

Innovating My Thinking and Practices as a Language Teacher Educator Through My Work as a Researcher

Paula Golombek

Abstract The innovation presented in this chapter represents how my research on language teacher identity using the concept of *identity-in-activity* transformed my instructional practices as a language teacher educator. I first describe two of Vygotsky's (1987) concepts, *everyday* and *academic concepts*, that are crucial to my practices as a teacher educator and researcher. I demonstrate how my writing up of research on one teacher's identity served as "narrative as externalization", enabling me to use the academic concept of *identity-in-activity* as a *psychological tool* that informed the way I integrated teacher identity into my instructional practices. I then detail how *identity-in-activity* functions within my Vygotskian grounded theoretical approach to teacher education through a prototypical case of a teacher. I hope to demonstrate how by intentionally incorporating language teacher *identity-in-activity* into professional development practices, beginning teachers can use *identity-in-activity* as a *psychological tool* to articulate the teacher identity to which they aspire, develop instructional practices aligning with that identity, apprehend the discourses shaping their *identity-in-activity*, and thereby gain increasing control of their teaching worlds. I also hope this will contribute to language teacher educators' ways of knowing by making what we do and why we do it explicit, as well as providing a window on the impact of what we do on teachers' development.

1 Introduction

The teacher educator in much research on second language teacher development seems at times to be like the all-powerful Oz—a mysterious force profoundly shaping the instructional activities and professional development of beginning

P. Golombek (✉)

Department of Linguistics, Undergraduate TESL Certificate Program, University of Florida,
Gainesville, FL, USA

e-mail: pgolombek@ufl.edu

© Springer International Publishing AG 2017

T.S. Gregersen, P.D. MacIntyre (eds.), *Innovative Practices in Language Teacher Education*, Educational Linguistics 30,
DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-51789-6_2

15

teachers. Yet who the teacher educator is in terms of his or her personal and socio-cultural history, theory of learning, and pedagogical intentions often remains hidden behind a curtain. Some language teacher educators made public how they have continued their professional growth by undertaking the very kinds of reflective and self-inquiry practices in which they engage their teachers in their teacher education programs (Bailey, Curtis, & Nunan, 1998; Bailey, Hawkins, Irujo, Larsen-Freeman, Rintell, & Willet, 1998; Hales, 1997). We glimpsed briefly into language teacher educators' *mental lives* (Walberg, 1977) in a TESOL edited volume that featured teacher educators from around the world documenting "how they think about and carry out their work" (Johnson, 2000 p. 1).¹ Such efforts highlight the importance of language teacher educators articulating what they do and why, as well as scrutinizing whether their rhetoric as teacher educators matches their practices.

More recently, language teacher educators have reiterated the need for those in the profession to not only conduct self-inquiry more actively and publicly but to examine the effect of their instructional practices and interactions on the teachers with whom they work (Edge, 2011; Golombek, 2015; Johnson & Golombek, 2013, 2016; Kubanyiova & Feryok, 2015; Mann & Walsh, 2013). Documenting the nature and impact of what we do on the teachers with whom we work and their instructional activity shifts the focus from whether we are consistent in our talk and actions to whether teachers are developing in the ways we/our programs intend. Personally, tracing teacher development as a researcher has enabled me to ground my intentions as a teacher educator and assess the outcomes of my interactions with teachers through the lens of Vygotskian sociocultural theory (Vygotsky, 1978, 1986). It is my own self-inquiry targeting my cognition, emotion, and practices concerning beginning language teacher identity in my work as a teacher educator through my research using language teacher *identity-in-activity* (Cross, 2006) that represents the innovation that I detail in this chapter.

Both my work as a language teacher educator and as a researcher of language teacher cognition are grounded in Vygotskian sociocultural theory. Two of Vygotsky's (1987) concepts, *everyday* and *academic concepts*, are crucial to understanding my practices as a teacher educator, as well as how my research on language teacher identity transformed my practices as a teacher educator. Vygotsky did not favor either *everyday* or *academic concepts* over the other but characterized them as being in an inseparable, dialectical relationship. That is, seemingly opposite concepts shape each other, possibly in transformative ways, and are understood through each other. *Everyday concepts* are tacit, incomplete, and possibly inaccurate knowledge derived from people's first-hand experience in the world, whereas *academic concepts* are systematic and generalizable knowledge learned in formal schooling. To illustrate, beginning teachers enter language

¹Volumes exploring mainstream teacher educators include Loughran and Russell (1997) and Russell and Korthagen (1995).

teacher education programs with *everyday concepts* rooted largely in their long-term experiences as learners. As learners, they experienced the consequences of different teachers' cognitions in the instructional activities and interactions in which they participated in various classrooms without having access to the teachers' reasoning behind such activities and interactions. For instance, a beginning teacher may have an *everyday concept* about student participation resulting from his/her long-term experiences as a student in different classrooms with different instructors, but little to no understanding of how to initiate and sustain student participation.

