Faculty Publications   Faculty Scholarship & Creative Works

2008

Preservice Literacy Teachers in Transition: Identity as Subjectivity

Mindy Legard Larson
Linfield College

The International Journal of Learning

Preservice Literacy Teachers in Transition:
Identity as Subjectivity

Mindy Legard Larson

Preservice Literacy Teachers in Transition: Identity as Subjectivity

Mindy Legard Larson, Linfield College, UNITED STATES

Abstract: This research addresses the complexities of identity development of elementary and middle school preservice literacy teachers during their teacher education program using a poststructural feminist theoretical lens. This research investigated two questions: 1) How do preservice teachers develop their identity as teachers of literacy in the midst of authoritative discourses? 2) What kinds of strategies and discourses do preservice literacy teachers use to negotiate the competing discourses of literacy during student teaching? The results indicated that the identities of the preservice literacy teachers were in transition during their teacher education program and authoritative discourses were at work constituting their subjectivities throughout this process. These discourses were heard as the preservice literacy teachers used deconstructive and reconstructive literacy discourses and strategies from their personal literacy biographies, literacy coursework, and student teaching practices. Their agency as literacy teachers was demonstrated through the strategies they used to negotiate and perform their identities during student teaching—working within and outside of the literacy structures of their cooperating teachers' classrooms. The research also indicated the power of time and space in relation with others, as a means for continued identity transformation.

Keywords: Poststructural Feminist Theory, Teacher Education, Literacy, Subjectivity, Agency

Introduction

THIS RESEARCH HAS evolved throughout my life in school as I continue to be transformed in my understanding of the concepts of "teaching" and "literacy." I began my career teaching first, second and third grades and then spent one year as a curriculum and program specialist. I quickly experienced the "uncertainties, the ambiguities, the contradictions, and the variability of the human enterprise that teaching is" (Dudley-Marling, 1997, p. 188).

When I began in teacher education, I spent the majority of my time teaching literacy methods courses full of theory, structures, strategies and skills of comprehensive literacy. Then in 2001 the U.S. Department of Education's No Child Left Behind Act arrived. With it came a new insurgence of scripted curriculums and a focus on accountability that changed the landscape of public education. My pedagogy as a literacy teacher was in need of re-invention.

With this need, a colleague and I engaged in a research project working with a preservice teacher teaching in an after-school reading program for struggling English language learners. The study illustrated how the discourse of a public school district's scripted reading program and the discourse of the university's comprehensive literacy positioned and conflicted a graduate student, Claire's emerging concept of literacy (Larson & Phillips, 2005). We sensed that Claire did not have a strong theoretical understanding for the rationale of our comprehensive literacy discourse. She was quickly pulled in by the school's scripted reading program through the powerful expectations of the curriculum leader that oversaw its implementation. Claire needed to be able to break from the binary of comprehensive literacy versus scripted curriculum, and needed strategies to negotiate this experience. In this study, we began to wonder if we were more intentional in articulating our own literacy theoretical framework and deliberate in teaching students such a framework, if our students would be more adept at defining literacy instruction as more than just a set of pedagogical tools (Hargreaves & Jacka, 1995; Hartse, Leland, Schmidt, Vasquez, & Ociepka, 2004).

With these teaching goals ready to be implemented, a new cohort of elementary and middle school preservice teachers arrived into the graduate teacher education program in which I taught. Two research questions emerged: 1) How will these preservice teachers develop their identity as teachers of literacy in the midst of authoritative discourses? 2) What kinds of strategies and discourses will these preservice literacy teachers use to negotiate the competing discourses of literacy during student teaching?

Poststructural Feminism Theoretical Framework

Poststructural feminism theory honors plurality, multiplicity, and difference (Tong, 1998). It is the tools of poststrucutralism—language, discourse, subjectivity and deconstruction—combined with feminisms' commitment to being politically and ac-

