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Abstract
Teacher recruitment and retention challenges facing urban school contexts provided the impetus for this study. High percentages of historically marginalized students, plagued by high poverty rates and low academic performance, as well as substandard facilities and inadequate material resources, serve as causative factors inhibiting recruitment and retention of credentialed teachers in urban schools (Education Commission of the States [ECS], 1999; Guarino et al., 2006; Horng, 2009; USDOE, 2003; 2004; Wirt et al, 2004). Schools and districts attempt to meet chronic teacher shortages in hard-to-staff urban schools by creating innovative teacher preparation schemes, such as the Urban Teaching Academy (UTA). This study focuses on teacher identity formation and prospective efficacy beliefs among a group of students enrolled in UTA. The research questions were examined using interpretive phenomenological inquiry (Smith, Flowers, & Larkin, 2009) through case study methodology (Yin, 2009). Findings show that the precollegiate student teachers in this study made meaning primarily from a student perspective, thus adhering to prototypical images of teaching characterized by identity markers. Salient components of definitions of teacher identity for precollegiate student teachers are Self and Care. Less relevant components for precollegiate student teachers were Emotion and Context. These components appear most influenced by the temporal distance between the precollegiate Urban Teaching Academy and actual teaching experiences during internship/practicum and subsequent teaching in a professional capacity, suggesting a
need to determine whether it is possible for precollegiate student teachers to meet the emotional and contextual demands of teaching at such an early stage. Additionally, this study proposes to extend on the teacher efficacy construct by offering a model for prospective efficacy as it pertains to individuals in teacher preparation at the precollegiate and preservice levels. This model contends that beginning with the self as influenced by personal, social, cultural, historical and political knowledge sources, precollegiate student teachers begin to develop an epistemological stance towards teaching. Over time, precollegiate student teachers build identity capital grounded in the skills, knowledge and dispositions gained through access to varied knowledge sources, which develop as precollegiate student teachers learn theoretical principles of teaching, obtain and learn from performance information, and combine the theory and practice into an epistemological framework that provides impetus for ongoing synergy between theoretical and practical experiences. The broader the base of identity capital from which the precollegiate student teacher draws, the greater the likelihood that she will develop prospective efficacy, or the belief that she will be capable of fulfilling teaching roles and responsibilities in the future. This study informs the literature on precollegiate and preservice teacher identity and extends the literature on teacher efficacy.
Chapter One

Introduction

Teacher recruitment and retention presents a compelling challenge for urban schools. Urban schools are particularly hard-to-staff with highly qualified and effective teachers due to risks associated with disproportionally high percentages of marginalized students such as students of color, students with disabilities, and students living in poverty (Education Commission of the States [ECS], 1999; USDOE, 2003; 2004; Wirt et al, 2004). For example, Wirt et al. (2004) report that high school students in public schools serving high percentages of students of color and students living in poverty are more often taught core subjects by out-of-field teachers than high-schoolers in more affluent schools with low percentages of students of color. Government reports confirm that students who are poor and students of color are more likely to be taught by beginning teachers and out-of-field teachers (USDOE, 2003; 2004). Moreover, teacher attrition is a chronic problem as these schools have been characterized as having revolving doors where teachers constantly move in and out of the schools’ faculties (Ingersoll, 2001). Ingersoll (2001) asserts that schools that have teacher recruitment problems are twice as likely to have teacher retention problems. Thus, recruitment and retention go hand-in-hand as a critical issue for urban schools as high attrition rates trigger high recruitment needs, which may in turn inhibit community-building and organizational performance (Ingersoll, 2001).
Schools and districts attempt to meet chronic teacher shortages in hard-to-staff urban schools by creating innovative teacher preparation schemes. The Urban Teaching Academy (UTA) located in a large urban school district in a southeastern state is a model that seeks to increase the teaching pool by providing incentivized precollegiate teacher preparation to high schoolers. This study focuses on teacher identity development and prospective efficacy beliefs among a group of students enrolled in UTA. Questions of interest ask how UTA students’ views of teacher identity, or what it means to be a teacher, develop within dual contexts of lived experiences as high school students and precollegiate student teachers, and how UTA students develop prospective efficacy, or the belief in their capabilities to effectively fulfill teaching roles and responsibilities in the future.

**Background and Rationale**

I conducted a pilot study with Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval to explore motivating factors cited by UTA students for choosing to become teachers. I believed that an understanding of students’ reasons for entering the profession would contribute to the knowledge base regarding successful recruitment and retention strategies. Knowing what motivates individuals to enter teaching can empower state and local policymakers and hiring entities to leverage that knowledge towards establishing school contexts that will attract qualified teachers, particularly in hard-to-staff urban schools. Ingersoll (2001) and others (Guarino, Santibanez, and Daley, 2006; Mack, Smith, & VonMany, 2003; Miller, 2005; Smith, Mack, & Akyea, 2004) maintain that schools can attract and retain qualified and effective teachers by improving structural components such as salary structure, overall school climate, administrative support, and
shared decision-making opportunities.

Specifically, African American student participants in Mack et al. (2003) and Smith et al. (2004) cited disciplinary problems in schools, low salaries, job satisfaction, and negative experiences with schooling as reasons that they would not choose teaching as their careers. On the other hand, these students acknowledged the value of teachers to society and expressed affinity for empowering and supportive aspects of teaching. Incentives such as increased overall compensation, ease of entry, positive school climate, student attendance and motivation to learn, college tuition reimbursement, and strong community involvement are notable incentives identified by the students in both studies. Additionally, African American high school students and freshman college students in Teacher Education programs express the desire to help children learn and acknowledge the liberating effects of education as reasons for choosing teaching as a career (Hill-Brisbane & Easley-Mosley, 2006; King, 1993; Mack et al., 2003). Evidence suggests altruism motivates many individuals who enter teaching (Guarino et al., 2006; King, 1993; Mack et al., 2003; Miller, 2005; Smith et al., 2004).

Pre-collegiate teacher academies (Education Commission of the States, 1999; Miller, 2005; National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality [NCTQ], 2009; Southern Regional Educational Board [SREB], 2003) are an early recruitment strategy (Guarino et al. 2006) that can help to contextualize teaching, provide mentoring and pre-induction support, and financial incentives in the form of college scholarships for students to enter teacher education programs (Hill & Gillette, 2005; Hill-Brisbane & Easley-Mosley, 2006; Hill & Gillette, 2005; Mack et al., 2003; Smith et al., 2004). Growing consensus suggests that pre-collegiate teacher academies can provide incentives
to teach by bridging the gap between students’ schooling experiences and students’ prospective experiences as teachers. Moreover, data from existing programs rate pre-collegiate teacher academies as cost-effective, providing satisfactory evidence of positive results along with widespread expert consensus (ESC, 1999). Hill-Brisbane and Easley-Mosley (2006) identified an emergent theme that pre-collegiate teacher academies, at minimum, cultivate students’ interests in becoming teachers.

One example of a precollegiate teacher preparation program is the Paterson Teachers for Tomorrow (PT4T) university-district collaborative in Paterson, New Jersey (Hill & Gillette, 2005). The program offers four-year scholarships to students who fulfill program activity requirements, graduate the program, receive acceptance to a post-secondary institution, and commit to returning to Paterson. PT4T advisors hope to “return talented, critical, and committed teachers and educational leaders” to Paterson Public schools by providing participating students prerequisite experiential and theoretical knowledge and skills needed to successfully teach students in urban schools (Hill & Gillette, 2005, p.44). Additionally, students’ statuses as “insiders” provide entrée through lived experience to idiosyncratic aspects of teaching in Paterson Public Schools (Hill & Gillette, 2005), as evidenced in the following:

A basic assumption in the design of PT4T is that those who understand a system, by virtue of having lived in the system and learned to deconstruct that system, (insiders) are in the best position to utilize their knowledge, skills, and dispositions to improve that system. Students, having been empowered themselves, will empower others. (p.44)

Each year since its inaugural graduating class in 2007, PT4T has graduated students who
subsequently entered teaching. Program coordinators attribute the success of the program to integration of components such as academic preparation support and guidance, connections to the partnering university, and financial assistance. Ongoing reflection and feedback about program operations by PT4T students help the program coordinators to adjust program components as needed.

**Purpose Statement**

The purpose of this study is to explore how high school students enrolled in a pre collegiate teacher training program, the Urban Teaching Academy (UTA), develop professional identity. Teacher professional identity formation has been associated with teachers’ commitment to the profession (Day, Kington, Stobart, Sammons, 2006; Hammerness, Darling-Hammond, & Bransford, 2005). Teacher professional identity evolves over a continuum (Olsen, 2008) in relation to dimensions of self, which emerge through discursive reflection and discourse regarding teaching knowledge and experiences (Beauchamp and Thomas, 2009). Moreover, contextual factors such as students’ own schooling experiences also shape teacher professional identity formation. Identity can act as an agentive source of increased efficacy. Teachers who feel efficacious are more likely to remain in challenging school settings, which many urban settings present (Day et al., 2006).

The pilot study of motivating factors influencing UTA students’ decisions to plan to enter teaching suggests that students begin to develop professional identity as they gain experiential and theoretical knowledge and skills. During the focus group interviews (Appendix A), it was clear that UTA students were beginning to form identities as teachers. The students’ responses to the interview questions indicated that students valued
what they were learning to the extent that they used the knowledge and skills taught in UTA to evaluate their teachers. Additionally, UTA students demonstrated metacognition in thinking about their learning from a prospective stance. They thought about aspects to their current schooling contexts from a teacher’s perspective in evaluating the acceptability of teaching practices that they observed and in which they participated as students. These students’ responses prompted my goal to learn more about teacher identity formation and prospective efficacy beliefs among UTA students.

The context wherein UTA students fulfill dual roles as both high school student and student teacher provides an ideal context to explore how students begin to form a professional teacher identity. The NCTAF (2003) notes the high rate of teacher turnover in urban schools and the associated costs in financial and human capital. Moreover, urban schools face perennial teacher recruitment and retention challenges, resulting in overrepresentation of beginning and out-of-field teachers (USDOE, 2003; 2004; Wirt et al, 2004). Schools that experience problems recruiting qualified, credentialed teachers also have difficulties retaining these teachers (Ingersoll, 2001). The UTA offers an opportunity to increase the teaching pool for urban schools as students who graduate the program earn scholarships to a 4-year institutional teacher education program and must commit to returning to teach in the district upon completing their teaching degree.

This study sought to ascertain how UTA students develop teacher identity and prospective efficacy beliefs particularly relative to acknowledging and accepting contextualized roles and responsibilities for teachers in urban school settings.

**Urban Teaching Academy (UTA)**

The Urban Teaching Academy (UTA) is modeled after programs such as PT4T.
The UTA is located in a large urban high school in the third largest district (193,062 students) in the state (FDOE, 2009). The school opened in September 1956. The school offers a Performing and Visual Arts Magnet component in addition to the recently added Urban Teaching Academy (UTA). The magnet component includes music, chorus, band, guitar, piano, theater, dance, drama and the visual arts. The school serves as an exemplar of the noted tensions that occurred following the Brown decision, as the original high school closed as part of desegregation in the state in 1971 (Shircliffe, 2002). Years later, in 1997, through contentious debates regarding competing visions concerning the school’s curriculum (magnet versus traditional), geographical location, and attendance boundaries, the school was restored (Shircliffe, 2002).

At this writing, the UTA was in its third year with Cohorts I (11th graders), II (10th graders), and III (9th graders). Students who complete all four years of their high school requirements successfully and receive acceptance to college earn college tuition scholarships as well as book funds to complete a four year degree in teacher education at a post-secondary institution. The following goal statement for UTA reflects the program’s focus on preparing students to enter a teacher education program in a post-secondary institution and teach in an urban setting upon completion of the baccalaureate degree.

Students participating in the Urban Teaching Academy (UTA) will attain general knowledge of history of education, law, reform, educational theories and practice, and engage in a practical application of this knowledge through field experiences. Upon completion of the UTA program, students will be armed with the skills, tools and preparation necessary to begin post-secondary training to facilitate entry
into the teaching profession in an urban educational setting. (UTA Curriculum, n.d., p.1)

Additionally, the UTA curriculum includes competencies to accomplish the Secretary’s Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills (SCANS). The SCANS competencies refer to students being able to use various resources such as technology efficiently, to work within teams effectively, to gain systems knowledge, and to think critically. The UTA curriculum progresses in complexity and intensity of knowledge and skills over the 4-year program. Additionally, UTA students’ practica teaching experiences increase each year, culminating in an internship experience in Senior Year.

Method

Research Questions

The research questions addressed in the study were,

1. How do UTA students’ views of teacher identity, or what it means to be a teacher, develop within dual contexts of lived experiences as high school students and student teachers?

2. In what ways do UTA students develop “prospective efficacy” beliefs, or the belief in their capabilities to fulfill teaching roles and responsibilities in the future?

The research questions were examined using interpretive phenomenological inquiry (Smith, Flowers, & Larkin, 2009) through case study methodology (Yin, 2009). Phenomenological inquiry entails “exploring experience on its own terms” (Smith et al., 2009, p.1). Students in UTA engaged in a process that holds critical significance to their lives. Their enrollment in the program indicates UTA students’ implicit commitment to
becoming teachers. The research questions privilege UTA students’ meaning making regarding what it means to be a teacher, as they matriculate through the theoretical and experiential components of the program at a point in time. UTA students’ experiences were examined holistically and comprehensively through the macro context of participation in UTA. Additionally, the micro contexts represented by specific theoretical and experiential knowledge and skills acquired during participation in the program were examined as part of UTA students’ “hierarchy of experiences” as student and student teacher (Smith et al., 2009, p.2). Cohort I of the UTA students served as the unit of analysis, with each student functioning individually as an embedded unit or case within the whole case (Yin, 2009). Cohort I members were the first of three groups of students to enter UTA and were in the 11th grade during final data collection for the study.

A limitation of interpretative phenomenological analysis is that the personal ideology of the researcher automatically influences interpretation of the data. Smith et al. (2009), refer to the researcher’s relationship to the data as a “double hermeneutic”, as while the participant tries to make sense of their experiences, the researcher tries to make sense of or interpret the participant’s experiences. It is impossible for the researcher to become the participant. Therefore, the researcher’s beliefs and values, colored by lived experience, impacted interpretation of the participant’s lived experiences reflected through various sources of data collected as part of the study. I followed structural coding guidelines prescribed by MacQueen, McLellan, Kay, & Milstein (1998), which helped to minimize the impact of the double hermeneutic intrinsic to IPA research methodology by increasing levels of objectivity to the process (Saldana, 2009).