In response to this situation, I try to cultivate the development of teachers beyond their everyday understandings by engaging them with *academic concepts* through sustained, goal-oriented participation in a range of teaching activities that have meaning in a specific teaching context with a specific group of students, such as lesson planning, designing instructional curriculum, actual teaching, and reflecting on teaching. Interacting in these activities provides opportunities for a zone of proximal development (Vygotsky, 1978) (ZPD) to emerge in/through which I try to determine the lower and upper limits of a teacher's potentiality, what he/she can do alone and with assistance. Teacher educators, as expert others, target their mediation at teachers' upper boundaries of the metaphoric space of their ZPD. If I introduce "engineering student participation" (Johnson & Kuerten Dellagnello, 2013) as an *academic concept* to mediate a teacher's cognitions, his/her everyday understandings provide a basis from which to perceive the *academic concept* initially.² I would then need to gage a teacher's understanding and use of the concept in teaching activities, and become less involved as the teacher begins to use the concept as a *psychological tool*. A beginning teacher has to interact with the concept over time in numerous concrete, teaching-related activities and with actual language students in order to internalize the concept, a gradual process of *internalization*. The interaction of *everyday* and *academic concepts* first emerges through interactions with me and others (external-social) and then appears gradually internally as a *psychological tool*, a tool for thinking which the teacher uses to regulate his/her thinking and teaching practices when facing new teaching conditions. When the beginning teacher can use "engineering student participation" as a *psychological tool*, he/she will change classroom activities so that students are involved in personally meaningful interactions that enable them to reach learning goals. In sum, when language teachers can use concepts as *psychological tools*, they conceptualize their teaching differently, enact instructional practices that align with those conceptions, and articulate the pedagogical reasons behind their transformed instructional practices. We

²I am using "engineering student participation" as an *academic concept* to illustrate a point while acknowledging that Johnson and Dellagnello describe it as a "sign" or "pedagogical tool". Discussion of what precisely constitutes an *academic concept* within language teacher education is beyond the scope of this chapter.

can say from a sociocultural theoretical perspective that their cognition, activity, and emotion are unified.

One way for teachers to make sense of *academic concepts* is through writing narratives about their teaching, especially narratives that capture the process of a teacher's self-inquiry. In my work with Karen Johnson, one of the three functions of narrative we advance is *narrative as verbalization*, which supports teachers' internalization of *academic concepts* (Johnson & Golombek, 2011). That is, teachers can deliberately exploit the sense-making function of narratives to work through their understandings of *academic concepts* within the setting and specifics of their teaching. Both the process and product of narrative writing mediates teachers as they reexamine and rename everyday understandings through these concepts, so they reorient to their teaching setting and gradually integrate these concepts into instructional practices in new teaching settings.

Everyday and *academic concepts* becoming internalized as a *psychological tool*, fundamental to my practices as a language teacher educator and my research on language teacher development, became critical to my own development as a teacher educator. My writing of an analysis of one teacher's narrative (Golombek & Klager, 2015) served as *narrative as verbalization* and represents the "innovation" I offer in this volume—how my research on language teacher identity using the concept of *identity-in-activity* (Cross, 2006), which became a *psychological tool*, transformed my instructional activities as a language teacher educator. It also exemplifies how teacher educators can continue to redraw the boundaries of language teacher cognition (Kubanyiova & Feryok, 2015) by making what we do and why we do it explicit, as well as providing a window on the impact of what we do on teachers' development (Golombek, 2015).

In this chapter, I define the concept of *identity-in-activity* together with the centrality of teacher identity in teacher professional development. I describe how I used this concept in my research of a teacher, and how the writing up of this research transformed my thinking about and practices as a teacher educator concerning language teacher identity. I detail how *identity-in-activity* functions within my Vygotskian grounded theoretical approach to teacher education, and illustrate through a prototypical case of a teacher. I hope to demonstrate how intentionally incorporating language teacher *identity-in-activity* into professional development practices can enable teacher educators in their own programs to exploit the contradictions that are likely to emerge as a result of teachers making their ideal and concrete *identity-in-activity* explicit. By addressing these contradictions, teacher educators can mediate teachers' conceptions of teaching and instructional practices responsively so as to align the ideal and concrete, and thereby foster teachers' professional development.

2 Why Language Teacher Identity Matters: The Value of *Identity-in-Activity*

What language teachers do in the classroom is intricately tied to how they perceive themselves as teachers. As a result, teacher identity formation is now recognized as central to language teacher development (Clarke, 2008; Duff & Uchida, 1997; Freeman, 2009; Kanno & Stuart, 2011; Miller, 2009; Morgan, 2004; Tsui, 2007; Varghese, Morgan, Johnston, & Johnson, 2005). Researchers working from different theoretical perspectives on language teacher identity have put forth distinct yet comparable concepts that illustrate to varying degrees the complex interaction of individual, social, cultural, and political forces that influence, constrain, and expand the development of teacher identity. For example, Farrell (2011) characterized an individual's conception of her/his language teacher identity as expressed through the concepts of teachers' *self-image*, their conceptual sense of who they are, and *professional role identity*, what they do. Yet, because "[t]here are no neutral spaces in schooling" (Morgan, 2004, p. 178), teacher identities are also positioned within particular sociocultural contexts embedded with both explicitly and implicitly expressed values. Varghese et al. (2005) thus offer the concepts of *identity-in-practice* and *identity-in-discourse* as a way to capture the identities teachers enact in their classrooms and the identities that are socially constructed for them by macro socioeconomic and political structures and their politicized discourses. What this suggests is how contested teacher identity is in terms of who a teacher intends to be, *ideal language teacher self* (Kubanyiova, 2009), and how that teacher is positioned by others. Teachers are negotiating their identities in each instructional context in different ways. Inevitably, teacher identity formation involves conflict (Tsui, 2007).