tion oriented and to remain "…open to new knowledge—asking new questions" (Hesse-Biber, Leavey, & Yaiser, 2004) that guides my teaching and research. Poststructural feminism theory recognizes that our teaching identities and that of our students is "not something one has, but something that develops during one's whole life" (Beijaard, Meijer, & Verloop, 2004, p. 107). Our subjectivities are created and re-created through powerful discourses working at our site of self (Weedon, 1987). "Discourse is not a language or a text but a historically, socially, and institutionally specific structure of statements, terms, categories, and beliefs" (Scott, 2003, p. 379). The acquiring of teacher identity is complex and is significantly influenced by biography, experiences and context (Britzman, 2003; Coldron & Smith, 1999; Sachs, 2001; Samuel & Stephens, 2000; Wenger, 1998). The development of identity is not analogous to a harmonic dance; rather such development is often difficult and conflicted (Britzman, 2003; Phillips, 2002). Preservice teachers vary in their ability to negotiate power relations of teacher education and student teaching (Marsh, 2002; Smagorinsky, Cook, Moore, Jackson, & Fry, 2004) within a socio-historical political context and often amidst education reform (Moore, Edwards, Halpin, & George, 2002; Sachs, 2001).

Preservice literacy teachers are bombarded with various authoritative discourses, from federal mandates such as the No Child Left Behind Act which narrowly defines literacy and sanctions specific pedagogical practices (Edmondson, 2004; Smith, 2003), to the authoritative discourses of "child-centered," "sociocultural," "reflective practice," and "comprehensive literacy" in teacher education programs that position student teachers discursively (Marsh, 2002; Smagorinsky, Lakley, & Johnson, 2002). The discourses of cooperating teachers within student teaching placements create power relationships that determine which practices and strategies are "approved" (Marsh, 2002; Moore et al., 2002; Smagorinsky et al., 2004). Preservice teachers own biographical discourses are authoritative (Marsh, 2002; Samuel & Stephens, 2000). The process of becoming a teacher is a time of subjectivity due to the bombardment of authoritative discourses at the site of self. Subjectivity then, becomes a space not only for contradiction, but also a place for potential change.

Preservice teachers can use deconstruction to analyze the various discourses at play at their sites of subjectivity (Marsh, 2002; Phillips, 1998; Sugrue, 1997). Employing the tool of deconstruction is vital in the process of identity development for preservice teachers. Deconstruction offers preservice teachers the opportunity to critically examine assumptions and determine the useful and dangerous aspects of discourses and the power they possess in varied contexts. Deconstruction provides preservice teachers a tool to keep their identities in-play through continual re-examination. This re-examination offers opportunities for preservice teachers to consider how they can re-create who they are becoming. Preservice teachers have the potential to develop a sense of agency by constructing strategies of power and resistance. As teachers are more aware of their situatedness within the discourses of their experiences, then they are able to question and re-construct themselves (Phillips, 1998, 2002; Zembylas, 2003).

Data Collection

Data for this study were collected during an 11-month graduate teacher education program. Seven preservice elementary and middle level teachers, Ian, Annie, Sienna, A.J., Jenny, Stef, and Mary Beth (all pseudonyms) volunteered for the study. The six females and one male were all enrolled in a Master of Arts in Teaching program at a private university in the western United States. The participants took two literacy courses with me over two semesters. The first course was an overview of literacy theory and an introduction to literacy methodology; the second literacy course developed additional literacy methodology. The students met monthly for 90-minute focus group meetings during their final semester in their teacher education program while they were student teaching. All meetings were audio-taped. Each session addressed the following questions: 1) How is literacy being presented/taught in your classroom? What is working? What are your concerns? 2) How does this connect or disconnect from your experiences as a student in your literacy courses? and 3) How are you able to teach and work in this system? I observed six of the seven participants teaching literacy lessons in their student teaching classrooms. Hour-long audio-taped individual interviews were conducted two weeks prior and two weeks after graduation.

Data for this research was taken from five main sources: course documents, teaching notebook, researcher journal, focus groups, and individual interviews. The documents included assignments from the literacy courses: exit slips from class sessions, conceptual metaphors of literacy, and a written response to an interview question. Additional documents included emails, biographical information, key literacy events timelines, data from the observation of the literacy lessons, and focus group and interview transcripts. My teaching notebook included all course documents. The research journal included notes connected to readings, theoretical connections, and methodological notes taken throughout the study.

Data Interpretation

Data interpretation was a messy, complex, recursive and ethical process (Britzman, 2003; Lather, 1993). Data were read multiple times with a poststructural feminism lens and discourses were coded. The term coded is not meant to signify objective, impartial, stagnant discourses identified, but rather discourses that emerged in my situated reading of the data. As I coded discourses, I wrote theoretical notes and analytical memos during and at the end of reading data. Both, before, during, and after coding, I was reading literature, processing with others about the data, asking questions of the data, and writing notes in my researcher journal. Three broad themes emerged from the coding: deconstructive discourses, reconstructive discourses, and agency—strategies and discourses of negotiation.