Participants

Participants from the pilot (n=7), plus two additional participants (n=2) comprised the study sample (n=9). Participants in the pilot completed a demographic questionnaire (Appendix B) with their first name, school name, grade, age, race/ethnicity, graduation year, UTA year 1 or 2, and confirmation of continued assent at the beginning of the individual interviews. The information shared on the demographic questionnaire, as well as from focus group and individual interviews (Appendix C) was used to develop initial profiles of the participants. Participants’ ages ranged from 16-18 years during data collection. The racial/ethnic composition of the participants based on self-identification was four Black females, three Hispanic males, one White female, and one Black male.

Data Collection, Analysis, and Reporting

Case study is a qualitative research method that is useful for answering “how” and “why” research questions regarding contemporary cases in naturalistic settings over which the researcher has little control (Yin, 2009). Case study is appropriate for answering “how” and “why” questions because they “…allow(s) investigators to retain the holistic and meaningful characteristics of real life events (Yin, 2009, p.4).” The purpose of case study research is to arrive at deep, perspectival understandings of complex social phenomena occurring in single or multiple cases (Mayan, 2009). These understandings may purpose to explore, explain, or describe the social phenomenon of interest, typically over time (Yin, 2009).

According to Yin (2009) and others (Corbin & Strauss, 2008; Merriam, 1998), natural settings are characterized by the existence of confounding variables that lend obscurity to efforts to demarcate the context from the phenomenon under investigation.
Moreover, the extent to which confounding variables exist in naturalized social contexts necessitates the use of multiple data sources that converge in a triangulating fashion. Using multiple sources of data such as interviews, observations, documents, and artifacts is crucial to case study research because it facilitates “converging lines of inquiry, a process of triangulation and corroboration (Yin, 2009, p.116).”

The most commonly used sources of evidence for case studies include documentation, archival records, interviews, direct observations, participant-observation, and physical artifacts (Yin, 2009). These sources of evidence, as well as sources such as questionnaires and surveys and relevant literature, are useful for studying experience in educational contexts; however, interviews are essential for making meaning of individuals’ lived experiences (Seidman, 2006; Yin, 2009). The focus of this study was to understand UTA students’ sense-making regarding their experiences as students and precollegiate student teachers. Therefore, interviewing was a major component of the data collection and analysis process. Additionally, reflective journals provided a third data source used in the study.

Data collection and analysis entailed using Seidman’s (2006) three-interview series to obtain a) a focused life history, b) the details of the experience, and c) reflection on the experience. Level I data analysis consisted of interpreting and coding UTA students’ pilot focus group data using a structural coding method based on the review of literature as precursor to additional more in-depth coding (Saldana, 2010). Level II data analysis involved subjection of pilot individual interview data, first, to interrater reliability checks, followed by a second phase of structural coding using the literature-based structural codes initially applied to the focus group data. The primary investigator
and two individuals with extensive prior experience conducting and analyzing qualitative
data conducted an initial interrater reliability check. The first individual, a professor and
advisor for the pilot study, has accrued more than 20 years experience in quantitative and
qualitative research methods as evidenced in prior training, teaching, and publications.
The second rater was a doctoral candidate, who subsequently earned a doctorate degree,
with formal advanced training in discourse analysis, educational measurement, and
qualitative inquiry methods. Additionally, the second rater has assisted with qualitative
data analysis on several scholarly projects within the department where this current study
was implemented.

The researcher met with the co-raters to review the interview protocol for
individual interviews (see Appendix C). The first individual student interview from
Cohort I was used to inform the coding schema used for data analysis (Mayan, 2009).
The co-raters obtained consensus regarding the interpretive convergence with the initial
coding of the first interview (Saldaña, 2009). The initial data (pilot focus group and pilot
individual interviews) and preliminary coding schemes (interrater reliability check and
structural coding) was refined through iterative constant comparison (Corbin & Strauss,
2008) whereby the transcripts were read and reread in order to locate words and phrases
that alluded to UTA students’ meaning making regarding becoming teachers. Data
derived from pilot focus group interviews, pilot individual interviews, and reflective
journals then were used to establish and label categories related to students sense-making
regarding becoming teachers based on the literature (Saldaña, 2009). Constas (1992)
describes the process of categorizing data as way of “describing the empirical
complexities” associated with managing multiple data sources (p. 255). Once satisfied
with the categories, a literature-based summary of each category was written and used as
the benchmark for convergence through structural coding process (Mayan, 2009).
Conclusions based on the data are reported in narrative form as a cross-case synthesis in
Chapter Four of this document. The final steps in analyzing the data was to develop
themes, or “thread(s) that integrate and anchor” the categories, which follow in the
discussion in Chapter Five (Mayan, 2009, p.97; Saldaña, 2009; Yin, 2009).

Summary of Findings

Findings show that the precollegiate student teachers in this study made meaning
primarily from a student perspective, thus adhering to prototypical images of teaching
characterized by identity markers including teacher-as-content-expert, teacher-as-
technocrat, teacher-as-transmitter, and teacher-as-relation. Salient components of
definitions of teacher identity for precollegiate student teachers are Self and Care. Less
relevant components for precollegiate student teachers were Emotion and Context. These
components appear most influenced by the temporal distance between the precollegiate
Urban Teaching Academy and actual teaching experiences during internship/practicum
and subsequent teaching in a professional capacity, suggesting a need to determine
whether it is possible for precollegiate student teachers to meet the emotional and
contextual demands of teaching at such an early stage.

Additionally, this study proposes to extend on the teacher efficacy construct by
offering a model for prospective efficacy as it pertains to individuals in teacher
preparation at the precollegiate and preservice levels. This model contends that beginning
with the self as influenced by personal, social, cultural, historical and political knowledge
sources, precollegiate student teachers begin to develop an epistemological stance
towards teaching. Over time, precollegiate student teachers build identity capital grounded in the skills, knowledge and dispositions gained through access to varied knowledge sources. These skills, knowledge and dispositions develop as precollegiate student teachers learn theoretical principles of teaching, are able to obtain and learn from performance information, and combine the theory and practice into an epistemological framework that provides impetus for ongoing synergy between theoretical and practical experiences. The broader the base of identity capital from which the precollegiate student teacher draws, the greater the likelihood that she will develop prospective efficacy, or the belief that she will be capable of fulfilling teaching roles and responsibilities in the future.

**Conclusion**

My conceptual framework for this study is phenomenology, so that my research questions guided my review of literature as opposed to the reverse. Hence, Chapter Two contains my comprehensive review of relevant literature regarding teacher identity formation and prospective efficacy beliefs particularly as pertaining to preservice teachers. Emerging definitions of teacher identity, influential factors on teacher identity formation, and a discussion regarding using reflections as a tool to explore teacher identity are then discussed. The second section of Chapter Two addresses prospective efficacy beliefs chiefly as it pertains to teaching in urban school settings. Teacher identity formation and prospective efficacy then are considered in a discussion about teacher commitment to the profession.
Chapter Two

Review of Literature

This study examines teacher identity formation and efficacy beliefs among students enrolled in an Urban Teaching Academy (UTA). The UTA, an accredited high school teacher training program, will grant graduates credentials to work as teaching assistants in the state (Jayakrishna, 2010). Therefore, the term precollegiate refers to students in the UTA and distinguishes high schoolers from students enrolled in a university Teacher Education program. In some instances, however, precollegiate student teachers and preservice teachers are discussed interchangeably when referencing cited literature. The research questions of this study ask how UTA students’ views of teacher identity, or what it means to be a teacher, develop within dual contexts of lived experiences as high school students and precollegiate student teachers, and how UTA students develop “prospective efficacy” beliefs, or the belief in their capabilities to effectively fulfill teaching roles and responsibilities in the future.

Recent reviews of relevant literature on teacher identity inform current understandings of what it is, how it is formed, and why it is important to teacher praxis (Beauchamp & Thomas, 2009; Beijaard, Meijer, & Verloop, 2004; Rodgers & Scott, 2008). Concepts advanced within these reviews overlap a great deal, yet each review contributes uniquely to evolving thought about teacher identity as a conceptual framework. Of particular significance for this study are concepts explicated within the
literature concerning differences in teacher identity formation depending upon teachers’ location in the preparation and training process; i.e., recruitment, preservice education, or inservice professional development (Hamman, Gosselin, Romano, Bunuan, 2010; Olsen, 2008).

The first section of this review addresses teacher identity. A discussion of the special circumstances of precollegiate student teachers precedes a discussion of emerging definitions of teacher identity. Next follows a somewhat hierarchical discussion of factors that contribute to teacher identity formation, beginning with the self, then moving to lay theories, National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE, 2008) standards, and institutional contexts and cultures. Examination of the value of anticipatory reflection in helping prospective teachers understand the experience of becoming a teacher ensues. The second section examines teacher identity and prospective efficacy, specifically as they pertain to precollegiate student teachers and urban school settings. The impact of teacher identity on commitment to the profession with consideration of implications for prospective efficacy and teacher recruitment, retention and attrition concludes the review.

Special Circumstances of Precollegiate Student Teachers and Identity Formation

Bifurcated Experiences

Special circumstances surrounding precollegiate student teachers’ experience necessitates a discriminating approach to the review of literature such that it would adequately inform the topic. The first consideration is the duality of the teacher preparation process for these students. Precollegiate student teachers enrolled in the UTA must negotiate lived experiences in dual worlds: i.e., the student world and the
precollegiate student teacher world. This bifurcated existence forces students to have to make sense simultaneously of both worlds from present and future perspectives. Because precollegiate student teachers are still in high school, they experience the craft of teaching vicariously as students. They are provided with increased practica experiences each year as they move toward their senior year of high school. However, precollegiate student teachers will not encounter direct teaching experiences on a regular basis, with accompanying responsibility for the teaching and learning environment, until much later when they participate in teacher education program practica and final internship experiences in college, and as beginning teachers upon graduation. Therefore, their experience throughout enrollment in the UTA is more conceptual than practical in that they must draw heavily from schooling biographies and lay beliefs when making meaning regarding teaching.

Moreover, precollegiate student teachers initially form their identities as teachers from a student’s perspective (Lortie, 1975; Sugrue, 1997). Providing UTA students opportunities to experience teaching from dual perspectives may improve UTA students’ chances to develop in ways conducive to current urban schooling contexts, as well as create a venue wherein to develop their “identity capital”, defined as “what individuals “invest” in “who they are” (Beauchamp & Thomas, 2009; Cote, 1996, p.425). However, students’ observational as opposed to participatory stance to teachers’ knowledge and work ethic, as well as the conceptual nature of the observations, serve as drawbacks to student-oriented perceptions of teaching (Lortie, 1975). The benefits of precollegiate student teachers’ participation in such programs have yet to be established as programs initiated and implemented according to administrative agenda may result in a product
focus as opposed to a process focus, thus hindering students’ identity formation (ten Dam & Blom, 2006). These mitigating factors in combination with “potential threats” associated with teaching in urban school settings attest to the relevance of teacher identity formation during the preparatory stage of their development (Ellsasser, 2008, p.482). In acknowledgement of differences in the features of teacher identity formation for students in UTA, and in accordance with the purpose of this study, this review focuses primarily upon relevant literature that speaks directly to preservice, and more specifically to precollegiate teacher identity formation as opposed to in-service professional development.

**Context Specificity**

Another major consideration to the special circumstances of precollegiate student teachers refers to contextual differences inherent to urban school contexts. Constantly changing school contexts demand better knowledge of how it feels to be a teacher as well as the knowledge and skills comprising subject-matter, pedagogical (planning, execution, and evaluation of teaching and learning processes), and didactical (support students’ social, emotional, and moral development) expertise in urban school settings (Beijaard et al., 2004; Beijaard, Verloop, & Vermunt, 2000). Concurrent enrollment in an urban school and the UTA may enhance precollegiate student teachers’ ability to appraise critically the knowledge, skills, and dispositional expectations for the profession by providing participants with opportunities to make sense of urban schooling contexts while forming their teaching philosophy articulating participants’ teacher identity (Beauchamp & Thomas, 2009; Day et al., 2006; Ellsasser, 2008; Geijsel & Meijers, 2005). On the other hand, a possible consequence of the extended time span between
UTA enrollment and entrance to a university teacher education program, followed by beginning teaching, may be that the teacher identity developed during UTA will be diminished to the point of obscurity, thus disrupting any conceptual coherence between these phases of development (Smarorinsky, Cook, & Johnson, 2003). The notion that transforming urban school contexts requires teachers to enter the profession with well-defined understandings of what it means to be a teacher as well as their preparedness to perform effectively as a teacher is equally significant. Hence, literature addressing future-oriented self-efficacy, or prospective efficacy, in conjunction with teacher identity formation is under review.

**Commitment Stability**

Finally, teacher identity formation and prospective efficacy beliefs inform an underlying theme of the study; i.e., teacher commitment. Because students’ reasons for choosing to pursue a teaching career was examined in a pilot study that informs the current study, commitment to entering the profession is ultimately of interest. Hong (2010) observes that teachers’ commitment to the profession evolves as their identity develops over time, and hypothesizes that teachers make career decisions as a function of the identity that has been “constructed, challenged, and modified throughout preservice teacher education and in-service teaching experience” (p. 1531), taking into account both the relational and developmental aspects of teacher identity. The question for precollegiate student teachers is whether their teacher identity forms in ways that affirm their commitment to enter the profession. Teacher identity formation, particularly as it involves efficacy beliefs, and its relevance to teacher commitment to the profession are important for educators and policy makers as current teacher recruitment and retention
rates struggle to keep pace with demands for teachers, particularly in urban K-12 settings (Boe, Cook, & Sunderland, 2008; Hong, 2010; Keigher, 2010). The next section begins the conversation with a look at emergent definitions of teacher identity.

**Emerging Definitions of Teacher Identity**

Definitions of teacher identity generally focus on how one’s intrapersonal individuality (self), which includes one’s emotions, dispositions, and ideology, engages with current, past, and projected lived experiences. This engagement of the self with others and world systems shapes an identity which operates within chosen or ascribed roles, and subsequently reform as prompted by changing contexts, creating what Alsup (2006) refers to as “situated identities” (p.3). Changing contexts refers to not only teaching settings and environments, but also to additional sources of knowledge such as educational theories, concepts, and philosophies of knowledge that inform teachers’ epistemological stance regarding the profession. Major reviews demonstrate the circularity of definitions of teacher identity (Beauchamp & Thomas, 2009; Beijaard et al., 2004; Rodgers & Scott, 2008). Additionally, examples of perspectival postures taken when conceptualizing teacher identity include *dialogical self theory* (Akkerman & Meijer, 2010), *possible selves theory* (Brown, 2006; Hamman et al. 2010), *role identity theory* (Cohen, 2008), *professional socialization* (Flores & Day, 2006), *social constructivist model* (Conway, 2001), and as a *sociocultural model* (Olsen, 2008).