It is this contestation and conflict associated with forming and enacting language teacher identity that led me to integrate this concept of *identity-in-activity* (Cross, 2006; Cross & Gearon, 2007) in my research. Cross (2006) conceived of the construct of *identity-in-activity* as a way to unify teacher identity in terms of how it is concretely enacted in the classroom and how it is discursively constructed by others. The concept of *identity-in-activity* allows for analysis of (1) what teachers do in their classrooms (microgenetic activity), and (2) what others say they should do (the historical, sociocultural, and institutional discourses shaping that classroom). What an analysis of the components of a teacher's *activity system* (Engeström, 1987) allows for is the detailing of who the teacher is (*subject*) in terms of beliefs, history, teaching theory, etc.; who the *community* (students, administrators, other teachers, and parents) is; what the implicit and explicit *rules* of behavior in the classroom are; what kinds of concepts and tools (*mediating artifacts*) shape learning activity; how power is distributed amongst community members (*distribution of labor*); and what the goals (*object*) of the classroom are—all interacting to create an outcome. The interaction among these components is likely to result in *contradictions*, which can be opportunities for growth (Engeström, 1987; Vygotsky, 1978). Identifying *contradictions* can be done initially by recognizing any *emotional* and *cognitive dissonance* a teacher expresses, which can act, though not always, as a catalyst for teacher

development (Childs, 2011; Golombek & Johnson, 2004; Johnson & Golombek, 2011; Kubanyiova, 2012; Reis, 2011).

3 Transforming My Thinking as a Language Teacher Educator Through My Research

My adoption of the concept of *identity-in-activity* began in my research of a teacher named Patrick (see Golombek & Klager, 2015). Patrick, who was my advisee, was teaching an advanced-level grammar class at the English Language Institute (ELI) affiliated with my university while he attended our MA program in Linguistics. At that time, he was taking a course with me on genre based approaches to language teaching and frequently expressed frustration and disappointment about how he was teaching grammar and how his students responded to his instruction. Noting his emotional evaluations, I encouraged Patrick to undertake systematic self-inquiry through *narrative inquiry* (Johnson & Golombek, 2002)³ to address what was problematic in his teaching of grammar to these students in that particular class. Through the process of his self-inquiry and the writing of his narrative, Patrick discovered a gap between his and his students' goals for the grammar classroom: his students' primary goal was to learn grammar through memorization for high-stakes tests like TOEFL and IELTS, whereas his goal was to teach grammar as communication. As a result of articulating and acknowledging this gap between himself and his students, he created a curriculum unit that integrated these seemingly contrary goals.

Because Patrick appeared to gain something personally powerful from the process and product of his narrative writing, I sought to understand Patrick's experience through a sociocultural theoretical lens, specifically by examining his *identity-in-activity*. Patrick's *emotional* and *cognitive dissonance* concerning what he and his students were doing in his grammar class pointed to a *contradiction*, an opportunity for growth. An examination of what he did in class (microgenetic analysis) showed that he largely explained grammar rules and students practiced these rules in decontextualized fill-in-the-blanks exercises. This instructional activity is hardly surprising given the students' goals and the larger discourses surrounding the importance of high-stakes tests. Patrick characterized his identity through the image of "the grammar inquisitor", which contradicted his *ideal language teacher self* (Kubanyiova, 2009) as facilitator of communication. By uncovering the particulars of his *identity-in-activity*, Patrick was able to address the contradiction by developing a genre-based grammar curriculum unit, which he described through the image of 'synergy'. By integrating students' objectives with who he wanted to be as a

³In our 2002 book, Johnson and I use this term differently from Connelly and Clandinin (1990), who use this as a research approach to understanding teachers. Our conceptualization is rooted in teacher self-inquiry for their own purposes, and views narrative process and product as being potentially transformative for teacher professional development throughout their careers. Perhaps this could be better labeled as teacher-generated narrative inquiry.

teacher, Patrick acknowledged how he was being positioned while developing an instructional response embodying who he aspired to be as a teacher.

Analyzing and writing up Patrick's data, my writing and revising of this personally-meaningful narrative, immersed me in a sustained process of making sense of the *academic concept of identity-in-activity* in my professional setting as a teacher educator and through a teacher whose professional development was my responsibility. I had data that demonstrated how who Patrick wanted to be as a teacher was thwarted by macro-level forces and his resulting frustration. The use of *identity-in-activity* to explain my analysis of Patrick's situation transformed my cognitions and activity of how I address teacher identity in my practices as a teacher educator. Eliciting *identity-in-activity* provides a means to identify a teacher's *ideal language teacher self* and how sociocultural and historical forces shaping a teaching context regulate what he/she does. On a pragmatic level, I can focus my mediation on developing the thinking and instructional practices of the teacher identity to which a teacher aspires. But it also reveals what is sometimes concealed in teacher education; that is, it enables me to attune my mediation to each teacher's cognitions, targeting emotions, in the learning-to-teach experience while also guiding them in concrete ways to deal with the messy and political, sometimes discouraging, realities of teaching.