The first theme was deconstructive literacy discourses. These deconstructive discourses were times when the preservice teachers analyzed the useful and dangerous aspects from three authoritative discourse sites identified in the data: literacy biography, literacy courses, and student teaching. The discourses within each site varied for each preservice teacher. It was from the three sites of authoritative discourses that often conflicting, and complimentary deconstructive discourses influenced the preservice teachers' subjectivities.

The second theme was reconstructive literacy discourses. These reconstructive discourses were times when Ian, Annie, Sienna, A.J., Jenny, Stef and Mary Beth imagined, explained, wondered, and shared who they wanted to become as teachers of literacy. Similar to the deconstructive discourses, the reconstructive discourses were another example of the subjectivities of the preservice literacy teachers.

The third theme was agency—strategies and discourses of literacy negotiation. The data indicated strategies and discourses the preservice teachers used to negotiate the competing literacy discourses during their student teaching. These methods differed from the reconstructive literacy discourses because this theme dealt specifically with the actions of the preservice teachers while student teaching. This theme explored the agency of the preservice literacy teachers as they lived—performed their developing identities.

Data taken from focus groups and interviews are indicated with codes. Focus group data is indicated with the letter "F" followed by a number "1," "2," "3," or "4," indicating from which focus group it derived. Individual interview data is indicated with the letter "I." For example, direct quotations taken from Ian during the second focus group will be cited as (Ian, F2). All direct quotations from the data are indicated in *italic* font.

Deconstructive Literacy Discourses

Ian, Annie, Sienna, A.J., Jenny, Stef, and Mary Beth used deconstructive literacy discourses that highlighted how they were able to analyze the useful and dangerous aspects of their literacy biography, coursework and student teaching experiences. Deconstructive discourses that shared useful aspects of teaching were seen in a focus group discussion (F4) regarding Stef and Mary Beth's literature circle unit. The deconstructive literacy discourses in this excerpt varied from "celebration," "questioning," and "affirmation."

Mindy*: How did your literature circles go?*
Stef: *They went well, really well and my cooperating teacher said, "Wow they are really doing it. They are doing a good job and actually discussing it." I'd sit in on their literature circles and help them and for the most part they were always, well there was one group that kind of had issues because there were more people in their group and for the most part they were always talking about stuff and they'd be flipping through their books and proving and like well no, here's this quote. They'd be digging through it and they had their post-it notes and they loved them. Overall I felt they were really successful. We had a culmination project at the end that was just like they were all clapping "We love it, thank you Ms. S. I love literature circles, are we going to have literature circles today?" They were all excited about it. Some of them wanted to keep their books longer even after they'd read it.*
Jenny: *What books did you read?*
Stef: *We read Esperanza Rising, Bud Not Buddy, Among the Hidden, The Great Turkey Walk, and Because of Winn Dixie. It went really well. I felt really satisfied about the whole thing. It was good.*
Mindy*: Great.*
Annie: *Did you learn a lot in the process?*
Stef: *Yeah, I did.*

This transaction was an example of how the focus groups created opportunities for the preservice teachers to hear about engaging literacy practices, to share ideas, and to celebrate successes.

The preservice teachers used deconstructive discourses to critique one discourse against another. The competing discourses would do battle against each other, as in the case of Mary Beth's experience with the Reading First coach. Mary Beth's (I) story demonstrated her struggle with the discourses surrounding the "value of independent reading," which was between the "independent reading is ineffective" discourse from the Reading First coach in her student

teaching school and Mary Beth's own discourse as well as the literacy courses discourse of "independent reading as effective," based on her course texts and action research project. The excerpt below from her interview describes Mary Beth struggling with two competing discourses:

> *I went into it [action research project on independent reading] such a stanch silent independent reading person, but then [I was] constantly getting things from the Reading First training, and the reading coach [talking] about how independent reading is not effective-- it is not fair to these kids, because of their early literacy background. We can't catch them up by doing the same things we do for students with high literacy backgrounds. I agreed with some points, and then I started reading [the research]. Ok, I get that point, that is different. They have had a different background than I did, and some of these other kids. So to teach them and to think you are going to get them all caught up, I constantly felt so confused and so I don't know? That's a good point, that's a good point? So I grew so much and thought about so many different [points of view]. ... It also gets me excited to do research; it's so exciting for me. ...It just made me feel like I really want to know everything that I am doing, and be able to back it up and explain it and do it. Otherwise why am I doing it?*