In a recent literature review, Rodgers and Scott (2008) discuss assumptions of identity in general, as,

(1) dependent upon and formed within multiple contexts which bring social, cultural, political, and historical forces to bear upon that formation, (2) formed in
relationship with others and involves emotions, (3) shifting, unstable, and multiple, and (4) involves the construction and reconstruction of meaning through stories over time. (p.733)

Similarly, Beijaard et al. (2004) determined that teacher identity formation is (a) ongoing, (b) involves both person and context, (c) consists of sub-identities that must be harmonious, and (d) requires a level of agency by teachers. In noting issues that arise from attempts to understand teacher identity, Beauchamp and Thomas (2009) point out that the discourse on teacher identity must examine the role of self, emotion, stories, reflection, agency, and context in identity formation.

Although reviews based largely on postmodernist perspectives characterize teacher identity in terms of its “multiplicity, discontinuity, and social nature”, a dialogic approach draws also upon modernist views in promoting examination of teacher identity as a unified, static, and individual construct in order to conceptualize accurately its meaning (Akkerman & Meijer, 2011; Sugrue, 1997). Teacher identity may fluctuate across spectrums of stability and cohesion depending upon the status of various influencing contextual factors at different times (Day et al., 2006). In viewing teacher identity as dialogical, Akkerman & Meijer (2011), similarly to Flores and Day (2006), define teacher identity as “an ongoing process of negotiating and interrelating multiple I-positions in such a way that a more or less coherent and consistent sense of self is maintained throughout various participations and self-investments in one’s (working) life” (p. 315). Moreover, Brown (2006) argues that teacher identity emerges best as a “developmental transformation” (p. 686). In other words, the teacher self surfaces as preservice teachers obtain theoretical and practical knowledge and expertise, resulting in
increasingly greater prospective efficacy beliefs and sense of agency to make teacher choices and decisions. Alsup (2006) frames the discussion of teacher identity around the notion of “borderland discourses” wherein teachers experienced transformational spaces in teacher identity as distinctions between various contextual discourses became increasingly ambiguous. Borderland discourses were often prompted by instances of cognitive dissonance or engaging in new experiences, resulting in preservice teachers’ “beginning to feel like teachers” (Alsup, 2006, p. 38). Similarly, Geijsel & Meijers (2005) reference contemporary school organizational arrangements centered on teacher commitment wherein motivational influences of others take precedence over organizational rules and regulations. In this scenario, interaction with others in the environment, using the existing discourse structure to frame “discursive meaning-making”, results in teachers constantly constructing and reconstructing their teacher identity based on comingling of new, personally relatable information and the teacher-self (Geijsel & Meijers, 2005, p.425).

Teacher identity is clearly a complex construct with various ascribed meanings. In the next section, recurring features of teacher identity that hold particular salience for this study are examined. How lay theories about teacher identity develop around the nature of teachers’ work, involving the self and the social, cultural, historical, and political milieu are discussed. Next come a discussion regarding possible intersections of the NCATE standards with additional knowledge sources influencing precollegiate student teachers’ identity formation.

**Critical Elements Factoring into Teacher Identity Formation**

**Precollegiate Teacher Identity Formation and Self**
Scholars claim that “self” is an integral part of identity formation (Rodgers & Scott, 2008; Malderez, Hobson, Tracey, & Kerr, 2007). Rodgers & Scott (2008) analyze self and identity formation through a developmental lens (see Kegan, 1982, 1994) to address the question of how teacher identity is formed, noting that “qualitatively different ways that teachers make sense of their experiences…reflect the different developmental capacities of teachers’ selves, and therefore, color and shape how they make sense of their identities” (p.739). It follows that teachers make sense of experiences differently depending on their stage of development, which explicates the constructive and reconstructive nature of identity formation; i.e., teachers distinguish between the personal, social, historical, and political identity sources based upon developmental location, thus contributing to the evolution of the self as well as the teaching self (Geijsel & Meijers, 2005; Rodgers & Scott, 2008).

The self is a contentious issue for many preservice teachers (Malderez et al. 2007). Preservice teachers in the study contemplated both activating and transforming into a teacher self. For many, the activation of a teaching self meant that the personal attributes they possessed made them suitable for the profession. For others, transforming into a teacher self involved having to adjust and adapt their personalities and skills-set to meet the demands of teacher. Preservice teachers who were younger, having entered the profession directly from college as beginning teachers focused largely on the roles and responsibilities in terms of the professional expectations of teachers (Malderez et al., 2007). In this instance, the constructivist aspects of teacher identity formation are supported.

Precollegiate student teachers are susceptible to the developmental ramifications
of the interactions between the self, meaning-making resources, and identity formation. Meaning-making resources include students’ lived experiences along with students’ interpretations of sociocultural depictions of teacher (Lortie, 1975; Sugrue, 1997). The next section looks at precollegiate teachers’ fashioning of lay theories (Sugrue, 1997) based on alternative knowledge sources regarding what it means to be a teacher.

**Precollegiate Teacher Identity Formation and Lay Theories**

Precollegiate teachers form lay theories (Sugrue, 1997) regarding what it means to be a teacher based on knowledge sources other than professional teacher education. Lay theories develop as one encounters and enacts the personal, social, cultural, political and historical images of teaching. Everyone who attends traditional school for their particular environment experiences an “apprenticeship of observation” while a student (Lortie, 1975). This apprenticeship leads to role-playing as students project teachers’ decisions and actions as part of the student-teacher relationship (Lortie, 1975). However, Lortie (1975) points out two limitations to viewing studentship as an apprenticeship; i.e., the student’s view of the teaching role is limited and imagined. These limitations result in misconceptions regarding the dimensions of teaching, as students draw heavily from personal and student-oriented perspectives involving a negligible amount of sharing of practical and technical knowledge and skills between students and teachers (Lortie, 1975). As Holt-Reynolds (1992) explains,

Lay theories are beliefs developed naturally over time without the influence of instruction (see Vygotsky, 1978). Preservice teachers do not consciously learn them at an announced, recognized moment from a formal teaching/learning episode. Rather, lay theories represent tacit knowledge lying dormant and
unexamined by the student (see Barclay & Wellman, 1986). Developed over long years of participation in and observation of classrooms (Lortie, 1975) and teaching/learning incidents occurring in schools, homes, or the larger community (Measor, 1985; Sikes, 1987), lay theories are based on untutored interpretations of personal, lived experiences (see Bullough, Knowles, & Crow, 1989; Knowles, 1989). (p. 326)

Lay theories may include images of teachers as having been born to teach, being able to care for, nurture, and control students, as well as the ability to deliver instructional content through transmissive means (Sugrue, 1997). The fact that precollegiate student teachers’ lay theories of what it means to be a teacher are based on what they have experienced and observed as ‘teacher’ through their personal and cultural milieu, calls into question the validity of their understandings of teacher (Sugrue, 1997). Students in UTA develop teacher identity based on lay theories as well as formal understandings derived from the UTA program curricula, instruction, and experiences prior to entering college. Therefore, precollegiate student teachers’ reliance on prior understandings of teacher identity may hinder acceptance of different views of teaching proffered within their teacher education programs (Hammerness et al., 2005; Olsen, 2008). Teacher identity among these student teachers will continue to develop throughout college matriculation and will be influenced greatly by standards of the accrediting institution, in this case, the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), as well as schools providing practica and internship experiences. Any dissonance experienced between these entities may influence UTA teachers’ commitment to the profession; i.e., decisions to enter and/or remain in the profession (Brown, 2006; Gaudelli & Ousley,
2009). The next section explicates the intersection of the NCATE standards with additional knowledge sources influencing precollegiate student teachers’ identity formation.

**Precollegiate Teacher Identity Formation and NCATE Standards**

Numerous researchers have investigated preservice teachers’ beliefs about teacher identity, with discussions typically centering on roles, responsibilities, values, and dispositions as important dimensions of teacher identity formation (Beijaard et al., 2004; Beijaard et al., 2000; Cohen, 2008; Friesen, Finney, & Krentz, 1999; Goodman, 1988; Hamman et al., 2010; Olsen, 2008). The NCATE assumes major influence nationally in defining teacher identity through its evaluation of the extent to which degree granting institutions in Teacher Education prepare teachers demonstrating specific behaviors and dispositions. Teacher identity within the NCATE framework establishes what Gee (2001) refers to as being a “certain kind of person in a given context” (p.99), by providing overarching unit standards ranging from “unacceptable”, to “acceptable”, to “target”. Furthermore, in articulating what teachers must “know and be able to do”, the NCATE institutionalizes a “core identity” (Gee, 2001, p.99) for teachers in each program area, which by design transcends contexts.

Students in the UTA who earn teaching degrees with support from the program sponsored scholarship will have received training from an NCATE institution in accordance with the requirements of the funding grant. Thus, the accountability framework for the degree-granting institutions, and ultimately the students themselves, are relevant to discussions of what UTA students believe it means to be a teacher as well as their beliefs about their capabilities to fulfill the roles and responsibilities associated
with teaching upon entering the profession. NCATE provides a system under which UTA students will attain recognition of being a teacher by demonstrating NCATE standards upon successful completion of an NCATE institution and passing the state certification examination. In this way, NCATE can purvey both a “D-identity” (discourse identity) and an “I-identity” (institutional identity) in line with Gee’s (2001) logic. The process of recognition begins with association with the UTA program and subsumes students’ efforts to be recognized as teachers in the classroom and the school as a whole, and upon graduation attainment of credentials that ascribe the role of teachers to them. The question is whether UTA student definitions of teacher correspond with that advanced by the NCATE. Precollegiate student teachers’ long-term adoption and/or adaption of NCATE standards strongly depend upon the degree to which the culture of the school where they ultimately teach correspond with the conceptual framework of the degree-granting institution where they received teacher training (Flores & Day, 2006; Smarorinsky et al., 2003). The UTA marks the beginning indoctrination of precollegiate student teachers to standards espoused by the educational community at-large.

The standards that NCATE institutions must meet incorporate an ongoing theme that teachers must be able to teach all students (NCATE, 2008, 2010). According to the NCATE (2008), teachers should be able to first assess the learning contexts in which they are placed in order to help all students learn. Such assessment would help to ensure that teachers demonstrate understanding of major educational concepts, principles, and theories in order to select appropriate research-based instructional and technological methods and strategies, including content knowledge and content-specific pedagogy, to meet their students’ needs (NCATE, 2008). Moreover, NCATE teachers must adjust
curricula, instruction, and dispositions based on reflection and critical feedback (NCATE, 2008). The NCATE asserts that its standards are “based on the belief that all children can and should learn”, noting that through a “broad liberal arts education” characterized by in-depth content, professional, and pedagogical knowledge as well as internship experiences, teachers will be able to effectively teach all students (NCATE, 2008, p.3). The NCATE is not without its critics, however.

Current critiques of NCATE. With membership representative of organizations of teacher educators, teachers, state and local policymakers, and professional specialists, one can infer that the NCATE standards reflect the general will of society as to the roles and responsibilities of teachers, thereby serving as a major sociopolitical knowledge source of teacher identity (NCATE, 2008). Notable limitations to using a standards-based model such as NCATE for teacher preparation that is primarily based on “role theory” include that such approaches assume that moving through the developmental stages of teaching is a linear process and that this process essentializes teaching (Akkerman & Meijer, 2011; Gaudelli & Ousley, 2009). Moreover, critics characterize standards-based approaches as promoting a one-size-fits-all teacher profile that ignores the impact of lived experiences, personal biography, social, cultural, political, and historical factors as well as school cultural influences on teacher identity formation, particularly during the early stages (Conaway, Browning, & Purdum-Cassidy, 2007; Gaudelli & Ousley, 2009; Smarorinsky et al., 2003).

NCATE and its affiliated institutions of higher education in effect establish socially validated parameters for judging teacher effectiveness by explicating an official paradigm for what teachers should know and do according to school levels and content-
areas. Student teachers enact NCATE standards through coursework, practica, and internship experiences; then, upon entering the profession, negotiate with colleagues and administrators to construct professional role identities that correspond with their belief systems regarding teaching (Cohen, 2008; Day et al., 2006; Flores & Day, 2006; Gaudelli & Ousley, 2009). Although teachers may articulate certain beliefs about teaching roles, Flores and Day (2006) found that the ways in which teachers operationalized their roles conflicted with stated beliefs. For example, “When they described the teacher’s role and good teaching, issues of flexibility, care, responsiveness to students’ learning needs, and the use of a variety of methods were recurring features. However, the way they taught went against their initial (ideal) beliefs (Flores & Day, 2006, p.228).” Teachers’ actions aligned more closely with the actions of close colleagues and their school’s culture as 10 out of 14 teachers expressed that they moved from an inductive, student-centered stance towards a more ‘traditional’ and teacher-centered one, often in contrast to stated beliefs (Flores & Day, 2006, p.227). Hence, although teachers may receive training at institutions accredited by NCATE, the disparities in the conceptual frameworks of postsecondary institutions and schools where teachers work may result in various levels of departure from knowledge, skills, and dispositions advanced by NCATE standards.

**Future directions for NCATE.** Although the NCATE guidelines promote “diverse, well planned, and sequenced experiences in P–12 schools” as part of institutional guarantees for teacher education (NCATE, 2008, p.4), more recently, a blue ribbon panel commissioned by NCATE signaled a “fundamental shift” in approaches to teacher education with the notion of establishing collaborative partnerships woven throughout (NCATE, 2011). The framework outlined in the panel report attaches
partnering efforts throughout implementation strands concerning the “practitioner to be
developed”, providers, curriculum, clients, funding, measures of effectiveness, staffing,
and roles and relationships (NCATE, 2010, p.12). Specifically, the practitioners, or
teachers, are “Novice teachers with extensive clinical experience and who meet the needs
of local school districts and meet the criteria of licensure. Programs jointly designed and
implemented by preparation programs and school districts” (NCATE, 2010, p.12).
Moreover, the panel articulated a vision of inclusivity and diversity for teacher education
programs and districts, stating that one way to strengthen candidate selection and
placement would be to match teachers with hard-to-staff schools based upon multiple
criteria, including “key attributes” that lead to effective teachers (NCATE, 2010). The
vision conveyed within the panel report is symbolic of forward movement towards
alignment with arguments that teachers expecting to teach in specific settings and/or
student populations need to develop specialized subject-matter, pedagogical, and
didactical knowledge and skills demanded by that context (Beijaard et al., 2004; Beijaard
et al., 2000; NCATE, 2010). In light of this, the next section considers teacher identity
formation in response to institutional contexts and cultures.