4 Using *Identity-in-Activity* Intentionally in My Language Teacher Education Practices

Recognizing *emotional* and *cognitive dissonance* a teacher expresses is pivotal in identifying *contradictions* between how teachers position themselves and how others position them. Teacher educators can look for *growth points* (Golombek & Doran, 2014; Johnson & Worden, 2014; McNeill, 2005), the moment or moments of a dialectic of cognition and emotion "coming into being" (Johnson & Worden, 2014, p. 124) that surfaces in what teachers say and do. The emotions a teacher expresses often signal some contradiction between ideal, material and discursively shaped *identities-in-activity*. If a teacher educator recognizes this, s/he can intentionally focus discussions with the teacher to address this *growth point*. Teacher educator and teacher can *think together*, or use language to carry out joint intellectual activity and to make joint sense of experience (Littleton & Mercer, 2013; Mercer, 2000; Mercer & Littleton, 2007). In the case of contradictions in *identity-in-activity*, the teacher educator and teacher can *think together* in order to develop conceptions and/or practices of teaching that are (more) congruent with the teacher's emerging *identity-in-activity*. Because this development is not a straightforward process, beginning teachers need repeated opportunities to try to enact concepts in their teaching in order to begin to enact instructional practices that align with their conceptions of teaching (Johnson & Kuerten Dellagnello, 2013; Kanno & Stuart, 2011). Consequently, the teacher educator needs to engage in *responsive mediation*

(Johnson & Golombek, 2016) with the teacher through sustained, coherent, and intentional activities and interactions to develop theoretically and pedagogically sound instructional practices aligned with *identity-in-activity*.

4.1 *Narrative Practices to Elicit Identity-in-Activity*

Teacher identities tend to remain tacit unless they are prompted through some method of reflection (Farrell, 2011). Narrative represents an exemplary method. Within sociology, narrative has been characterized as the means to the study of identity formation (Somers, 1994). Within LTE, narrative has been characterized as *externalization*, a process of sense-making involving introspection, articulation, explanation, and evaluation of thoughts, feelings, and teaching practices, as well as *narrative as verbalization*, a process of teachers working through *academic concepts* through their own instructional goals and settings (Johnson & Golombek, 2011). Narrative, thus, can be a productive means through which to elicit, explore, and document teacher identity formation.

When I am working with teachers in the internship, one narrative practice that I typically begin with is having teachers describe (or represent in a visual) their ideal class, i.e., what they want the teaching and learning activity to look like in their classrooms. Their descriptions reveal their burgeoning ideal concept of their *identity-in-activity*, their *ideal language teacher self* (Kubanyiova, 2009), by explaining what teachers and students are doing in the class, how they are interacting with each other, and how these activities and interactions promote learning. Once teachers have externalized their ideal *identity-in-activity*, I can repeatedly use this as a concrete reference point when we engage in dialogic interactions directed at cultivating teachers' thinking about teaching and abilities to design theoretically congruent instructional practices. As a teacher and I co-construct a ZPD, I can mediate teachers at their upper boundaries as they work to develop their *identity-in-activity* and congruent practices by situating teachers' thinking about and doing of teaching in terms of their actual context.

I return to their ideal *identity-in-activity*, their *ideal language teacher self*, as a guide to how I respond to them in their teaching journals as they narrate their tacit beliefs, emotions, knowledge, and interpretations in response to what they experience in their classrooms. Using teaching journals in language teacher education can be problematic, such as teachers having to rely on their memories to reflect on what transpired in their classes, and representing themselves in ways they perceive the teacher educator favors (Hobbs, 2007; Mann & Walsh, 2013). As a result, I do not grade journals.

Observing a teacher teach provides further insights into teachers, especially if teacher educators and teachers can dialogue about what transpired in a class. In my activities as a teacher educator, I have characterized the interaction between the teacher educator and teacher watching the videotape as a narrative practice through the term *dialogic video protocol* (DVP) (Golombek, 2011). The videotape becomes

the concrete resource through which the teacher educator and teacher *think together*, with the teacher educator mediating in intentional ways, so the teacher may express his/her understandings of and feelings about teaching in ways he/she could not under the demands of real teaching. As the teacher and I co-construct a ZPD, I weave in what the teacher expressed as his/her ideal class in journal 1, the ideal *identity-in-activity*, in order to examine whether and how it was manifested in the teacher's actual teaching activity as we watch the video. If the teacher expresses *emotional* and *cognitive dissonance* concerning her/his instructional activity, a possible *growth point*, the teacher and I engage in *responsive mediation* to try to devise instructional activity that is congruent with the ideal. Teachers can try out new instructional ideas in the safe space of the ZPD, ideas that they can try to materialize in instruction in their next classes.

Another way to elicit a teacher's *identity-in-activity* is through a *narrative inquiry*, defined as "systematic exploration that is conducted *by* and *for* teachers through their own stories and language" (Johnson & Golombek, 2002, p. 6, emphasis in original). When engaging in this kind of systematic self-inquiry, teachers typically describe their tacit thoughts, beliefs, knowledge, fears, and hopes as they express their day-to-day understandings of their instructional contexts. Through the process of writing and reading the narrative and in dialogue with a teacher educator and/or other teachers, teachers can identify their *identity-in-activity* in their own words, and address any *cognitive and emotional dissonance* in their teaching, contradictions, and/or *growth points* that emerge. The teacher educator with access to the teacher's internal cognitive and emotional struggles, as well as understanding of his/her activity of teaching, can engage the teacher in *responsive mediation* using the teacher's articulated *identity-in-activity* as a reference point.

Each of these narrative activities plays a complimentary role in enabling teacher educator and teacher to *think together* as they explore the teacher's *identity-in-activity*. Other kinds of narrative activities could no doubt be used to elicit and explore language teacher *identity-in-activity*. In any case, narrative activities should be done in ways that are responsive to who individual teachers are—their unique personal histories and emerging emotional and cognitive needs, abilities, and goals—as well as to the goals, affordances, and constraints of the institutional setting.