Mary Beth's subjectivity was constituted from this battle between "independent reading as effective" vs. "independent reading as ineffective." She introduced a literacy structure during her student teaching that was not "approved" by the Reading First specialist. Her interactions with the Reading First specialist caused her to be pushed to know why she uses certain literacy structures like independent reading. This experience was a time of battle of two competing discourses creating her subjectivity. The "independent reading is effective" was a stronger discourse, and the experience left her wanting to research her practice.

Sienna (F1) was another example of being caught between her cooperating teacher's authoritative discourse of literacy and her own discourses of literacy. This was seen in the first focus group. The discourse of the "power of the cooperating teacher" were evident in this interchange:

> Sienna: *I tried going through it [scripted reading lesson] fast but I got caught because she [cooperating teacher] happened to be in the room and then on my little feedback sheet she keeps in a little notebook and writes notes on a lot of my lessons. She just said, "You need to*
>
> *extend your lesson time. It should be 15 minutes white board, 15 minutes overhead, 15 minutes of the worksheet." I got a little friendly reminder that I am still under her belt I guess [laughter]*
> Mindy: *This is when you were doing your primary teaching?*
> Sienna: *Yes. That's the other thing....I mean I am getting used to it, but I thought that she [cooperating teacher] would be [gone] during [my] primary duty, but she is actually there most of the time. I'd say 90%.*
> Mindy: *Writing in her notebook?*
> A.J.: *I feel better already.*
> Sienna: *[laughter] Yes.*
> Mindy: *And somehow you have to take that notebook with a grain of salt which would be really hard to do I imagine.*
> Sienna: *Oh yeah it is. Yeah, exactly. She's not a mean person; in fact she is a caring person. She is just very regimented and-*
> Ian: *Likes control.*
> Sienna: *Structured. Yes.*

Sienna was positioned by her cooperating teacher in ways that impacted her developing identity as a teacher of literacy. Sienna's cooperating teacher reminded Sienna that certain discourses and practices of literacy were accepted, and that Sienna's attempts to do things differently would not be accepted. The power of her cooperating teacher's ideology and control were at battle as Sienna's literacy discourses were called into question.

Stef's (I) experience with workbooks is another example of deconstructive discourses regarding her own elementary experience with workbooks and how they caused her friend to feel like she was "*a bad reader.*" She shared:

> *I did these phonics workbooks where it was a huge book this thick. I see the lack of value in those worksheet in [my] second grade [student teaching placement]. I remember I had a friend who had a lot of learning disabilities and she always did really poorly and she got things wrong. She really struggled and it made her feel like she was a bad reader...Then when I was teaching second grade and I had to give a lot of worksheets I always felt bad. It made me not want to make kids do them or not put a lot of emphasis on them because I know from my own experiences they weren't valuable.*

In this example, Stef is positioned between her deconstruction of her biography and the deconstruction of her student teaching experience. Her cooperating teacher expected her to give students phonics worksheets, similar to the ones she did as an elementary

student. Yet, Stef felt they were not valuable. These competing discourses from her two experiences in elementary schools impacted her subjectivity, and the discourses collided against one another. Stef's example indicated as Gee (1996) states that "Discourses have meaning only in relation to one another" (as cited in Marsh, 2002, p. 336). Stef's identity appeared to be developing as she used deconstructive discourses to critique, take apart, and process her experiences as a student teacher.

Not all of the preservice teachers were able to use deconstructive discourses that showed an understanding of the literacy concepts aligned with the discourses of their literacy courses. When A.J. (F2) used her "comprehension" discourse regarding her cooperating teacher's practices, she discussed how her teacher was having students complete state reading multiple choice practice tests for two weeks. A.J. was excited because she felt her cooperating teacher was finally teaching comprehension. She wrote in an email, *"Houston we have comprehension."* The understanding that comprehension was equal to multiple choice tests was in stark contrast to how comprehension was discussed in her literacy coursework. This inability to understand literacy impacted A.J.'s identity development as a teacher of literacy.