Precollegiate Teacher Identity Formation and Institutional Contexts and Cultures

Institutional contexts and cultures are perhaps most germane to the current study
as students in UTA must make sense of conceptual spaces from perspectives both as
students and precollegiate student teachers, with minimal benefit of direct experience in
making pedagogic and didactic decisions (Achinstein, Ogawa, Sexton, & Freitas, 2010;
Beauchamp & Thomas, 2009; Beijaard et al., 2004; Cohen, 2008; Ellsasser, 2008; Flores
& Day, 2006; Friesen et al., 1999; Gaudelli & Ousley, 2009; Gee, 2001; Hamman et al.,
Contexts that inform precollegiate teachers’ perceptions of what it means to be a teacher extend to the school physical plant, the surrounding community, and include local norms, as well as universal, yet often nuanced, thinking about schooling practices. This conceptual layer to contextual sense-making requires UTA students to simultaneously draw upon lay theories, UTA principles and practices, as well as contemporary personal, sociocultural, political, and historical factors to extrapolate meaning regarding current and future contexts (Beijaard et al., 2004; Flores & Day, 2006; Florio-Ruane & Williams, 2008; Lortie, 1975; Olsen, 2008; Sugrue, 1997). On one hand, school-based teacher education provides student teachers opportunities to both experience and evaluate contextual factors in the midst of teacher identity formation (Beauchamp & Thomas, 2009). On the other hand, the tacit nature of context wherein how one thinks and knows, as well as how one is perceived by self and others, may be hidden and can result in inattention to normative structures, leading to a loss of “agency, creativity, and voice” by precollegiate student teachers (Rodgers & Scott, 2008).

**Normative structures.** The various sources of meaning upon which precollegiate student teachers rely may reinforce preconceptions about teaching that prove difficult to overcome, even with access to theoretical knowledge and practica experiences (Beijaard et al., 2000; Hammerness et al., 2005; Olsen, 2008). Students in UTA must observe and negotiate the normative structures (school & professional culture) of their primary context, high school, in the contrasting roles as student and precollegiate student teacher. Normative structures comprise the values, beliefs, and dispositions of the profession typically demonstrated via language and actions/decisions as teachers make identity claims to specific cultures and teaching roles during identity formation (Akkerman &
Meijer, 2011; Cohen, 2008; Smarorinsky et al., 2003). Moreover, collective teacher efficacy beliefs, operationalized as a measure of teachers’ shared beliefs in their capabilities to teach their students, form the normative system within schools that affects teachers’ behaviors in response to school cultural influences (Goddard, Hoy, & Woolfolk Hoy, 2000; Goddard, Hoy, & Woolfolk Hoy, 2004).

Researchers have examined preservice teachers’ negotiation of normative structures in schools while becoming teachers. For example, Akkerman and Meijer (2011) apply Bakhtin’s notion of speech genres to teachers, proposing that teachers often use various speech genres associated with specific content-areas, pedagogical frameworks, socioeconomic class, etc. In another instance, Goodman (1988) found that language, or “ethnographic expressions”, provided insight into student teachers’ teaching philosophy, which guided their actions. Although student teachers in the study often seemed to express similar teaching philosophies when explaining their pedagogical decisions, these decisions reflected different imagery derived from past and present experiences as well as future expectations for their teaching roles (Goodman, 1988). Student teachers in the study used their “intuitive screen”, or orientating perspective, as a mechanism for making sense of practica experiences (Goodman, 1988, p.130). Acceptance or rejection of concepts presented to student teachers in their teacher education programs was largely dependent upon preexisting perspectives; thus, concepts that did not correspond to these perspectives were typically rejected (Goodman, 1988). Hence, although precollegiate student teachers draw from a variety of sources of meaning during teacher identity formation; teaching philosophy, alignment with lay theories, intuitive screens, and perspectives present substantial contingencies for modeling and/or
formal adoption/adaptation.

As members of underrepresented groups entering the profession; i.e., ethnic and/or racial minorities, first generation teachers, etc., UTA students may also face tacit rules and codes of privileged groups such as teachers from middle and upper class backgrounds, majority ethnic and/or racial groups, and teaching profession heritage (Delpit, 1988; Florio-Ruane & Williams, 2008). Entrée, acceptance, and success as teachers partially hinges on precollegiate student teachers’ ability to negotiate the normative structures associated with the selected role of teacher throughout the socialization process (Cohen, 2008; Flores & Day, 2006; Goodman, 1988). Rogers and Scott (2008) argue that individuals must be aware of the normative structure of multiple contexts or risk silencing and agentive failure. Siwatu’s (2011) findings support the notion that self-efficacy beliefs change in response to contextual factors. Students in UTA face the challenge of commanding the normative structures of current school contexts, as well as those in which they may teach in the future.

**School culture.** School culture significantly shapes teacher identity formation, even when accounting for personal history and prior experiences as students and at various junctures during teacher preparation (Beijaard et al., 2000; Flores & Day, 2006). Expectations for teachers’ roles may be influenced more by school culture than by concepts learned in their teacher education programs, particularly if the conceptual framework of their teacher education programs were fragmented, not existent, and/or does not align with that espoused within the school where they teach (Flores & Day, 2006; Smarorinsky et al., 2003). For instance, teacher roles inform identity differentially for primary and secondary school teachers (Day et al., 2006). Literature on the topic
suggests that elementary teachers’ identity is tied strongly to motivation, commitment, and job satisfaction; whereas, secondary teacher identity is more closely aligned with subject-matter status (Day et al., 2006). Moreover, teachers of “at-risk” students, typically subscribe to roles as advocates, accommodators, supporters, and problem-solvers (Friesen et al., 1999). Teacher identity becomes a negotiated space once teachers assume roles and actively engage in schooling contexts; however, beginning teacher identity will more likely reflect training and preparation as well as personal, sociocultural, political and historical factors that influenced identity formation during teacher education programs (Friesen et al., 1999; Sugrue, 1997).

Diverging formulations of teacher identity emanating from differing lived experiences as student teachers in which expectations for the role and individual beliefs about the role interact, typically translate to disparate levels of commitment to the profession (Cohen, 2008). Therefore, how teacher identity forms during teacher education is relevant to its future trajectory and subsequent impact on commitment. Reflection is a valued skill in teacher identity formation (NCATE, 2008; Urzúa & Vásquez, 2008). Therefore, the reflection from a future-oriented stance is discussed in the next section.

**Experiencing Becoming a Teacher through Anticipatory Reflection**

While reflection is typically retrospective in nature, one can make the case for the relevance of “prospective” or “anticipatory” reflection, particularly in the case of precollegiate student teachers (Conway, 2001; Urzúa & Vásquez, 2008). Reflection can take place within all phases along the continuum of teacher development, making it useful for understanding how teachers see themselves as teachers (Olsen, 2008).
Reflection serves as narratives through which an individual exposes various “I-positions”, constructing and reconstructing multiples stances, and thus, involves temporal considerations of interactions between contexts and self (Akkerman & Meijer, 2011; Brown, 2006). As such, reflections provide a device for articulating narratives or stories of pre collegiate student teachers’ lived experiences (Akkerman & Meijer, 2011; Beijaard et al., 2004; Conway, 2001; Florio-Ruane & Williams, 2008). Akkerman and Meijer (2011) contend that narratives confer a dialogical view of identity, incorporating patterned behavior imbued with personal, sociocultural, historical and political influences. Over time, normative structures of present and future contexts, as well as influence of significant others increasingly meld with pre collegiate student teachers’ core identity in light of their understandings of what teaching is, thus reducing complexity and strengthening agency for making generalized decisions (Akkerman & Meijer, 2011; Flores & Day, 2006; Florio-Ruane & Williams, 2008).

In experiences such as the UTA, pre collegiate student teachers use past and current experiences to envision future contexts and to project personal responses to future-occurring situations (Akkerman & Meijer, 2011; Hamman et al., 2010; Urzúa & Vásquez, 2008). Anticipatory reflection can provide a platform for doing so. Conway (2001) explains the apparent contradictions in the term “anticipatory reflection” in explicating a looking inward stance to denote the backward dimension to reflection,

Looking back in the reflective sense is about gaining some reflective distance to understand better the meaning of lived experience, one's relationship within and to the world. Reflection is not only about taking the long view backward in time, but also, and … about looking forward toward the horizon. Looking toward the
future with knowledge of the past from the viewpoint of the present, I am suggesting, is a particularly salient aspect of novice teachers' everyday experience. (p. 90)

Conway (2001) conducted a phenomenological case study of six preservice teachers’ year-long internship experience to examine the role of and development of anticipatory reflection during preservice teachers’ internship experience. Preservice teachers were asked to graph their remembered and anticipated teaching experiences using story-lines, and then to write and talk about them during a final focus group session in a series that were conducted throughout their final internship. Preservice teachers were asked to draw two lines, the first depicting their comfort levels in terms of challenge and support with their actual experiences during the internship and anticipated experiences during the first teaching year, and the second depicting their anticipations at the onset of the internship.

The findings of this study (Conway, 2001) suggest that teachers experience discrepancies between their anticipated and actual experiences both at the beginning of the internship and at the end, just prior to beginning to teach. The six teachers in the study experienced increasing levels of comfort and hope during their internships. Preservice teachers’ drawings showed stable anticipations at medium-to-high levels both at the beginning and at the culmination of the internship in contrast to more unstable and fluctuating levels of comfort during actual internship experiences. Additionally, with the exception of one preservice teacher, all drawings depicted an “epic-hero grand narrative” (e.g., Gergen, 1991) wherein preservice teachers repeatedly faced down daunting challenges, reigning triumphant in the end. The epic-hero grand narrative theme
reappeared in anticipation of the first year of teaching; however, preservice teachers projected that challenges would be smaller and expressed confidence in their preparedness to face challenges because of having participated in the internship (Conway, 2001).

Similarly, Urzúa and Vásquez (2008) found that novice teachers used anticipatory reflection, or reflection for action to convey self-images and their projected states in future teaching scenarios. Novice teachers’ use of first-person language was examined as proxy for communicating reflection for action or anticipatory reflection, and as indicators of identity formation. Guided by their definition of identity as a function of teachers’ first-person references to “activities, knowledge, beliefs and attitudes related to teaching” (p.1937), Urzúa and Vásquez (2008) analyzed talk reflecting teachers’ plans and/or predictions for achieving goals and solving problems in the future through verbal expressions. Findings suggest that novice teachers in the study articulated current levels of knowledge and efficacy beliefs through talk. “Future-oriented talk, thus, constitutes an index of constructed views of self, as teachers position themselves along various continua of control, authority, and expertise” (Urzúa & Vásquez, 2008, p. 1944). Hence, anticipatory reflections can help teachers to use successful and unsuccessful solutions to prior experiences to simultaneously make predictions and plan for the future (Conway, 2001; Hamman et al. 2010; Urzúa & Vásquez, 2008).

However, student teachers are not always able to predict and plan for future challenges (Brown, 2006). For one thing, student teachers demonstrate greater facility with formulating plans for task-focused rather than quality-focused decisions and actions, indicating limited ability to project actions beyond the immediacy of current contexts.
This may result in student teachers experiencing “unanticipated intrapsychic disturbance” because of dissonance between actual experiences and the developing teacher identity, or “teacher self” (Brown, 2006, p.680). Student teachers’ lived experiences in teacher education involve constantly rehearsing areas where they lack proficiency as they encounter unanticipated challenges along the pathway to a fully-developed teacher identity (Brown, 2006). The stronger the efficacy beliefs held, the likelier the extent of effort and the length of engagement during intrapsychic disturbance episodes (Bandura, 1977). A sense of efficacy is required for student teachers to even attempt to face challenges, and unless corrective experiences occur, intrapsychic disturbance may lead to low efficacy beliefs, which in turn, negatively impact teacher commitment to the profession, ultimately resulting in higher teacher attrition rates (Bandura, 1977; Brown, 2006). The next section provides an overview of efficacy and defines prospective efficacy as conceptualized in this study. Following which, the importance of teacher identity and prospective efficacy beliefs for teachers in urban school contexts and implications for teacher education are discussed.

**Teacher Identity and Prospective Efficacy Beliefs**

Efficacy beliefs, or beliefs in one’s capability to perform actions to achieve desired outcomes, is derived from social cognitive theory and has been studied relative to students’, teachers’, and faculties’ individual and collective beliefs regarding their abilities to impact student outcomes (Bandura, 1993; Evans & Tribble, 1986; Gibson & Dembo, 1984; Goddard, 2001; Goddard et al., 2000, 2004; Goddard & Skrla, 2006; Knoblauch & Woolfolk Hoy, 2008; McKinney, Haberman, Stafford-Johnson, & Robinson, 2008; Siwatu, 2007; Siwatu, 2011; Soodak & Podell, 1994; Torre Cruz &
Casanova Arias, 2007; Tournaki & Podell, 2005; Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2007; Weinstein, 1988; Woolfolk Hoy & Spero, 2005). Social cognitive theory postulates that individuals exercise human agency derived from self-efficacy to conduct their lives (Goddard, 2001). Moreover, efficacy can be manifested in cognitive, motivational, affective, and selection processes, thereby influencing the ways in which efficacy influences individuals at different stages and contexts (Bandura, 1993). The positioning of UTA students in primarily conceptual spaces related to teacher identity formation places self-efficacy beliefs in a prospective realm for precollegiate student teachers; hence, I coin the term **prospective efficacy** to capture the future-oriented nature of efficacy beliefs for UTA students.