5 My Transformed Understandings in Practice: Interactions with Arya

Through this extended example, I describe how I used *identity-in-activity* intentionally to facilitate Arya's articulation of her ideal and tacit *identity-in-activity*, and then engaged in *responsive mediation* by using this articulated identity as we examined her concrete instructional practices throughout the internship. Arya represents a prototypical case that illustrates how teachers and I interact in various

narrative-based activities.⁴ The data excerpts were selected to show I identified contradictions in Arya's *identity-in-activity*, and then how the contradictions were addressed in subsequent instructional practices and interactions.

Arya, a linguistics major, was in the last semester of her senior year when she participated in the internship, the capstone course of an undergraduate teaching English as a second language certificate program. Prior to the internship, Arya took a pedagogical grammar class that I taught; during the internship, she was also taking a graduate level course on genre-based approaches to language teaching with me and working as a language assistant (LA) at the university's English Language Institute (ELI). As an LA, she designed and implemented communicative activities regularly with a group of language learners outside their official ELI courses. Arya thus had some, albeit informal, instructional experience with learners of English.

6 Arya's Teaching Journal

As a requirement of the internship, Arya wrote seven reflective journals (three in response to prompts and four in response to how she was experiencing her teaching). The journals provide a way for me to learn more about the teachers, what they think and feel about their teaching experiences. The first two journal prompts asked respectively for teachers first to describe their ideal class (also described as what the teacher's and students' activity in the classroom would look like), and second, to describe their strengths and challenges as beginning teachers. Though I have used this as an instructional activity repeatedly as a teacher educator, how I understood the value of these prompts changed. They helped identify Arya's ideal *identity-in-activity*, so we could use this to compare with her *identity-in-activity* as she began teaching (the ideal conception versus the concrete enactment).

Arya wrote the following about her ideal classroom:

My idealized classroom, whether it was grammar or listening/speaking or what have you, would **focus strongly on the socially relevant functions of language**. I would want the main focus of the class to be **the analysis of texts**. Basically, I would want my ideal classroom to consist of **students doing guided analyses of texts in which they would come to understand not only how semantic choices are functioning within the text, but also how the text is functioning within a larger context**. I would want my students to not only focus on linguistic relationships within the text, I would want them to **be aware of what speech act is occurring and how those linguistic relationships are contributing to it**.

I enjoy coming up with lesson plans and units that are **engaging** for the students as well as **informative about how language can be used**. I want to help students not only understand the Target Language, but also to **move more easily within a culture**. To understand what they are hearing even if it is not something found in a textbook. My ideal classroom wouldn't be focused 100% on one particular area of language use (academic for example). I would want my classroom to be more interested in **how language is used** in general. I

⁴Some data taken from Johnson, K. E., & Golombek, P. R. (2016). *Mindful L2 Teacher Education: A sociocultural perspective on cultivating teachers' professional development*. NY: Routledge.

would want to be able to do activities that **are interesting and informative about the English language-if not strictly relevant to the students' daily lives.**

What can be inferred about Arya's ideal *identity-in-activity* is that she is a discourse- and meaning-based, communication-oriented teacher. What can be similarly inferred is how she envisions her students' *identity-in-activity*—language noticers, discourse analysts, problem solvers, and communicators. The students in Arya's class would be actively constructing their understanding of language by “doing guided analyses of texts”. They would be developing their metalinguistic knowledge as she wants them to understand how language choices function pragmatically within specific texts within the larger discourse context. Her identity is also constructed by creating instruction “relevant for their everyday lives”.

Arya described her perceptions of her strengths and challenges as a teacher in her second journal entry:

I think my strengths as a teacher lie in how much I enjoy teaching. I am fascinated by the process of learning and enjoy being able to watch students' progress through their studies. Because of this I don't mind putting time into lesson planning. To me the majority of a teacher's work should be done outside of a classroom before class. I think **that learning should be mediated self-discovery and that it's the teacher's job to mediate.** Though, obviously, I don't yet have the experience (the sheer number of hours in front of a classroom making changes to lesson plans and seeing how those changes affect the learning process), I think that **my willingness to spend the extra time preparing is a strength** in and of itself.

I would say that my biggest weakness in teaching is the same as my biggest weakness in general. **I often lack confidence,** even if I am sure of what I am saying. Though I do a better job of faking it in the classroom (no statements ending with question intonation) I do think that **I need to work on becoming more confident in myself as a teacher.**

Arya fleshes out her *identity-in-activity* as she describes her strengths and concerns as a teacher. She identifies herself as an enthusiastic and prepared teacher. Her major concern, understandably, is that she lacks confidence. The second journal enabled me to learn about Arya's self-perception and related emotions in order to be sensitive to her as we addressed emerging contradictions. Responding to teachers' affective concerns is a critical aspect of mediating teachers/learners responsively (Golombek & Doran, 2014; Johnson & Golombek, 2013, 2016; Mahn & John-Steiner, 2002). Bolstering a teacher's confidence while trying to develop his/her teacher/teaching expertise simultaneously is a teacher educator's constant challenge.

These two journal entries communicated Arya's ideal *identity-in-activity* before she even began to teach. I could thus use my understanding of Arya's ideal *identity-in-activity* to attune my mediation of Arya as I responded to her journals, as we discussed her lesson plans, and after observing her teach.

7 Arya's Dialogic Video Protocol

I videotaped Arya teaching a lesson on intonation during her second week of teaching, and we engaged in a DVP two days later. She began the lesson with an interactive lecture in which she elicited students' understanding of the concept of intonation. Our initial talk during the DVP focused on how Arya could have made more appropriate explanations of intonation.