The ways in which the preservice teachers were able to use deconstructive discourses to analyze the useful and dangerous aspects from their literacy biography, literacy coursework and student teaching indicated their subjectivity in transition. They used deconstructive discourses to celebrate successes, shared frustrations when discourses didn't align and indicated the power of authoritative discourses.

Reconstructive Discourses

The reconstructive discourses from Ian, Annie, Sienna, A.J., Jenny, Stef, and Mary Beth were seen in their ability to look back upon their literacy biographies, literacy courses, and student teaching to reconstruct themselves as teachers of literacy. The poststructural focus of continued transformation was seen in these discourses. Mary Beth (F1) used reconstructive discourses of "independent reading," "conferences," and "match books to readers" as she shared ways in which she plans on structuring her future independent reading time. She stated,

I like that she [Sharon Taberski-course text] has two separate independent reading times. After looking over my [action research] data I like the two separate times, so she is making sure that they are doing one with conferences to make sure they are matched with the book that they can actually read but then they can pick their books for the other DEAR time. That

means that they are actually getting feedback, I really like that model.

Mary Beth was referring back to the discourses of her literacy course texts to help her reconstruct what literacy would look like in her future classroom. This structure of independent reading would allow Mary Beth to meet the individual needs of her students by giving them time to read and through assessing their reading. The authoritative discourse of her text and her action research project on independent reading informed her future plans for teaching literacy.

Annie saw beyond the boundaries of curriculum. Annie's (I) reconstructive discourses of literacy were seen in her interview as she shared how she will evaluate curriculum based upon her philosophy of literacy:

I would say finding out what the kids enjoy, and then monitoring and adjusting and always [be] constantly monitoring and adjusting because ...Routman, says [you should] always be learning as a teacher and how important professional development is and collaborating with other teachers. She lays out first and foremost for us as teachers to try not to be set in your ways, like "This is how I do it." [Instead] let's reassess myself and see what I could be doing better and how maybe this group of kids is way different from last years, so what do I need to adjust to be make sure that they are enjoying it.

Contrary to Mary Beth, Annie's evaluation tool was based in her knowledge of theory of literacy. Her reconstructive discourses of "knowing kids" and "being open" indicated ways in which she will not as limited by curriculum.

Most promising was when Ian and Annie indicated how and why they plan to continue this cycle of reinvention. Annie (I) saw the need to be actively involved in her development as a teacher of literacy. She reflected:

I know I need to continue my literacy development and professional development just as much as my kids, and then reflect on it and reflect on everyone else around me to see how they are developing themselves and then learn through each other.

As she processed the impact of the focus groups, she shared how *"these kinds of conversations really help a lot to formulate thoughts because I know what I believe but being able to talk about it is another thing and having the language."* Annie explicitly stated how her continued growth as a literacy teacher is vital to her teaching. She has a desire to be growing

in her development as a literacy teacher and professional.

Similarly, Ian (I) dreamed of developing a literacy community. In his interview he stated,

> *It would be really cool to have a small literacy group like we had. I feel like when I am a teacher the networking won't be as easy. When you are at school, you are obviously with all these people that are in the same situation doing the same type of thing, its great, but why isn't that the case in schools? It just gets more independent it seems like; each teacher does their own thing. They work together to some degree but they never have these independent small, non-school funded planning sessions with other teachers. I feel like that would be extremely valuable.*

Ian's quest for continued learning was evident. This connected with his personal biography when he shared how he often wrote and shared poetry and music with friends. Both Ian and Annie's desire and need to continue to reconstruct who they are becoming as teachers was a sign of their desire to continue to use discourses to re-invent their identities as teachers of literacy. The ways in which the preservice teachers spoke and processed together, in how they want to teach literacy, and why and how they will make these decisions, was critical to their identity development as literacy teachers.

Agency—Strategies and Discourses of Literacy Negotiation

Ian, Annie, Sienna, A.J., Jenny, Stef, and Mary Beth negotiated their student teaching and thus their identities in varying ways. A.J. chose not to negotiate, while Jenny did not feel a need to negotiate because her cooperating teacher's literacy pedagogy was aligned with Jenny's literacy coursework and philosophy of teaching. Ian, Annie, Sienna, Stef, and Mary Beth used varying strategies to negotiate both within and outside the literacy structures of their cooperating teachers' classrooms. Some took daring risks, like Mary Beth as she implemented a literacy structure that was not approved by her school's federally funded literacy curriculum. They shared "how" they negotiated, like Annie's strategy to build a relationship with her cooperating teacher and Ian's ability to be "creative." The preservice teachers shared "why" they negotiated literacy in their student teaching, like Sienna's "dying to try" to Stef's "I want to be a part of students' literacy success." These negotiating strategies and discourses remind us how political schools and student teaching are for preservice teachers. Student teaching is a dance, a balance, a tightrope walk that preservice teachers must "juggle."