**What is Prospective Efficacy?**

I conceived of the term “prospective efficacy” to make a distinction between precollegiate/preservice teachers’ experiences in comparison to inservice teachers’ experiences. The difference between prospective efficacy and efficacy beliefs comes down to the question asked and the reliability of the answer. In the case of efficacy, one asks, “Am I capable of performing successfully?” In some cases, even, “How well am I able to perform successfully?” In contrast, prospective efficacy, poses the question, “Will I be able to perform successfully in the distant future,” or “How well will I be able to perform in the distant future?” Prospective efficacy begs the question of not only successful performance, but also of temporal sustainability (Akkerman & Meijer, 2011; Brown, 2006). The temporal aspect to prospective efficacy requires forecasting into the future. This forecasting involves both looking back, looking inward, and projecting into the future (Conway, 2001; Urzúa & Vásquez, 2008). In order to move forward with
confidence, individuals must believe that they will be able to execute current skills, knowledge, and expertise to fulfill responsibilities successfully in the distant future. Hence, prospective efficacy implies confidence, proficiency, and commitment sustained over extended time. In this study, literature on self-efficacy forms the basis for examining precollegiate student teachers’ prospective efficacy beliefs regarding their ability to execute successfully teaching roles and responsibilities in future K-12 contexts (Siwatu, 2011; Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk-Hoy & Hoy, 1998).

**Information Sources for Efficacy Beliefs**

Teachers gain efficacy information from performance accomplishments (successful personal performance), vicarious experiences (seeing others perform successfully), verbal persuasion (being told that one can perform successfully), and psychological states (one’s emotional response to performance), which inform teachers’ analysis of teaching tasks in light of perceived competence to accomplish the tasks (Bandura, 1977; Goddard et al., 2000). Each information source influences one’s self-efficacy beliefs depending upon the frequency and nature of successes and failures, in terms of whether one obtains information about one’s capabilities directly through mastery, or indirectly through others (Bandura, 1977). Moreover, Bandura (1977) explains that mastery experiences exert the greatest impact on self-efficacy beliefs, and once self-efficacy beliefs are established, they are resistant to change. Seeing others perform tasks successfully can also increase one’s self-efficacy beliefs if the other individual is viewed as being highly competent (Bandura, 1977). A similar caveat applies to efficacy beliefs and verbal persuasion. Although verbal persuasion yields much less influence on efficacy beliefs because disconfirming experiences easily eclipse any
expectations of mastery based on verbal persuasion, guided assistance can strengthen the influence of verbal persuasion on performance (Bandura, 1977). Finally, high self-efficacy beliefs typically lessen the likelihood that one will respond to new, threatening, and/or difficult situations with negative or debilitating emotions (Bandura, 1977).

Information sources are quite salient for precollegiate student teachers. How precollegiate student teachers experience the information sources in terms of successes and failures, as well as directly or vicariously, have implications for prospective efficacy beliefs (Bandura, 1977; Bandura, 1993; Goddard et al., 2004; Goddard & Skrla, 2006). Precollegiate student teachers generally have to imagine or project their competence for meeting task demands, making efficacy beliefs tentative at best. However, early efficacy-building experiences such as those in the UTA can help to maintain teacher efficacy beliefs (Bandura, 1993; McKinney et al., 2008). Successful performances that are either symbolic, appear to be simplistic or too easy, or attributed to external causes are unlikely to strengthen self-efficacy over time (Bandura, 1977). Bandura’s (1977, 1993) social cognitive theory suggests that precollegiate student teachers are likely to strengthen self-efficacy beliefs when they experience repeated successes with direct teaching experiences. Because guided practice coupled with verbal persuasion can be effective for increasing self-efficacy beliefs, scaffolding (supported assistance/instruction based on level of need) experiences can provide a basis for feelings of competence, thereby inducing greater effort by those subject to verbal persuasion. As precollegiate student teachers encounter developmentally challenging situations and are able to perform successfully, are privy to scaffolded successes, and/or intermittent corrective experiences, self-efficacy beliefs regarding personal performance on these and similar
experiences are expected to increase.

Cognitive processing of efficacy informational sources is consequential to the level of self-efficacy achieved by individuals (Bandura, 1977). Contextual factors weigh heavily in the self-assessment of one’s ability to generalize performance to contexts which differ from those in which success was accomplished (Bandura, 1977). This is particularly relevant in the case of precollegiate student teachers as self-efficacy beliefs in conceptual spaces do not necessarily translate to real experiences that may occur in the future. Self-efficacy is enhanced further when one performs successfully in challenging situations or tasks as well as when one perceives self-growth after overcoming setbacks (Bandura, 1977). Collective efficacy beliefs can play an integral role for precollegiate student teachers due to the duality of experience for UTA students, the indirect nature of performance information sources, and the early developmental stage of teacher identity in which UTA students’ experiences take place.

**Collective efficacy.** Perceived collective efficacy refers to the beliefs of teachers that the faculty as a group can execute the courses of action required to educate students successfully (Bandura, 1977; Goddard, 2001; Goddard et al. 2004). As mentioned previously, precollegiate students must rely heavily on alternative information sources when making sense of the contexts in which they experience teaching as students and as precollegiate student teachers. Collective efficacy is normative, making it an important factor in school culture and in how teachers respond to cultural influences (Goddard et al. 2004). Hence, collective efficacy serves as an important alternative information source for precollegiate student teachers (Goddard, 2001). The duality of roles assumed in the school forces precollegiate student teachers to project performance capabilities onto
anticipated situations on the basis of perceived collective efficacy for their school.

Collective efficacy beliefs strengthen with repeated successes, and diminish with repeated failures in much the same way as personal teaching efficacy (Bandura, 1977; Goddard, 2001). Mastery experiences, particularly pertaining to student achievement have demonstrated predictability for perceived collective efficacy (Goddard, LoGerfo, & Hoy, 2004). Thus, if the school that precollegiate teachers attend has a history of academic success and social capital, the collective efficacy of the teaching staff is likely to be higher than if the school is seen as a failure because of chronically poor academic performance (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2007). Precollegiate student teachers’ self-efficacy can be predicted to rise in concert with their perceptions of self-efficacy held by their teachers and other teachers in the school (Knoblauch & Woolfolk Hoy, 2008).

**Efficacy Needs for Urban School Contexts**

One notable aspect concerning self-efficacy in urban contexts relates to the notion that one can believe that certain actions will produce certain outcomes (*outcome expectancy*), yet beliefs regarding one’s ability to perform the needed actions (*efficacy*) influence whether or not one demonstrates willingness to take action (*agency*) toward goal attainment (Bandura, 1977). Teachers’ perceptions of competence might include their beliefs regarding whether all students can learn, which would influence the amount of effort that teachers will apply to the needs of students (Goddard et al. 2000). “Efficacy beliefs are context specific. Teachers feel efficacious for teaching particular subjects in specific settings, and they can be expected to feel more or less efficacious under different circumstances” (Goddard et al. 2000, p. 482). Prospective efficacy beliefs for
precollegiate student teachers pertain not only to teaching abilities in general, but also to whether UTA students believe that they will be equipped to teach diverse student populations that are typically representative of urban school contexts. Moreover, self-efficacy is difficult to change, making the early experiences provided to students in UTA critical in influencing initial teaching efficacy beliefs for urban contexts, which have demonstrably lower collective efficacy among preservice teachers (Bandura, 1977; Goddard et al., 2000; Knoblauch & Woolfolk Hoy, 2008; Milner, 2005).

Urban schooling contexts are characterized by large concentrations of students from culturally and linguistically diverse (CLD) backgrounds located in city centers characterized by high poverty and crime rates (Brunetti, 2006; Conaway et al., 2007; McKinney et al., 2008; Siwatu, 2011; Zhou, 2003). Context-specific issues such as limited resources, overcrowding, large percentages of low performing students, high student dropout rates, high teacher turnover rates, and inadequate leadership and collegial support make urban schools challenging to teach in, resulting in difficulty recruiting and retaining teachers (Hirsch, 2006; Ingersoll, 2001; USDOE, 2003; 2004; Wirt et al, 2004; Zhou, 2003). Study findings show that preservice teachers overestimate the difficulties associated with teaching children from CLD backgrounds (Weinstein, 1988). However, high-efficacy teachers have been found to be effective based on student achievement outcomes (Gibson & Dembo, 1984). Therefore, high-efficacy is especially desirable among teachers in urban schools serving large populations of students from CLD backgrounds and experiencing contextual issues associated with urban schools.

Recent studies examine preservice and novice teachers’ prospective efficacy beliefs regarding readiness to teach in urban settings. Siwatu (2011) administered a
“sense of preparedness questionnaire” to 43 preservice teachers to determine readiness to teach in urban versus suburban schools, and additional questions queried readiness to teach Black, Hispanic, and White students in each setting. The second phase to the study involved obtaining “culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy appraisals” (CRTSE) to determine preservice teachers’ self-efficacy to implement culturally responsive pedagogy (Siwatu, 2011, p.361). Preservice teachers made CRTSE’s in response to researcher-developed essays portraying an urban school context and a suburban school context, created in an attempt to standardize the contexts for respondents (Siwatu, 2011). Participants were asked to read the version for the urban setting and explain whether the description was consistent with their previous conceptions about the setting. They then completed a 31-item culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy scale, after which they answered five questions regarding their sense of preparedness to teach in the setting (Siwatu, 2007). They repeated the procedure for the suburban setting four days later.

Preservice teachers participating in the study indicated higher levels of preparedness to teach in suburban settings, to teach all student groups in suburban versus urban settings, and to teach White students in any setting (Siwatu, 2011). Overall, preservice teachers in the study expressed self-efficacy beliefs for suburban schools that were significantly higher than for urban schools (Siwatu, 2011). This study informs us that certain preservice teachers may have high prospective efficacy beliefs for teaching in urban settings.

In contrast, Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (2007) reported findings that no significant relationship exists between context and self-efficacy for novice teachers (≤3 years). The study included teachers from suburban, urban and rural settings. Although the
teaching setting resulted in minimal effects on self-efficacy beliefs, contextual factors such as the level of support in the form of teaching resources made a significant impact on self-efficacy for novice teachers. Additionally, support from colleagues, parents, and the community informed the self-efficacy beliefs of novice teachers. Overall novice teachers appear to utilize information from vicarious experiences, verbal persuasion, and emotional arousal more than mastery experiences, of which they have few (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2007)

**Efficacy Needs for Teacher Education**

Traditional teacher education programs focus on preparing teachers to work with students according to age/grade level, subject-area, and special learning needs; thus, teachers often implicitly include CLD students in the group of students with special learning needs (Conaway et al., 2007). Teachers without specific training to teach students who they perceive as having special learning needs may feel ill-equipped to work with CLD students, and by extension, with students in urban settings in general (Goddard et al. 2000; Tucker et al. 2005). Moreover, as the push for inclusive practices continues, precollegiate student teachers need to feel efficacious to teach students with disabilities, English Language Learners (ELL), and other identified learning needs, regardless of the grade and subject-area they plan to teach (Siwatu, 2007; Tournaki & Podell, 2005).

Many now advocate for including an additional context-based category in teacher education that addresses urban schools as integral to understandings of CLD students who are prevalent in urban K-12 settings (Conaway et al., 2007). Additionally, research suggests that prospective teachers require experience in urban school settings as early and
as often as possible in order to develop the “ideological preparation” needed to work successfully in urban schools (McKinney et al., 2008, p.69). The UTA answers calls for procedural as well as ideological teacher preparation by providing a context-specific teacher education program to high schoolers slated to obtain teaching credentials and ultimately to teach in urban settings upon graduation (NCATE, 2010).

**Findings in Preservice Efficacy Studies**

Differences in self-efficacy beliefs based on student and preservice teacher demographics and their developmental stage of teacher preparation have been demonstrated (Evans & Tribble, 1986; Goddard & Skrla, 2006; Siwatu, 2007; Torre Cruz & Casanova Arias, 2007; Woolfolk Hoy & Spero, 2005). In one study, preservice teachers’ efficacy beliefs appeared to be independent from anticipations of problems that they will face once they begin to teach full-time; however, elementary preservice teachers’ self-efficacy was significantly higher than secondary, and self-efficacy among females in both elementary and secondary was significantly higher than males (Evans & Tribble, 1986). A related study concluded similarly that preservice teachers with high self-efficacy beliefs expressed higher satisfaction with internship experiences, and believed that teaching was less difficult than those with low self-efficacy beliefs (Torre Cruz & Casanova Arias, 2007). Preservice teachers interning in high socioeconomic status (SES) schools had more self-efficacy than preservice teachers in low SES schools (Woolfolk Hoy & Spero, 2005). Moreover, preservice teachers expressed greater self-efficacy in overcoming difficulties from external influences such as those involving their students’ families, demonstrating a level of idealism consistent with their lack of direct experience, whereas inservice teachers expressed greater facility in handling difficulties
associated with classroom discipline and management (Torre Cruz & Casanova Arias, 2007). Finally, although preservice teachers expressed self-efficacy for teaching CLD students along dimensions involving interpersonal relationships, making students feel comfortable as members of the learning community, they expressed doubts and fears about their abilities to teach English Language Learners (Siwatu, 2007). These findings support the notion that efficacy beliefs may become stronger or weaker according to contextual factors, thus making the case for early diverse within-school teacher education in urban schools as a proactive measure to support teachers entering difficult-to-staff schools (Goddard & Skrla, 2006; McKinney et al., 2008; NCATE, 2010). The next section summarizes the discussion regarding conceptual relationships between teacher identity formation and prospective efficacy beliefs and precollegiate student teachers’ commitment to the profession.

**Teacher Identity Formation, Prospective Efficacy, and Professional Commitment**

Research regarding teacher identity formation and prospective efficacy beliefs for precollegiate (preservice) student teachers illuminate the relevance of both for understanding teacher commitment to the profession (Boe et al., 2008; Brown, 2006; Cohen, 2008; Day et al., 2006; Gaudelli & Ousley, 2009; Geijsel & Meijers, 2005; Hammerness et al., 2005; Hargreaves & Dawes, 1990; Hong, 2010; Keigher, 2010). Teacher identity and efficacy beliefs work hand-in-hand to inform precollegiate student teachers’ beliefs regarding competence to teach students from culturally and linguistically diverse (CLD) backgrounds in particular, including racially and/or ethnically diverse students, students placed in Exceptional Student Education (ESE) programs, English Language Learners (ELL), and students living in poverty (Conaway et al. 2007; Goddard
et al., 2000; Goddard & Skrla, 2006; Siwatu, 2007, 2011; Tournaki & Podell, 2005; Tucker et al., 2005; Woolfolk Hoy & Spero, 2005). Urban school contexts in which students in the Urban Teaching Academy (UTA) will contract to teach upon graduation from a Teacher Education program, present additional contextual factors for which preservice teachers have expressed low self-efficacy beliefs (Brunetti, 2006; Conaway et al., 2007; Hirsch, 2006; Ingersoll, 2001; McKinney et al., 2008; Siwatu, 2011; Wirt et al., 2004; Zhou, 2003). Teachers who leave the profession as novice teachers tend to have lower self-efficacy than teachers who remain; therefore, early experiences working under diverse contextual conditions may help to establish high self-efficacy and strengthen teacher commitment to teaching as well as increase the likelihood that they will remain in the profession (Bandura, 1993; Hong, 2010; Goddard & Skrla, 2006; McKinney et al., 2008; ten Dam & Blom, 2006; Torre Cruz & Casanova Arias, 2007). Examining prospective efficacy among precollegiate student teachers will inform projections regarding future commitment to the profession.