This talk shifted however as the video showed the class discussion that emerged in the activity that followed her lecture. She instructed students to mark for intonation on a transcript of a speech by President Obama as they watched the speech. In some sense, Arya was using transcripts as she expressed in her ideal *identity-in-activity*. After watching the video of the speech, she had students immediately regroup for whole class discussion. What transpired was a repeated initiation-response-feedback (IRF) pattern of teacher-student interaction. Specifically, Arya would ask a question, a student would give an example, and Arya would paraphrase the student's answer. The video showed that the students were slow to respond to her questions and did not interact with each other. Upon viewing these IRF sequences, Arya asked me a pointed question, "do I wait (.) too long for students to respond?", which led to a lengthy exchange.

- A: Do I (.) m- maybe this isn't the best lesson but do I wait (.) too long for students to respond,
 TE: What do you think, (2.0)
 A: (in breath) everything I've read suggests that wait time is really important and that the ability to no (.) let yourself be pressured into giving an answer yourself is good
 TE: uh-huh
 A: and so usually I try to add another question that is still the same
 TE: uh-hm
 A: I dunno sometimes I feel like (1.0) it takes (1.0) like a student starts answering, I want them to say everything they wanna say though sometimes I just feel like it's me standing there for a really long time (.) I don't know if that's okay
 TE: and that feels bad? Okay so there's two questions here
 A: uh-hm
 TE: does that feel bad that you're standing there and waiting while somebody talks?
 A: (sighs)
 TE: and if it does why does it feel bad
 A: it doesn't feel (2.0) bad,
 TE: uh-hm
 A: it feels (2.0) uncomfortable,
 TE: for who, (3.0)
 A: for me=
 TE: =why=
 A: =a lot of times the other students are looking at me: instead of the person who's talking.
 TE: mmm
 A: but I don't wanna interrupt the person who's talking to me that's the most important
 TE: uh-hm(.5) uh-hm okay (3.0) so they're looking at you for: what?
 A: that's just who they expect to look at in the classroom
 TE: I mean it seems that part of the problem is the class set up, people in rows but why do you feel nervous, (2.0) cause they're looking at you

- A: it seems silly if it is
 TE: yeah it does or you feel they're bored? Like why: do you feel uncomfortable, I think this is really important (3)
 A: huh (2.0) it almost (1.0) seems like (1.5) rather than listening to their classmates they're just waiting for the classmate to be done so they can just have me go back over it all,
 TE: uh huh
 A: which is fine,
 TE: uh huh
 A: but I still wanna let the student (1.0) cause I always make a point of recapping everything
 TE: right
 A: in case someone didn't hear it

In asking if she waits too long for students to answer and noting “I don’t know if that’s okay”, Arya was asking me for explicit assessment and guidance. Arya expresses self-doubt (her lack of confidence about what she was doing as a teacher) about whether she is facilitating appropriate classroom interaction and then her feeling uncomfortable about what transpires in classroom interactions after she asks a question. Her response of self-doubt suggests *emotional* and *cognitive dissonance* in that she experiences negative affective concerns about her related teaching actions. I prompted Arya to articulate her discomfort and reasoning for enacting the IRF sequence in the way she does, by asking why she felt so uncomfortable. Her response represents a potential *growth point*, and allowed me to address the contradiction between her ideal (students explaining the reasons behind the language used in a text) and actual *identity-in-activity* (her explaining how the language was being used because she perceived students could not). I encouraged Arya to think about how this particular activity of students engaging with the transcripts and video watching could be altered so she could achieve her ideal.

- TE: Since you brought this up why does all of this have to be so teacher directed (3)
 Arya: (breaths in heavy)
 TE: **Could you change the activity so that not everything is (.) you leading the discussion** (4.0)

Arya’s breathing in heavily suggests a degree of emotional discomfort with the first question or perhaps that this question was at the upper end of her potentiality. Yet these two questions opened up a space for Arya and me to *think together* about what we viewed on the video. Although Arya was using transcripts outwardly in accord with her ideal *identity-in-activity*, what she and I learned about her instructional activity—immediately regrouping the class and then standing at the front of the room asking questions—did not support that identity. From a reasoned pedagogical perspective, students had neither sufficient time to think about Arya’s questions to provide answers on the spot nor opportunities to co-construct their understandings with classmates. Once Arya understood how her instructional activity was inhibiting student participation, we could *think together* about alternative instructional activities that aligned with her ideal *identity-in-activity* to enable her to do what she could not do independently.

I reminded Arya of an activity that she had experienced as a student in my class on several occasions. Students problem solved answers to questions with a partner or in a small group; then they wrote answers on a transparency that they presented to the class using the overhead projector. After providing this concrete example, I asked her a specific question to engage her at the upper limits of her potentiality:

how could you have the same (1) resources (1) but changed (2) what was happening in this class (1) and from physically changing the class to activities changing the class?

On the basis of this discussion about re-imagining what she and the students could have done differently in that class, Arya was able to design classroom activity in which students constructed and explained their understandings of language and pragmatics without her teacher-fronted lecturing. In the next class, she modified what we had discussed: She had students work with a partner to analyze a series of spoken and email requests based on questions she created. Then, each pair underlined language in the requests on the overhead and explained their reasoning about how the highlighted language was functioning to realize a specific request (e.g., less imposing and very imposing) between people with a particular relationship (in terms of hierarchy and intimacy). In the journal she wrote after this class (# 6), Arya expressed how happy she was that students had an “open conversation”, in which they explained their ideas about language to each other. She “facilitated” the conversation by asking questions rather than telling them answers. Arya evaluated this class as “great”, as she successfully enacted activities that aligned with her ideal *identity-in-activity*.