Discussion of Themes: Deconstructive Discourses, Reconstructive Discourses, and Agency—Strategies and Discourses of Negotiation

The identities of Ian, Annie, Sienna, A.J., Jenny, Stef, and Mary Beth were in formation during their graduate teacher education program. Authoritative discourses were at work constituting their subjectivities. These discourses were seen as Ian, Annie, Sienna, A.J., Jenny, Stef, and Mary Beth used deconstructive and reconstructive literacy discourses and practices from their personal literacy biographies, their literacy courses, and their student teaching. Their agency as literacy teachers was seen as they negotiated and performed their identities during student teaching—working within and outside of the literacy structures—defending and articulating what they were doing and why they were negotiating.

Power of Time and Space in Relation with Others. A thread that tied the themes of deconstructive and reconstructive discourses and agency were seen in the ways that the focus groups and interviews created a time and space for these preservice teachers to be in relation with one another. It was here they were able to deconstruct literacy discourses from sites of authoritative discourses: biography, literacy courses, and student teaching. This space allowed the preservice teachers to dialogue, question and wonder as they took apart taken-for-granted ways of knowing and recreated new ways of teaching.

This powerful space for students to be "in relation" (Ellsworth, 2005) with one another can be seen as the preservice teachers shared the impact of their focus groups on their development as a teacher of literacy. The discourses around the power of the focus groups was seen in the interview transcripts when the preservice teachers are asked, "How do you think the focus groups supported or did not support you in the becoming a teacher of literacy?" The following discourses were identified: "working collaboratively with others" (Mary Beth, I; Jenny, I; Stef, I; Annie, I; Ian, I), "listening to others' experiences" (Mary Beth, I; A.J., I; Annie, I; Stef, I), "sharing ideas and strategies" (Annie, I; Ian, I; Jenny, I; Sienna, I), "giving feedback" (Annie, I; Stef, I), "problem solving" (Annie, I), "venting" (Sienna, I), and "reflecting" (Annie, I; Ian, I; Sienna, I).

Transitional Space. The opportunity to be together became what Winncott (as cited in Ellsworth, 2005) calls a "transitional space."

> Winncott's transitional space is what "makes possible the difficult transition from a state of

habitual ("natural" feelings) compliance with the outside world, with its expectations, traditions, structures, and knowledges, to a state of creatively putting those expectations, traditions, and structures to new uses" (p. 30).

It is these transitional spaces, like the focus group when Ian, Annie, Sienna, A.J., Jenny, Stef, and Mary Beth and I were in relation with one another. These transitional spaces allowed the preservice teachers to use deconstructive and reconstructive literacy discourses, and to share the strategies and discourses of negotiation. The ability to take a part their "state of habitual compliance" and to creatively think about these with new "expectations, traditions, and structure" is the very act of developing identities as teachers of literacy. It is in these transitional spaces that transformation took place; identities were re-invented.

Conclusions

What follows brings the situated, partial understanding of what I have discovered along the way through my research and teaching. So, how *do* preservice teachers develop their identity as teachers of literacy in the midst of authoritative discourses? I believe this becoming means preservice teacher identity development is more complex than imagined. "Complex" as defined as "more dynamic, more unpredictable, more alive," in contrast to "complicated," which can always be reduced to the sum of its parts (Davis & Sumara, 1997).

Preservice literacy teacher identities are developed in complex ways. First, they come to their teacher education program with varied background experiences with literacy. It is in their literacy courses they learn the language of "literacy teacher." They learn the theories, structures, strategies and skills of literacy. Then they are given time to "practice" their skills as student teachers. And in the case of these

seven preservice literacy teachers, they came together once a month in a focus group, were observed teaching literacy lessons, emailed, and participated in an interview. This transition from student to teacher did not produce seven identical teachers.