Commitment in this study refers to teachers’ propensity to enter the profession and remain beyond the novice (≥ 3 years) level. Researchers looking into preservice teachers’ commitment to the profession have defined it in terms of psychological connectedness (Lamote & Engels, 2010; Van Huizen, 2000), as a set of values and ideologies (Day, Elliot, & Kington, 2005), and as an intrinsic predisposition or calling to teaching (Achinstein et al., 2010; Flores & Day, 2006; Sugrue, 1997). Specifically, in a small scale study involving 20 teachers, Day et al. (2005) found that teachers understood commitment as a fusion of their personal and professional identities. Teachers in the study shared visions of commitment characterized by,
• A clear enduring set of values and ideologies, which inform practice regardless of social context,

• A clear sense of standards: the active rejection of a minimalist approach to teaching (to just doing the job),

• A continuing willingness to reflect upon experience and the context in which practice occurs and to be adaptable, and

• Intellectual and emotional engagement (p.573)

Moreover, teachers considered these factors to be a part of their core identity, thus adding an element of determinism to their commitment (Day et al., 2005; Hargreaves & Dawes, 1990). The importance of the self as influenced by lay theories and the teaching self developed through experiential reflection are evinced in this study (Day et al., 2005; ten Dam & Blom, 2006). However, empirical studies provide mixed results regarding the impact of teacher identity and self-efficacy beliefs and commitment to the profession. Hong (2010) supports the notion that teacher commitment levels evolve along with teacher identity during the course of one’s professional development (Day et al., 2005). In a study involving 84 preservice (n=54), inservice (n=10) and dropout (n=20) teachers, preservice teachers expressed low efficacy beliefs, which often translated into fears about facing students, particularly difficult students, in the future. Although preservice teachers demonstrated low self-efficacy, these future teachers expressed commitment to completing their programs successfully. Preservice teachers’ commitment to completing their programs appear more closely related to their perceptions of teaching as a calling, rather than to practical concerns regarding the impact of expended time and effort on family and personal obligations, as was the case with dropout and in-service
teachers (Hong, 2010).

A significant finding of difference between preservice teachers and the other teachers concerns attributions by preservice teachers of emotional stress as stable, internal, and uncontrollable (Hong, 2010). Hong (2010) posits that such conceptualizations of emotional burnout may lead to teachers dropping out when confronted with difficult situations in teaching because teachers see no way of resolving challenges. Furthermore, because of their limited teaching experiences, preservice teachers may fail to appreciate the micropolitical constraints they will face as teachers (Hong, 2010). Preservice teachers’ simplistic views of the impact of emotions on future practice, combined with underdeveloped understandings and skill in negotiating school cultures may hinder their professional development, resulting in propensities toward leaving when they are ill-equipped to handle successfully the challenges of teaching.

Additionally, Skaalvik and Skaalvik (2007) found a strong correlation between teacher self-efficacy and teacher commitment. Low self-efficacy related to failure at mastery experiences may reduce agentive action by teachers (Bandura, 1977). Precollegiate student teachers have few opportunities to demonstrate mastery, thus these students are likely to draw upon vicarious experiences, verbal persuasion, and emotional arousal in developing prospective efficacy beliefs (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2007). Because a strong, positive correlation exists between teacher self-efficacy and collective efficacy, collective efficacy beliefs may apply more influence on precollegiate student teachers’ prospective efficacy beliefs in response to the preponderance of indirect teaching experiences (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2007; Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2007). The verdict remains open as to the impact of precollegiate student teachers’
identity formation and efficacy beliefs upon teacher commitment. The purpose of this study is to increase understandings on the topic.

**Conclusion**

This study examines how precollegiate student teachers develop understanding of what it means to be a teacher (*teacher identity*) and beliefs regarding their own capabilities to perform effectively as teachers in the future (*prospective efficacy*). This chapter reviews the literature base that informs the topics under investigation. The first section looks at the crosscurrents of definitions of teacher identity as presented in the literature. The overall conclusion is that teacher identity generally focuses on how one’s intrapersonal individuality (self), which includes one’s emotions, dispositions, and ideology, engages with current, past, and projected lived experiences. This engagement of the self with others and world systems shapes an identity which operates within chosen or ascribed roles, and subsequently reform as prompted by changing contexts, creating what Alsup (2006) refers to as “situated identities” (p.3). Changing contexts refers to not only teaching settings and environments, but also to additional sources of knowledge such as educational theories, concepts, and philosophies of knowledge that inform teachers’ epistemological stance regarding the profession. In the final analysis, it is clear that no one definition of teacher identity can adequately capture all the dimensions that apply uniquely to individuals; thus, making the lived experiences of individual teachers critical to teacher identity formation.

The remaining sections of the chapter include a discussion of the special circumstances of precollegiate student teachers, followed by a somewhat hierarchical discussion of factors that contribute to teacher identity formation, beginning with the self,
then moving to lay theories, National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE, 2008) standards, and institutional contexts and cultures. Examination of the value of anticipatory reflection in helping prospective teachers understand the experience of becoming a teacher ensues. Reflection is a valuable tool for teachers and, in the case of precollegiate student teachers, entails looking back, looking inward, and looking forward to make sense of what it means to be a teacher. The next section examines teacher identity and prospective efficacy, specifically as they pertain to precollegiate student teachers and urban school settings, as UTA is located in an urban school setting as well as UTA students will have to contract to return to teach in an urban school setting in the sponsoring district upon graduation from a teacher education program. The characteristics of urbanity serve as key contextual factors in this study. Finally, the impact of teacher identity on commitment to the profession with consideration of implications for prospective efficacy and teacher recruitment, retention and attrition concludes the review.

The next chapter discusses the conceptual framework and methodology used in the study. Interpretive phenomenological case study methodology were employed in addressing the research questions (Smith et al., 2009; Yin, 2009):

1. How do UTA students’ views of teacher identity, or what it means to be a teacher, develop within dual contexts of lived experiences as high school students and student teachers?

2. In what ways do UTA students develop “prospective efficacy” beliefs, or the belief in their capabilities to fulfill teaching roles and responsibilities in the future?
Details regarding the site, participants, data collection and analysis procedures are provided. The chapter concludes with consideration of steps taken to strengthen credibility and trustworthiness, ethical concerns, and limitations of the study.
Chapter Three

Method

The purpose of this research was to examine teacher identity formation and prospective efficacy beliefs among students enrolled in a precollegiate Urban Teaching Academy (UTA). The research questions of this study ask how UTA students’ views of teacher identity, or what it means to be a teacher, develop within dual contexts of lived experiences as high school students and precollegiate student teachers, and in what ways UTA students develop prospective efficacy beliefs or beliefs in their capabilities to effectively fulfill teaching roles and responsibilities in the future. A combination of focus group and individual interview data obtained from a pilot study, as well as data from reflective journal responses obtained within this study, provide the data set for analysis and interpretation of findings.

Interpretive Phenomenological Analysis (IPA) provided the conceptual framework as well as informed case study methodology used in this study (Smith et al., 2009; Yin, 2009). This hybrid methodological design, which combines IPA and case study methodology, served the purposes of this study well by allowing access to individual students’ lived experiences within the naturalized boundaries of the precollegiate Urban Teaching Academy. Carefully designed group and individual interview protocols elicited foundational responses concerning each student’s developing identities as teachers. Subsequently, responses to literature-based reflective journal
prompts continued to forge in-depth understandings of the interplay between each student’s negotiated experiences as students and precollegiate student teachers and teacher identity formation and prospective efficacy beliefs.

This chapter begins with overviews of phenomenology as an epistemological frame (Smith et al, 2009), and case study methodology (Yin, 2009). The next section presents the study design, including descriptions of the site, the Urban Teaching Academy (UTA), and the participant selection process with profiles of the participants. Then, data collection and data analysis procedures used in the study are described. The concluding sections of the chapter discuss the reporting strategies detailed in Chapter Four, steps taken to implement quality indicators to improve credibility and trustworthiness, as well as discussion of ethical concerns and limitations of the study, particularly as pertains to Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval and compliance.

**Epistemological Frame—Interpretive Phenomenology**

Interpretive phenomenology provided the epistemological framework for this study. According to Smith et al., (2009),

IPA is concerned with human lived experience, and posits that experience can be understood via an examination of the meanings which people impress upon it. These meanings, in turn, may illuminate the embodied, cognitive-affective and existential domains of psychology. People are physical and psychological entities. They do things in the world, they reflect on what they do, and those actions have meaningful, existential consequences. (Smith et al., 2009, p.34)

Smith et al., (2009) describe interpretive phenomenology analysis (IPA) as phenomenological, interpretive, and idiographic. Philosophical tenets drawn from the
work of Husserl (intentionality, reflection, bracketing), Heidegger (person-in-context, intersubjectivity, interpretive), Merleau-Ponty (body-in-the-world), and Sartre (evolving self, nothingness, relationality) informs the definition of phenomenology as efforts to understanding lived experience (Smith et al., 2009). Daily living involves mostly subconscious awareness of one’s experiences. However, experiences take on special meaning when an individual becomes conscious of them, thus provoking a level of reflexivity involving the experience and ones meaning making concerning experience (Mead, 1934). Smith et al. (2009) describe the overall experience as a comprehensive unit with subunits that may become exposed as particular experiences elevate in level of consciousness.

In the case of precollegiate students in UTA, the comprehensive unit was students’ enrollment in the UTA. Subunits included the instructional content and experiences that students engaged in throughout the UTA, which interacted with UTA students’ situated identities created by constant engagement with changing contextual factors (Alsup, 2006). This study aimed to examine students’ understandings of teacher identity and prospective efficacy by eliciting reflective responses regarding explicit as well as tacit understandings of the knowledge, skills and dispositions required of teachers and students’ beliefs about their capabilities to perform successfully in the future as teachers.

The second critical aspect to IPA refers to hermeneutics, or the theory of interpretation (Smith et al. 2009). Interpretation focuses on meaning-making and juxtaposes the researcher’s epistemological biography with that of the participants under investigation (Bochner, 2005). Smith et al. (2009) describe hermeneutics primarily from
the philosophical positions of Schleiermacher (added value to text), Heidegger (the thing itself, fore-conception), and Gadamer (context). The hermeneutic circle, which concerns itself with the dynamics between parts and the whole, is the generally accepted guiding principle here (Smith et al., 2009). Importantly, the interpretive process is iterative and non-linear. Interpretation involves the researcher going back and forth with the data in order to make the best interpretation of experiences. This discursive relationship between the researcher and the data underscores the various levels at which the researcher can make meaning of the text, thereby making the interpretive process multi-perspectival, adding depth to the interpretive process (Smith et al., 2009). Equally salient is the ‘double hermeneutic’ whereby “the researcher is making sense of the participant, who is making sense of x” (Smith et al., 2009, p.35). In this case, the researcher’s ability to bracket her own interaction with the text is crucial to minimizing the impact of ‘fore-conceptions’ that one naturally brings to phenomenological interpretation.

The key to understanding the lived experiences of precollegiate students in UTA was to integrate the multiple sources of data in order to obtain a multileveled analysis of students’ teacher identity formation and prospective efficacy beliefs. Data obtained during the pilot included focus group interviews, individual interviews with each student, and member checks for the individual interviews conducted with each student. The information drawn from these sources were analyzed, along with reflective responses obtained in this study, to provide an in-depth holistic view of UTA students’ teacher identity formation and prospective efficacy beliefs.

The third major component to IPA is that it is idiographic, or concerned with the particular (Smith et al., 2009). The idiographic nature of IPA pertains to its attention to
detail as well as its attention to particular persons, situations, and/or contexts (Smith et al., 2009). Therefore, small, purposively selected, homogeneous samples are appropriate for one engaging in IPA (Smith et al. 2009). According to Smith et al. (2009), although small sample sizes make it difficult to generalize findings, IPA is well-suited for inductive analysis when taking the relational aspect of experience into consideration.

In the case of UTA students, each participant in this study presented an embedded case within the whole case. Data derived from each student’s lived experience have been analyzed with remaining data sources to provide “detailed, nuanced analysis of particular instances of lived experiences” of UTA students (Smith et al., 2009, p.37). UTA students were encouraged to share openly their experiences with the understanding that responses were neither correct nor incorrect. Their personal views, opinions, and understandings were valued. By way of the pilot study, precedent was established wherein students observed the researcher as one who maintained confidentiality. I contend that this helped UTA students to feel secure in sharing openly regarding their experiences.

Case study methodology is a qualitative research method that is useful for answering “how” and “why” research questions regarding contemporary cases over which the researcher has little control (Yin, 2009). Case study is a recommended methodology for IPA as case study attends to the most salient dimensions of IPA; i.e., phenomenology (lived experiences in naturalized settings), interpretive (meaning-making), idiographic (particularistic, individual, case). Smith et al. (2009) support the suitability of case study methodology when conducting IPA, stating that case study offers a way of disturbing “assumptions, preconceptions, and theories” associated with the phenomenon under investigation. The following section briefly discusses the historical
path of case study methods, definition, and more on my rationale for choosing case study methodology.

**Case Study Methodology**

**Historical Overview**

Case study, an interdisciplinary, cross-epistemological research methodology, has experienced shifts in popularity, prevalence, and meanings throughout the twentieth and twenty-first centuries (Merriam, 1988; Platt, 1992). Sociologists in the Chicago School revised the anthropological view of case study, popularizing the methodology as a means of studying life in the city during a period of great social change in the first half of the twentieth century (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005; Johansson, 2003; Lutters & Ackerman, 1996). As cities transformed from rural towns to urban centers during the years between World War I and the Great Depression, cities offered a prime context, or “social laboratory” in which to examine issues such as race, poverty, and crime (Lutters & Ackerman, 1996, p.2). Sociologists in the Chicago school advanced the debate regarding the types of data collection and analysis that would render case studies generalizable (Platt, 1992).