In the next class, Arya had devised a similar partner-based problem solving activity focusing on the different uses of “I’m sorry” in discourse. However, when only three students showed up, she reverted back to her teacher-fronted, lecture-based style of teaching. In her teaching journal (# 7), she blamed this reversion on the lack of “talkative students” being in class. As an experienced teacher educator, I understood that if the activity was set up in the ways we had discussed, the number of students present in class should be irrelevant—her *identity-in-activity* could be enacted according to the ideal. With this in mind, I responded in her journal by encouraging her to reflect further through questions meant to push her thinking:

Are you sure about this? Did they NOT want to talk or did they not understand what you wanted from them? Did you give them an opportunity to prepare to talk? Again, I just don’t understand what the problem was from what you describe. I would encourage you to think more on this and what you did. It may not be as you think...

Arya finished her teaching in the internship, and after some reflection and discussion with me and her co-teacher, she responded to these questions in her end-of-semester teacher-generated *narrative inquiry*. She commented that reverting to her teacher-fronted style was a result of her “nervousness” because she did not think three students could participate in the ways she had established in the previous class. Arya’s experience underscores how developing a cohesive ideal and concrete *identity-in-activity* consistently is a complicated process. Beginning teachers need to engage with subject matter knowledge, pedagogical strategies, and *academic concepts* in varied teaching activities over periods of time to foster greater agency

in enacting their ideal *identity-in-activity* concretely, especially because the conditions in which they teach can change daily. As teacher educators, we need to stay attuned to whether or not a teacher's ideal is being enacted in his/her *identity-in-activity* throughout the learning-to-teach experience, and if not, work with the teacher at the upper levels of an emerging ZPD to develop appropriate instructional practices.

8 Second Language Teacher Educators as Lifelong Learners of Teaching

The writing of this chapter represents what has been an ongoing *narrative as verbalization* for me in that I have deliberately used the *academic concept* of *identity-in-activity* to reexamine, rename, and reorient my experiences as a language teacher educator. This concept now functions as a *psychological tool* that continues to shape how I conceptualize language teacher identity and teacher identity formation, as well as how I target my mediation at teachers' upper boundaries of potentiality so they can develop instructional practices that align with their identity. In describing in this chapter how and why I use this concept intentionally and systematically in my practices, I am re-committed to using *identity-in-activity* as I prepare to begin another semester with a new group of beginning teachers in the internship. My personal/professional development, my self-innovation, mirrors the process of development in which I try to immerse teachers. My development originates in and grows out of my sustained interactions with the teachers with whom I work, and with new *academic concepts*, such as *identity-in-activity*, to which I am exposed through other researchers. Because my development as a teacher educator and my teachers' development are intimately connected, documenting and understanding my development has become indispensable in my practices as a language teacher educator and as a lifelong learner of teaching.

References

- Bailey, F., Hawkins, M., Irujo, S., Larsen-Freeman, D., Rintell, E., & Willet, J. (1998b). Language teacher educators collaborative conversations. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32, 536–546.
- Bailey, K. M., Curtis, A., & Nunan, D. (1998a). Undeniable insights: The collaborative use of three professional development practices. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32, 546–556.
- Childs, S. S. (2011). "Seeing" L2 teacher learning: The power of context on conceptualizing teaching. In K. E. Johnson & P. R. Golombek (Eds.), *Research on second language teacher education: A sociocultural perspective on professional development* (pp. 67–85). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Clarke, M. (2008). *Language teacher identities: Co-constructing discourse and community* (Vol. 8). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