The process of continual transformation of preservice literacy teacher identity does not follow a formula. Several factors appeared to influence the complex development of the preservice literacy teachers' identities throughout my research: authentic, meaningful literacy experiences; time with "experts" reading, writing and dialoguing; opportunities to negotiate and teach authentic, meaningful literacy; opportunities to deconstruct personal literacy biography, literacy courses, and literacy teaching with others; and opportunities to reconstruct future practices as a literacy teacher. This process needs to be done with time and space in relation to others.

Implications for Future Teaching and Research

As a feminist researcher I am naturally drawn to praxis—how my research informs my teaching. My goal as a teacher of literacy is to construct an environment—a time and a space for my students to be in relation with one another so continual transformation will have the opportunity to occur. My desire is to create opportunities for students to have authentic, meaningful experiences with literacy in my courses; time and space for preservice teachers to name and contextualize discourses (Gore, 1993); and time and space for preservice teachers to become aware of the discourses at play in their subjectivity.

I am drawn to hooks' (1994) words, that "The classroom with all its limitations, remains a location of possibility" (p. 207). I am filled with hope that my classroom remains a location of possibility for my students as well as for my research and teaching of preservice literacy teachers.

References

Beijaard, D., Meijer, P., & Verloop, N. (2004). Reconsidering research on teachers' professional identity. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 20*(2), 107-128.

Britzman, D. P. (2003). *Practice makes practice: A critical study of learning to teach*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Coldron, J., & Smith, R. (1999). Active location in teachers' construction of their professional identities. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 31*(6), 711-726.

Davis, B., & Sumara, D. (1997). Cognition, complexity and teacher education. *Harvard Educational Review, 67*(1), 105-125.

Dudley-Marling, C. (1997). *Living with uncertainty*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Edmondson, J. (2004). Reading policies: Ideologies and strategies for political engagement. *The Reading Teacher, 57*(5), 418-429.

Ellsworth, E. (2005). *Places of learning: Media, architecture, pedagogy*. New York: RoutledgeFarmer.

Gore, J. (1993). *The struggle for pedagogies: Critical and feminist discourses as regimes of truth*. New York: Routledge.

Hargreaves, A., & Jacka, N. (1995). Induction or seduction? Postmodern patterns of preparing to teach. *Peabody Journal of Education, 70*(3).

Hartse, J. C., Leland, C., Schmidt, K., Vasquez, V., & Ociepka, A. (2004). Practice makes practice, or does it? The relationship between theory and practice in teacher education, *Reading Online* (Vol. January/February).

hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom*. New York: Routledge.

Larson, M. L., & Phillips, D. K. (2005). Becoming a teacher of literacy: The struggle between authoritative discourses. *Teaching Education, 16*(4), 311-323.

Lather, P. (1993). Fertile obsession: Validity after poststructuralism. *The Sociological Quarterly, 34*(4), 673-693.

Marsh, M. M. (2002). The influence of discourses on the precarious nature of mentoring. *Reflective Practice, 3*(1), 103-115.

Marsh, M. M. (2002). The shaping of Ms. Nicholi: The discursive fashioning of teacher identities. *Qualitative Studies in Education, 15*(3), 333-347.

Moore, A., Edwards, G., Halpin, D., & George, R. (2002). Compliance, resistance and pragmatism: The (re)construction of schoolteacher identities in a period of intensive educational reform. *British Educational Research Journal, 28*(4), 551-565.

Phillips, D. K. (1998). *Playing at twilight: Subjectivity, discourses, and preservice teachers' talk.* Unpublished dissertation, Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR.

Phillips, D. K. (2002). Female preservice teachers' talk: Illustrations of subjectivity, visions of 'nomadic' space. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 8*(1), 9-27.

Sachs, J. (2001). Teacher professional identity: Competing discourses, competing outcomes. *Journal of Education Policy, 16*(2), 149-161.

Samuel, M., & Stephens, D. (2000). Critical dialogues with self: Developing teacher identities and roles-a case study of South African student teachers. *International Journal of Educational Research, 33*(5), 475-491.

Scott, J. W. (2003). Deconstructing equality-versus-difference: Or, the uses of poststructuralist theory for feminism. In C. McCann & S.-K. Kim (Eds.), *Feminist theory reader: Local and global perspectives* (pp. 378-390). New York: Routledge.

Smagorinsky, P., Cook, L. S., Moore, C., Jackson, A., & Fry, P. (2004). Tensions in learning to teach: Accommodation and the development of a teaching identity. *Journal of Teacher Education, 55*(1), 8-24.