In fact, this debate, which continues today among many social scientists, dealt with the definition of case study in terms of whether it could stand alone as a research method, or whether, due to the in-depth study of phenomena in natural contexts, case studies were inextricably destined to be a part of other methods (Merriam, 1988; Platt, 1992). Moreover, as Platt (1992) and others (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005; Johansson, 2003; Merriam, 1988) point out, the second half of the twentieth century was marked by a distinct separation between positivist and interpretive research methodologies, and less
precisely by quantitative and qualitative research methods. Various writers have labeled the historical fluctuations associated with case study methodology differently. For example, Denzin & Lincoln (2005) define the transitions in qualitative research, where they include case study research:

- Traditional (1900-1950);
- Modernist, or golden age (1950-1970);
- Blurred genres (1970-1986);
- Postmodern, a period of experimental and new ethnographies (1990-1995);
- Post experimental inquiry (1995-2000);
- Methodologically contested present (2000-2004); and
- Fractured future (2005- ). (p.3)

Similarly, Johansson (2003) speaks of two generations of thought regarding case study research. The first generation, roughly 1900-1950, aligned with the traditional anthropologically-based genre adopted and adapted by the Chicago School. Positivism and quantitative methods predominated during the last one-third of this period. The second generation followed in the late 1960’s with researchers such as Robert Yin, whose philosophy was essentially to “…redefine case study method as logic of design, seeing it as a strategy to be preferred when circumstances and research problems are appropriate rather than an ideological commitment to be followed whatever the circumstances (Platt, 1992, p.46).” In this sense, the epistemology of case study methods according to Yin (2009) stems from either the theoretical proposition(s) or purpose(s) for the study, along with the data collection and analysis techniques posed by the researcher, rather than by a
standard epistemological stance for case study methodology.

**Definition**

Case study research is an empirical inquiry of real-life contemporary phenomena in their natural settings (Yin, 2009). Natural settings are characterized by the existence of confounding variables that obscure efforts to demarcate the context from the phenomenon under investigation (Yin, 2009). Moreover, the extent to which confounding variables exist in naturalized social contexts necessitates the use of multiple data sources that converge in a triangulating fashion. Therefore, Yin (2009) contends that researchers must first define the case, or unit of analysis, under inquiry, as well as identify appropriate data sources that will inform their understanding of the case(s) based upon apriori theoretical propositions or purpose statements to guide data collection and analysis.

Case studies may investigate single-or-multiple cases in holistic (looks at the case globally) or embedded (looks at subunits of the case) configurations and may employ qualitative, quantitative, and/or mixed-method designs (Yin, 2009). Hence, the nexus of case study research is not a particular methodology. Instead, its purpose is to arrive at deep, perspectival understandings of complex social phenomena occurring in single or multiple cases (Mayan, 2009; Smith et al., 2009). These understandings may purpose to explore, explain, or describe the social phenomenon of interest, typically over time.

**Rationale**

Researchers choose case study as a research method based on the types of questions they intend to answer concerning the phenomenon under investigation (Mayan, 2009). Case study is appropriate for answering “how” and “why” questions because they
“...allow(s) investigators to retain the holistic and meaningful characteristics of real life events (Yin, 2009, p.4).” In other words, in contrast to experimental and quasi-experimental research methods, case study methods require no control of behavioral events or manipulation of variables to answer questions regarding case(s) ranging from individuals and small groups to communities and organizations (Yin, 2009). According to Yin (2009), researchers can choose from four types of case study designs based on their research questions: a) Type 1 – single-case (holistic) designs, b) Type 2 – single-case (embedded) designs, c) Type 3 – multiple-case (holistic) designs, and d) Type 4 – multiple-case (embedded) designs. The rationale for choosing a single-case design is when the case is a) a critical case for testing a well-formulated theory, b) an extreme or unique case, c) a representative or typical case, d) a revelatory case, or e) a longitudinal case (Yin, 2009). Although a multiple-case design would be impossible or otherwise prohibitive under these circumstances, multiple-case design is preferable whenever possible as it presents the occasion for replication logic, in contrast to the sampling logic applied in experimental and quasi-experimental studies (Yin, 2009). If the researcher has chosen to base the design on theoretical propositions, two to three cases on a topic with consistent findings is a literal replication (Yin, 2009). Studies on an additional 4 to 6 cases, some based on the initial proposition and the rest based upon rival propositions, with anticipated results, equates to a theoretical replication, which strongly confirms the initial theoretical proposition(s) (Yin, 2009). However, if the findings from some cases do not result as expected by confirming the study’s initial propositions and the rival explanations, the researcher should revise the initial propositions as indicated by the results. The more cases studied in the multiple-case design the better for building a
theoretical framework upon which to generate additional studies (Yin, 2009). The alternative is to forego theoretical propositions in the case of descriptive studies (Yin, 2009). In this case, the purpose and research questions form the basis for analysis.

Case study offers investigators latitude to access varied sources of evidence such as interviews, observations, documents, and artifacts, which may be more challenging to apprehend when employing experimental as well as other qualitative methods. Case studies are particularly well-suited for evaluation studies of programs, projects and initiatives as they offer investigators opportunities to:

- *Explain* the presumed causal links in real-life interventions that are too complex for the survey or experimental strategies
- *Describe* an intervention and the real-life context in which it occurred
- *Illustrate* certain aspects within an evaluation, again in descriptive mode
- *Enlighten* those situations in which the intervention being evaluated has no clear, single set of outcomes (Yin, 2009, p.19)

The rationale for case study methodology further substantiated its suitability for this study, which was purposed to answer how questions regarding precollegiate students’ teacher identity formation and prospective efficacy beliefs using multiple sources of qualitative data. The desire to gain in-depth knowledge of how students understand teaching and what they believe regarding their capabilities to teach in future contexts drove the selection of case study as it offered an opportunity to study each participant in detail and from multiple relational perspectives within the whole case. The next section describes the design of this study. The site for the study, the participants, and data collection and analysis procedures were chosen in light of the research questions being
investigated.

Study Design

The Site

This study was conducted in a large urban school district in the southeastern United States. The original school (study site), which is located in the third largest district (n=193,062) in the state, opened in September 1956 (FDOE, 2009). The original high school closed as part of desegregation in the state in 1971 (Shircliffe, 2002). However in 1997, through contentious debates regarding competing visions concerning the school’s curriculum (magnet versus traditional), geographical location, and attendance boundaries, the school was restored (Shircliffe, 2002). The school is located across the street from a large public housing project and an adult living facility. Commuters on a major thoroughfare in the city can see the large edifice. The school is location in the downtown of a major metropolitan area and the immediate vicinity has been embroiled in gentrification conflicts. As a result, the housing project is being closed and leveled in stages and local businesses have plans for corporate expansion.

Curricular program offerings of the study site include a Performing and Visual Arts Magnet Program in addition to the Urban Teaching Academy (UTA) magnet (School Choice Attractor and Magnet Programs, 2012). The Performing and Visual Arts magnet includes music, chorus, band, guitar, piano, theatre, dance, drama, and visual arts. The Urban Teaching Academy (UTA) magnet, which serves as the setting for this study, was established at the study site at the same time as two additional high schools in the district in the 2008-2009 school year. The study site earned recognition as a School of Distinction among Magnet Schools of America’s 2011 Merit Awards winners (Magnet
I became involved with the study site when I conceived of the pilot study in Spring, 2010, as a way to learn about factors influencing high schoolers’ interests in becoming teachers. Preliminary investigations into the topic led to the discovery of the Urban Teaching Academy (UTA) at three local high schools; one in which a college friend worked. I gained entrée to the school through my personal acquaintance, whom held a leadership position in the school for more than 10 years. When I asked about the UTA, my friend willingly helped me to make connections to the program’s district coordinator. The district coordinator was accommodating in informing me of the district’s procedures for gaining approval for a study; and helping, along with my college friend, to facilitate introductions to the school principal and teachers in the UTA, marking the beginnings of the pilot study, which was conducted with IRB, district and school approval in Spring, 2010. Preliminary findings from the pilot study led to additional questions regarding teacher identity and prospective efficacy. I subsequently amended IRB, district and school approval to investigate teacher identity and prospective efficacy in this study.

**School – student and faculty demographics.** According to the Florida Differentiated Accountability Program School Improvement Plan, the school serves a multi-ethnic school population of 1,457 students. The student ethnic breakdown is 45.5% Black, 28% white, 21% Hispanic, 4% multiracial, and 1.5% Asian or American Indian, with an overall minority enrollment of 71%. Fifteen percent of the student population is students with disabilities (SWD), 6% are classified as English Language Learners, and 9% are in programs for the gifted. Fifty-eight percent (58%) of the students are on free
and reduced lunch programs. Staff demographics indicate that various levels of experience for the teaching staff with eleven (11%) first year teachers, 38 (35%) teachers in years 1-5, 33 (30%) teachers in years 6-14, and 27 teachers (25%) in year 15 or greater. Ninety-six percent (96%) of the teachers are highly qualified according to state standards. Two of the domains that function as quality indicators for the site are accountability and school climate.

The school earned an “A” grade on the state’s accountability grading system in Spring 2010, reflecting that the school improved in specific areas of high school components, including increasing the graduation rate from 86% to 87%, the acceleration participation rate from 53% to 61%, the acceleration performance rate from 46% to 60%, reading readiness from 70% to 87%, and math readiness from 54% to 75%. Even with the progress that current data suggest, the school has been unable to achieve Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) according to the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001.

Moreover, the district administers the School Climate and Perception Survey to students, teachers, and parents annually to document their perceptions about the school and to inform school and district improvement planning and implementation efforts. In 2010, the student survey indicated that 49% of students strongly agreed with statements on the survey. As a result, the faculty and staff set a goal to increase positive responses to the following statements on next year’s student survey: (a) There is an adult I can talk to at school if I have a problem, (b) The principal and teachers at my school care about me, (c) I feel safe at school, (d) I spend most of my day working on lessons and learning, and (e) I see my principal almost every day. The School Climate and Perception Survey serves as an important quality indicator for schools in the district. Information from the
survey is used specifically to help guide improvement efforts to increase parental involvement in students’ education.

The Urban Teaching Academy (UTA)

The UTA is a program that offers precollegiate teacher education to enrolled students. The sponsoring district committed to providing graduates of the UTA who earned admission to college and who signed a Commitment to Return Contract, 4-year scholarships to complete a teacher education program in the state (Urban Teaching Academy Application for Admission, 2009-2010). Students who received scholarships through the program must commit to teaching in an urban school setting in the district upon attaining state teaching credentials. The UTA at the study site currently consists of 44 students across three student cohorts; i.e., Cohort I (11th graders, 12 students), Cohort II (10th graders, 12 students), and Cohort III (9th graders, 18 students). Nine students from cohort I participated in this study.

The UTA curriculum progresses in complexity and intensity of knowledge and skills over the 4-year program. Developers of UTA curricula and instruction organized each year of the 4-year program around specific outcomes/teaching goals implemented through a crosswalk of components including (a) Secretary’s Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills (SCANS) Standards, (b) Teaching Points, (c) Chapter/Pages in Text, (d) Task/Skill, and (e) Suggested Strategies/Activities. The 4-year course outlines lists the following as textbooks used for instruction: Those Who Can, Teach (Ryan & Cooper, 2004), An Introduction to Education: Choosing Your Teaching Path (Powell, 2009), and Instruction for All Students (Rutherford, 2002). The outcomes/teaching goals included targeted for instruction each year were goal setting/career planning, instructional
strategies, lesson planning and classroom management, culture and diversity, and field experiences. Additional outcomes/teaching goals taught each year included: history of education, school reform, and school law and finance in the first year (9th grade), the state’s ethics code in the second year (10th grade), and educational philosophy and exceptionality in the third year (11th grade). Students in the UTA participated in a clinical internship at the study site during two elective class periods in the fourth year (12th grade), wherein they were to apply the knowledge and skills taught during the first three years of participation in UTA.

**UTA—student demographics.** The Urban Teaching Academy (UTA) was in its third year with Cohorts I (11th graders), II (10th graders), and III (9th graders) during conduct of this study, with total enrollment of forty-four students. Nine of twelve students from Cohort I participated in this study; i.e., the seven Cohort I students who participated in the pilot study and two additional Cohort I students volunteered to participate in this study, bringing the total to nine (n=9). The demographic breakdown based on race/ethnicity during the study year (2010-2011), for Cohort I (11th grade) included Black, Non-Hispanic (6 students, 50%), Hispanic (2 students, 16.7%), Multiracial (1 student, 8.3%), and White, Non-Hispanic (3 students, 3%), totaling 12 students. The demographic breakdown based on gender during the study year (2010-2011), for Cohort I included Female (8 students, 66.7%) and Male (4 students, 33.3%). The demographic breakdown based on race/ethnicity during the study year (2010-2011), for Cohort II (10th grade) included Black, Non-Hispanic (7 students, 58%), Hispanic (1 student, 8.3%), and White, Non-Hispanic (4 students, 33.3%), totaling 12 students. The demographic breakdown based on gender during the study year (2010-2011), for Cohort I
included Female (10 students, 83.3%) and Male (2 students, 16.7%). Finally, the demographic breakdown based on race/ethnicity during the study year (2010-2011), for Cohort III (9th grade) included Black, Non-Hispanic (11 students, 61.1%), Hispanic (4 students, 22.2%), and White, Non-Hispanic (3 students, 16.7%), totaling 18 students. The demographic breakdown based on gender during the study year (2010-2011), for Cohort III included Female (14 students, 77.8%) and Male (4 students, 22.2%).

**Participant Selection**

The participants in this study included members of Cohort I (Year 3, n=7), who along with students in Cohort II (n=9), participated in the individual interviews and/or focus groups of the pilot study in the spring semester of the 2009-2010 school year. Additional students in Cohort I (n=2) volunteered to participate in the current study, bringing the total number of participants to nine (n=9). According to demographic questionnaires that the participants in the pilot completed, ages ranged from 16-19 years during data collection. The racial/ethnic composition of the participants in this study was four African American females, three Hispanic males, one African American male, and one white female. Each student volunteered to participate in this study with formal signed consent and student assent according to the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of the sponsoring university.

