdependence” and take full responsibility for their own intellectual growth and other interns’ intellectual and professional development as well.

In addition, the value of communication among interns is that language plays critical roles in making personal knowledge professional knowledge. Language allows “the individual to transform his or her own inchoate understanding into a form that is more conscious and rational, thus serving the self. It also allows the individual to share insight or understanding with other, thus serving the community” (Prawat, 2000, p.6).

In terms of changing the way of developing professional knowledge and constructing professional identity, this study must include interns’ personal interests, desires, purposes, and capacities, serving its primary focus of intern-intern professional through online peer-led dialogue and peer cooperative professional learning. This online peer-led dialogue contributes to remain communication with their peer so that they can improve the quality of teacher, of teaching practices, and of student learning. It also serves to remain open-minded so that interns are entertaining many interpretations of their experiences. It allows intern go beyond the limitation of their understanding and actions toward professional development. It contributes to shift the value of intern-intern dialogue into as a means of professional development, serving modes of knowing so that interns invent the diverse views and perspectives on the meaning of the development of professional knowledge and the construction of professional identity. Communication, open-minded, and diverse views and perspectives encourage interns to confront this existing conception of professional expertise, to make interns of what make them as learners, including inquiries that help intern learn about how to critically think about them as teachers and changing the existing pedagogical knowledge of teacher quality and teacher development.
In this sense, both teacher educators and educational researcher have to consider intern-intern dialogue as a means of continuing to change teachers’ practices and to problematize the practices of teaching in the U.S. teacher education context. In order to make intern-intern dialogue is playing more critical roles in intern’s professional development, teacher educators must design an online peer-led dialogic forum, including reflection-in-action and reflection-on-action (Schon, 1989). Mostly, the current online peer-led dialogic forum consists of reflection-on-action. It meant that interns reflect their practices of teaching and share their experiences and ideas with time interval. Interns barely interacted with other interns in a real time conversation. Using real time conversation, interns can redefine the problems of practices and the value of experiences and rethink what situations interns confront with and what conflicts they encounter. In addition, interns have to be exposed professional literatures so that interns can be broadened understanding of self and the world within the very specific theoretical context. More importantly, online peer-led dialogue has to be redesigned more systematically so that interns understand intention of this type of a teacher education. It can also provide a platform for how interns view themselves as cultural and social actors to change the existing characteristics of teachers’ professional development and reorganizes political enactment toward changing the culture of professional development.

Unlike the U.S. context of teacher education, Korean teacher education had rarely discussed teachers’ professional development in terms of critical inquiry into the practices of teaching and critical reflection on the problems of practices. This online peer-led dialogue might encourage student teachers to remain engaged in sharing experiences and ideas without external interventions from experts (i.e. university supervisors and mentor teachers). This online peer-led dialogue gives Korean student teachers to gain the great autonomy so that they are able to solve their problems of practices during their student teaching periods. At the same time, realistically, Korean teacher education programs would hardly establish
professional development schools for interns’ professional development as a teacher. By establishing online discussion forum, a teacher education program may increase the possibilities of changing the culture of a teacher education, the nature of schooling, and the existing discourse of teacher quality, school quality, and educational quality and avoid potential conflicts between student teachers and mentor teachers and between student teachers and students. And also raising questions of teacher identity, student teachers in Korean teacher education programs can redefine the roles of teachers in classrooms and schools as well.

As this study suggested, online peer-led dialogue had benefits of developing professional knowledge and constructing professional development by challenging the underlying assumptions of teacher knowledge. This study might help junior teacher educators, educational researchers, interns in professional development schools, and mentor teachers who were working with these interns valuing differences within a specific context. This study has to reconsider the value of online space as a professional learning community which interns can see new possibilities for bringing changes drawing out from interns’ experiences and interns’ relationships with students, mentor teachers, professional development associates, and university supervisors. This online discussion forum as a means of teacher education should be expanded building a new professional learning community between interns and interns and between interns and prospective teacher education students who were hardly connected their curricular and pedagogical knowledge of teaching into school and classroom contexts. Prospective teacher education students can ask question about what they are concerned with. Interns can help these students critically think about knowledge that they are learning from university method courses by sharing their experiences and ideas, introduce inquiry issues, and inviting them into the professional learning community. Moreover, teacher educators have to consider these interns as sources of
knowledge for professional development so that they must remain interns engaged in on-going discussion of experiences, ideas, and growth. By participating these interns in the next year discussion, the future interns can make the deeper sense of what changes mean for them and what changes they can bring into the classroom teaching and teaching practices.

Considering interns as professional practitioners, how does this online peer-dialogue change the culture of professional development? Is this online peer-dialogue a plethora of teacher professional development? If this type of professional development can help interns to gain more autonomy that determine their goal and role of teaching, what are the big difference between the current professional development and online peer-lead professional development? How do interns value their experiences and ideas different from the existing professional development? Does this online peer-led dialogue reconstruct or reorganize the process of meaning construction of their present history of experience and reconnect their experiences to the university method courses? How does this type of teacher professional development contribute to construct new identities for university supervisors, mentor teachers, and professional development associates? Can these online peer-led dialogue continue in the future to teacher practices and to problematize practices?
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