Smagorinsky, P., Lakley, A., & Johnson, T. S. (2002). Acquiescence, accommodation, and resistance in learning to teach within a prescribed curriculum. *English Education, 34*(3), 187-213.

Smith, F. (2003). *Unspeakable acts, unnatural practices: Flaws and fallacies in "scientific" reading instruction*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Sugrue, C. (1997). Student teachers' lay theories and teaching identities: Their implications for professional development. *European Journal of Teacher Education, 20*(3), 213-226.

Weedon, C. (1987). *Feminist practice and poststructural theory*. New York: Blackwell.

Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning meaning and identity*. New York: Cambridge Press.

Zembylas, M. (2003). Emotions and teacher identity: A poststructural perspective. *Teachers and Teaching: theory and practice, 9*(3), 213-238.

About the Author

Dr. Mindy Legard Larson

Mindy Legard Larson is an Assistant Professor in the Education Department at Linfield College in McMinnville, Oregon, USA. She received her Ph.D. from Oregon State University and M.S. in Education from Western Oregon University. Mindy began her career in education as an elementary teacher. She taught first, second, and third grades and worked as a Program and Curriculum Specialist. Prior to coming to Linfield, Mindy taught in the Master of Arts in Teaching program at George Fox University in Newberg Oregon, USA. Her research interests include literacy theory and pedagogy; preservice teacher identity; poststructural feminist research and pedagogy; and children's and young adult literature.

The International
JOURNAL *of* LEARNING

COMMON GROUND

Please visit the Journal website at http://www.Learning-Journal.com
for further information about the Journal or to subscribe.

THE UNIVERSITY PRESS JOURNALS

International Journal of the Arts in Society
Creates a space for dialogue on innovative theories and practices in the arts, and their inter-relationships with society.
ISSN: 1833-1866
http://www.Arts-Journal.com

International Journal of the Book
Explores the past, present and future of books, publishing, libraries, information, literacy and learning in the information society. ISSN: 1447-9567
http://www.Book-Journal.com

Design Principles and Practices: An International Journal
Examines the meaning and purpose of 'design' while also speaking in grounded ways about the task of design and the use of designed artefacts and processes. ISSN: 1833-1874
http://www.Design-Journal.com

International Journal of Diversity in Organisations, Communities and Nations
Provides a forum for discussion and builds a body of knowledge on the forms and dynamics of difference and diversity.
ISSN: 1447-9583
http://www.Diversity-Journal.com

International Journal of Environmental, Cultural, Economic and Social Sustainability
Draws from the various fields and perspectives through which we can address fundamental questions of sustainability.
ISSN: 1832-2077
http://www.Sustainability-Journal.com

Global Studies Journal
Maps and interprets new trends and patterns in globalization. ISSN 1835-4432
http://www.GlobalStudiesJournal.com

International Journal of the Humanities
Discusses the role of the humanities in contemplating the future and the human, in an era otherwise dominated by scientific, technical and economic rationalisms. ISSN: 1447-9559
http://www.Humanities-Journal.com

International Journal of the Inclusive Museum
Addresses the key question: How can the institution of the museum become more inclusive? ISSN 1835-2014
http://www.Museum-Journal.com

International Journal of Interdisciplinary Social Sciences
Discusses disciplinary and interdisciplinary approaches to knowledge creation within and across the various social sciences and between the social, natural and applied sciences.
ISSN: 1833-1882
http://www.Socialsciences-Journal.com

International Journal of Knowledge, Culture and Change Management
Creates a space for discussion of the nature and future of organisations, in all their forms and manifestations.
ISSN: 1447-9575
http://www.Management-Journal.com

International Journal of Learning
Sets out to foster inquiry, invite dialogue and build a body of knowledge on the nature and future of learning.
ISSN: 1447-9540
http://www.Learning-Journal.com

International Journal of Technology, Knowledge and Society
Focuses on a range of critically important themes in the various fields that address the complex and subtle relationships between technology, knowledge and society. ISSN: 1832-3669
http://www.Technology-Journal.com

Journal of the World Universities Forum
Explores the meaning and purpose of the academy in times of striking social transformation.
ISSN 1835-2030
http://www.Universities-Journal.com

FOR SUBSCRIPTION INFORMATION, PLEASE CONTACT
subscriptions@commonground.com.au