- Connelly, F. M., & Clandinin, D. J. (1990). Stories of experience and narrative inquiry. *Educational Researcher*, 19, 2–14.
- Cross, R. (2006, November). Identity and language teacher education: The potential for sociocultural perspectives in researching language teacher identity. In *Teaching, and Education at the Australian Association for Research in Education Annual Conference: Engaging Pedagogies* (pp. 27–30).
- Cross, R., & Gearon, M. (2007). The confluence of doing, thinking and knowing: Classroom practice as the crucible of foreign language teacher identity. In A. Berry, A. Clemans, & A. Kostogriz (Eds.), *Dimensions of professional learning: Identities, professionalism and practice* (pp. 53–67). Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Duff, P. A., & Uchida, Y. (1997). The negotiation of teachers' sociocultural identities and practices in postsecondary EFL classrooms. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31, 451–486.
- Edge, J. (2011). *The reflexive teacher educator in TESOL: Roots and wings*. London: Falmer Press.
- Engeström, Y. (1987). *Learning by expanding: An activity-theoretical approach to developmental research*. Retrieved Nov 4, 2013, from <http://lchc.ucsd.edu/MCA/Paper/Engestrom/expanding/toc.htm>
- Farrell, T. S. (2011). Exploring the professional role identities of experienced ESL teachers through reflective practice. *System*, 39, 54–62.
- Freeman, D. (2009). The scope of language teacher education. In A. Burns & J. C. Richards (Eds.), *Cambridge guide to second language teacher education* (pp. 11–19). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Golombek, P., & Doran, M. (2014). Unifying cognition, emotion, and activity in language teacher development. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 39, 102–111.
- Golombek, P., & Klager, P. (2015). Play and imagination in developing language teacher Identity-in-Activity. *A Journal of English Language, Literatures in English and Cultural Studies*, 68, 17–32.
- Golombek, P. R. (2011). Dynamic assessment in teacher education: Using dialogic video protocols to intervene in teacher thinking and activity. In K. E. Johnson & P. R. Golombek (Eds.), *Research on second language teacher education: A sociocultural perspective on professional development* (pp. 121–135). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Golombek, P. R. (2015). Redrawing the boundaries of language teacher cognition: Language teacher educators' emotion, cognition, and activity. *The Modern Language Journal*, 99, 470–484.
- Golombek, P. R., & Johnson, K. E. (2004). Narrative inquiry as a mediational space: Examining emotional and cognitive dissonance in second-language teachers' development. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 10, 307–327.
- Hales, T. (1997). Exploring data-driven language awareness. *ELT Journal*, 51, 217–223.
- Hobbs, V. (2007). Faking it or hating it: Can reflective practice be forced? *Reflective Practice*, 8, 405–417.
- Johnson, K. E. (Ed.). (2000). *Teacher education: Case studies in TESOL practice*. Alexandria, VA: TESOL, Inc..
- Johnson, K. E., & Golombek, P. R. (2011). The transformative power of narrative in second language teacher education. *TESOL Quarterly*, 45, 486–509.
- Johnson, K. E., & Golombek, P. R. (2013). A tale of two mediations. Tracing the dialectics of cognition, emotion, and activity in novice teachers' practicum blogs. In G. Barkhuizen (Ed.), *Narrative research in applied linguistics* (pp. 85–104). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Johnson, K. E., & Golombek, P. R. (2016). *Mindful L2 teacher education: A sociocultural perspective on cultivating teachers' professional development*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Johnson, K. E., & Golombek, P. R. (Eds.). (2002). *Narrative inquiry as professional development*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Johnson, K. E., & Kuerten Dellagnello, A. (2013). How “sign meaning develops”: Strategic mediation in learning to teach. *Language Teaching Research*, 17, 409–432.

- Johnson, K. E., & Worden, D. (2014). Cognitive/emotional dissonance as *growth points* in learning to teach. *Language and Sociocultural Theory*, 1, 125–150.
- Kanno, Y., & Stuart, C. (2011). Learning to become a second language teacher: Identities-in-practice. *The Modern Language Journal*, 95, 236–252.
- Kubanyiova, M. (2009). Possible selves in language teacher development. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self* (pp. 314–332). Bristol, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Kubanyiova, M. (2012). *Teacher development in action: Understanding language teachers' conceptual change*. New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Kubanyiova, M., & Feryok, A. (2015). Language teacher cognition in Applied Linguistics research: Revisiting the territory, redrawing the boundaries, reclaiming the relevance. *The Modern Language Journal*, 99, 435–449.
- Littleton, K., & Mercer, N. (2013). *Interthinking: Putting talk to work*. London: Routledge.
- Loughran, J., & Russell, T. (Eds.). (1997). *Teaching about teaching: Purpose, passion and pedagogy in teacher education*. London: Falmer Press.
- Mahn, H., & John-Steiner, V. (2002). The gift of confidence: A Vygotskian view of emotions. In G. Wells & G. Claxton (Eds.), *Learning for life in the 21st century: Sociocultural perspectives on the future of education* (pp. 46–58). Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Mann, S., & Walsh, S. (2013). RP or 'RIP': A critical perspective on reflective practice. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 4, 291–315.
- McNeill, D. (Ed.). (2005). *Gesture and thought*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Mercer, N. (2000). *Words & minds: How we use language to think together*. London: Routledge.
- Mercer, N., & Littleton, K. (2007). *Dialogue and the development of children's thinking: A socio-cultural approach*. London: Routledge.
- Miller, J. (2009). Teacher identity. In A. Burns & J. C. Richards (Eds.), *Cambridge guide to second language teacher education* (pp. 172–181). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Morgan, B. (2004). Teacher identity as pedagogy: Towards a field-internal conceptualisation in bilingual and second language education. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 7, 172–188.
- Reis, D. S. (2011). "I'm not alone". Empowering non-native English-speaking teachers to challenge the native speaker myth. In K. E. Johnson & P. R. Golombek (Eds.), *Research on second language teacher education: A sociocultural perspective on professional development* (pp. 31–34). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Russell, T., & Korthagen, F. (Eds.). (1995). *Teachers who teach teachers: Reflections on teacher education* (pp. 95–109). London: Falmer Press.
- Somers, M. R. (1994). The narrative constitution of identity: A relational and network approach. *Theory and Society*, 23, 605–649.
- Tsui, A. (2007). Complexities of identity formation: A narrative inquiry of an EFL teacher. *TESOL Quarterly*, 41, 657–680.
- Varghese, M., Morgan, B., Johnston, B., & Johnson, K. A. (2005). Theorizing language teacher identity: Three perspectives and beyond. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 4, 21–44.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1986). *Thought and language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1987). In R. W. Rieber & A. S. Carton (Eds.) *The collected works of L. S. Vygotsky: Problems of general psychology*. New York, NY: Plenum Press.
- Walberg, H. J. (1977). Decision and perception: New constructs for research on teaching effects. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 7, 33–39.

Innovative Practices in Language Teacher Education
Spanning the Spectrum from Intra- to Inter-personal
Professional Development

Gregersen, T.S.; MacIntyre, P.D. (Eds.)

2017, XIV, 268 p. 27 illus., Hardcover

ISBN: 978-3-319-51788-9