The students in Cohort I (Year 3), the first of three groups of students to enroll in the UTA and were in the 11th grade during final data collection for the study, formed a purposive sample for this study (Smith et al. 2009). Purposive sampling is appropriate for phenomenological case study research and serves as a means of strengthening transferability of findings (Anfara, Brown, & Mangione, 2002). The purpose of this study
was to gain deeper insight into UTA students’ development in teacher identity and prospective efficacy. As the first class, these students offer a unique opportunity to access knowledge of the program from the ground-up. UTA students’ immersion in the precollegiate teacher education curricula and experiences increases with each year of enrollment in the program. Therefore, I deduced that students in Cohort I would be best postured to draw upon and articulate their experiences along the constructs under investigation in this study. Cohort I of the UTA students served as the unit of analysis, with each student functioning individually as an embedded unit or case within the whole case (Yin, 2009). A brief profile of each student follows. Pseudonyms are used in place of the student’s actual name. The descriptive information comes from information sheets that each student completed for me prior to the pilot study as well as tidbits of insight that I gained through interaction with each student.

**Felecia.** Felecia is a 17 year old African American female. It was clear upon meeting her that she was open to discussing the program. What I most remember about this first meeting was that she entered the room with a smile and no matter what the topic of discussion, she continued to smile. Felecia seemed to attempt to frame each response in a positive tone. She made it clear that UTA was not her first choice but that she had had some personal events that took place during the time of entry that resulted in UTA gradually becoming her major area. She talked about dance with a twinkle in her eye and openly expressed how much she missed being able to dance at the level she’d danced at previously. Her little sister has autism. Felecia wants to become a special education teacher because of her experiences with her sister, and she does not feel that her sister’s teachers have been effective. During this discussion, she referred to her father a number
of times and mentioned that “that part of my life left” or that “he left”. I immediately concluded that her father had died. Many minutes later, near the end of the discussion, she confirmed that this was the case. It was as though she was building-up to sharing it and it took many turns of she and a friend seated next to her touching on it before she dared say it. Felecia’s admission that her father, for whom she expressed a strong love and respect for had died, left me marveling at her resiliency, the fact that she was still able to smile and move forward. Yet, I also wondered what that smile masked.

**Rafael.** Rafael is a 16 year old Hispanic male. He recently transferred from the UTA program at another school so this is his 3rd year in the program, but only his second year at this school. He expressed some tension about coming to the school and fitting in but shared that so far everyone in the program had embraced him. Rafael appears to be a shy, thoughtful young man. He is one of those people where I could almost see his mind working as the discussion progressed. Rafael stated that his ultimate goal was to become a professor because he heard that teachers are underpaid. It was interesting to me that Rafael responded that “teaching is teaching” when asked what type of school he’d like to work in. In fact, I had to probe him as he initially responded in terms of the level and subject that he was interested in teaching. He may not have been cognizant of urban versus suburban because the program requires that students commit to teaching in an urban school or he might simply believe that the context is irrelevant to teaching; i.e., believing that the practice of teaching would not necessarily be different in different schools. I was looking for students to offer some descriptive information about the school, students, and surrounding community in response to this question, but most did not without much probing. Rafael expressed a love and desire for teaching.
**Monique.** Monique is a 17 year old African American female. Monique is extremely soft spoken and I had to stretch physically to hear her most times. Monique seemed in sort of a melancholy mood. However, she was very confident and sure of her intention to teach. She stated that she had decided to teach as a result of being in the program and that the UTA had had a tremendous positive impact on her behavior and work ethic. She indicated that she had always liked to help others learn. Monique had very little to say to the other students and it was difficult to discern much about her relationships with them. Post script: Monique returned signed consent and assent forms for the final phase of data collection, however, she was absent on each day of data collection from reflective journals.

**Luis.** Luis is a 16 year old Hispanic male. Luis has a very friendly demeanor. He is also a ‘smiler’ like Felecia. Luis was also in UTA at another school and continued when he transferred to this school. UTA appears to be a stop-gap for Luis as he stated that he wants to be an aviation engineer after getting his teaching degree. By the same token, Luis mentioned that being in UTA confirmed his decision to teach. He initially stated that he definitely wanted to become a teacher because when he was in 5th grade his teacher would send him to the kindergarten class to help, so he wants to become a kindergarten teacher. I am not sure whether Luis will continue with the program and this sort of situation brings to mind those individuals who enter teaching because they perceive it as an easy pit stop on the way to their true dream profession. It might also be that as a male, Luis feels that teaching is feminized profession, so although he really wants to teach, he is unable or unwilling to acknowledge this, so he keeps the more masculine profession in the public view of his ideal job, thus saving face. This is all
speculation on my part and I choose to do so as Luis’s conflicting feelings about teaching puzzle me. I want to find out more.

**Raul.** Raul is a 16 year old Hispanic male who makes no bones about the fact that teaching is not his first choice. His conversation suggests that he is mature for his age. Later, he demonstrated a great deal of insight and thoughtfulness into matters. He discussed how participating in UTA was beneficial to him, even though he did not want to become a teacher and pointed out the skills that he was gaining that would help him in his chosen profession of being a software engineer. Raul described teaching as an option, stating that his first choice would be to attend Columbia University to study computer science and business administration to run a business. He stated that he would decide whether to accept the scholarship from the UTA. Recently when I spoke to Raul, he mentioned that he had an appointment with a counselor about college prospects. He and his teacher say that he has nearly a perfect GPA and that scholarship opportunities abound. It appears that he may be seeking one so that he is not obligated to obtain a teaching degree and make a 3-year commitment. Post Script: Raul’s father died during the final phase of data collection. Therefore, he was able to complete Prompts 1-4 only.

**Jackie.** Jackie is a 15 year old African America female who expresses a passion for teaching. She is also quite soft spoken and difficult to hear. In talking about her passion for teaching, Jackie mentioned that she has always learned fast and that she loves math so she wants to teach high school math. I was quite surprised by her passion because of her quiet disposition. It was refreshing to actually hear someone talk about teaching with excitement. Jackie easily rattled-off the things that she was learning and how UTA was helping her to understand better what teachers do. However, she seemed
to have no concept of what an urban school looks like. When she talked about urban schools, she mentioned perhaps the most elite public high school in the district as an example, which I found fascinating. I surmised from this that she had heard about this school that had the best academic record, the best sports program, and the best of everything else, and wants to work there. She mentioned that an urban school has a lot of diversity. Jackie seems to have made no connection that her high school is an urban school, and so does not at this point understand the characteristics that make urban schools challenging for some teachers.

Erica. Erica is a 17 year old African American female with an outgoing disposition. Erica and Felecia sat next to each other and seemed to be close friends. Throughout the discussion, they shared a lot of knowing glances and constantly affirmed one another’s comments. Erica expressed that she was not happy with her schooling experiences and wanted to teach so that she could be better than the teachers she had had. The decision to teach had taken some time and after participation in a field experience at a neighboring elementary school, she decided that she wanted to teach elementary students and she does not have anything else planned. She placed a great deal of importance on relationships and repeatedly talked about teachers needing to care about students. Erica saddened me because she could not come up with one teacher that she would like to emulate. I thought that everyone had at least one!

Josef (new participant). Josef is a 17 year old African American male who volunteered to participate in the study in the final phase of data collection. Additionally, Josef is new to the UTA program in the current school year. Therefore, he was not a part of the pilot focus group and pilot individual interview data collection. As a new student in
the UTA, Josef’s meaning making was limited in comparison to the remaining participants, each of whom was in his or her third year of the program.

**Asiah (new participant).** Asiah is a 17 white female who also volunteered to participate in the study during the final phase of data collection. She was present when I conducted the orientation for the pilot study the previous spring, but declined participation. I was surprised and elated that more students chose to participate. Asiah’s mother served as a chaperone for a “College Experience Day” that I planned and organized for the UTA students earlier in the semester. Students’ responses were overwhelmingly positive. The College Day Experience may have sparked students’ interests in exploring further their own development as precollegiate student teachers.

The brief profiles of the participants demonstrates that this is a homogeneous group with a manageable size (n=9), thus providing the opportunity to gather in-depth data regarding their experiences with UTA (Smith et al., 2009). The students each have their personal stories that impact their experiences, however, they share in common grade, age, and ethnic/racial membership (all except one student is a member of an ethnic/racial minority group), thus ensuring that their perspectives regarding many aspects of the UTA experience will also correspondence closely. The sample size (n=9) will also allow cross-case analysis to further understandings regarding teacher identity formation and prospective efficacy beliefs for students at the precollegiate level.

**Data Collection Procedures**

The purpose of this study was to examine the lived experiences of UTA students in order to understand teacher identity formation and prospective efficacy within dual contexts as high schoolers and as precollegiate student teachers. Pre-collected data from
the pilot study (focus group and individual interviews) and newly collected data (reflective prompt responses) comprised the data sources used to address the research questions for this study. The focus group and individual interview protocols approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) and used in the pilot study are located in Appendix A and Appendix C, respectively. Figure 1 depicts the timeline for data collection, beginning with collection of focus group and individual interviews in the pilot study and culminating with collection of data through participants’ individual responses to reflective journal prompts in this study. The remainder of this section includes an overview of the pilot study and a discussion of its role in informing the research questions for this study. Data collection procedures, were decided according to the research questions and the unit of analysis (Yin, 2009).

![Figure 1. Data Collection Timeline](image)

**Pilot overview.** Teacher recruitment and retention issues are primary among my research interests. As a special educator, I am well-aware of the continuing struggle to recruit and retain highly effective teachers to the field. In reading, thinking, and experiencing the issue, I concluded that if teacher educators were able to tap into early career interests of high schoolers, we might begin to close the supply and demand gap that currently exists, particularly in schools located in urban areas.
A class assignment requiring me to create a graphic representation of needs in teacher education, special education returned this issue to the forefront in my thinking. My graphic representation, which I submitted illustrated the notion that students choose to teach based on their schooling experiences (see Appendix D). Students who have positive experiences and complementary perceptions about teaching and learning are more likely to enter the profession. Conversely, students having more negative experiences and perceptions about schooling are less likely to enter the profession. My thinking was that teacher educators could make tremendous inroads with teacher recruitment and retention by proactively acclimating students to the profession as early as possible.

My written proposal to the professor facilitating the course was to write a collaborative grant with the local school district seeking funding to establish a precollegiate teacher training program. I was aware of grow-your-own programs that typically trained paraprofessionals and parents to become teachers. However, I had no knowledge that programs such as the Urban Teaching Academy (UTA) existed until I began to research for the intended grant. Upon learning that the Urban Teaching Academy existed, I obtained IRB approval for the pilot study investigating UTA students’ motivations for entering the teaching profession. Preliminary findings from the pilot study proved foundational for this study.

**Basis for further study.** Participants’ responses to focus group and individual semi-structured interview questions in the pilot study in Spring 2010, suggested that much of these students’ commitment to the profession hinged upon their beliefs/understandings regarding (a) effective teacher qualities, (b) the essence of
teaching, and (c) their beliefs about whether they would be able to implement
successfully the knowledge and skills that they associated with teaching effectively.
These responses stimulated my interest in how the UTA experience would ultimately
inform teacher identity formation and prospective efficacy beliefs (a term that I later
coined) for these students.

The focus group protocol included questions to establish rapport with the
participants and garner an overview of students’ experiences in UTA. For instance,
following initial introductions and discussion of ground rules, I asked students to talk
about a typical day in the program. Intended as an ice-breaker, this question was a way to
get participants thinking about what actually occurred day-to-day and where they each fit
in the grand scheme of things. I then asked participants directly if they wanted to become
teachers. If participants stated that they wanted to become teachers, I followed up with
brief discussions of the grade-level and content-area the participant wanted to teach.
Participants’ responses to this question tended to organically include some discussion of
when and why they became interested in teaching. The remaining questions asked
participants to discuss needed resources to be successful and how the UTA was helping
them to be successful. Finally, I asked participants if they wanted to share anything about
which I had not asked. Key responses that informed this study reflect participants’
identification as teachers and tensions that arose from participants’ dual roles as students
and as precollegiate student teachers. These tensions often manifested in interactions with
teachers in participants’ non UTA courses.

Participants’ responses to interview questions showed that most believed that
through UTA they gained knowledge and skills that were relevant to teaching and
learning. Moreover, individual responses supported that participants made connections between knowledge and skills garnered in the UTA and participants’ conduct and efficacy in future contexts as teachers. For example, the practice teaching that participants engaged in at feeder elementary schools allowed them to rehearse planning and delivery of instruction, which they saw as the primary role for teachers. Similarly, participants projected future expectations for student behavior onto current experiences. Participants wanted to model what they deemed as appropriate student conduct in their own conduct. Participants expressed self-reflective tendencies and recognition of developmental aspects to teaching. Responses revealed a dialogical process that was occurring as participants lived-out experiences associated with the UTA together with their individual, personal lived experiences.

It was clear to me that UTA students were beginning to form identities as teachers. The students’ responses to interview questions indicated that students valued what they were learning to the extent that they used the knowledge and skills taught in UTA to not only evaluate and adjust their own performance, but to also evaluate their teachers. Students in the UTA demonstrated metacognition in thinking about their learning from a prospective stance. They thought about aspects to their current schooling contexts from a teacher’s perspective in evaluating the acceptability of teaching practices that they observed and in which they participated as students.

These participants’ responses motivated me to learn more about teacher identity formation and prospective efficacy beliefs among students enrolled in the UTA. I therefore conducted a review of literature on teacher identity formation and efficacy (from which I derived the concept “prospective efficacy”), which I discussed in Chapter
Two of this document. I obtained IRB approval to amend my pilot study, allowing me to investigate further teacher identity formation and prospective efficacy beliefs among UTA students by collecting data from a third source, reflective journal prompt responses, completed by volunteer participants in Spring 2011.

The next section describes the procedures I used to analyze the data. I begin the section with a discussion of subjectivity as it applies to qualitative research and the strategies that I employed to lessen the influence of my personal ideology on the data as well as a interrater reliability check that I conducted prior to beginning to code the data. I continue the section on data analysis with a description of the structural coding method used along with operational definitions of superordinate and subordinate categories used as the coding scheme in this study. Finally, I describe each level of data analysis; i.e., Level I (Pilot—Focus Group Interviews), Level II—Focus Individual Interviews), and Level III (Reflective Journal Prompt Responses).

Data Analysis Procedures

The purpose of this study was to examine the lived experiences of UTA students in order to understand teacher identity formation and prospective efficacy within dual contexts as high schoolers and as precollegiate student teachers. I analyzed pre-collected data from the pilot study (focus group and individual interviews) and newly collected data (reflective prompt responses) from this study in relation to existing research literature on teacher identity and teacher efficacy to address the research questions:

1. How do UTA students’ views of teacher identity, or what it means to be a teacher, develop within dual contexts of lived experiences as high school students and precollegiate student teachers?
In what ways do UTA students develop “prospective efficacy” beliefs, or the belief in their capabilities to fulfill teaching roles and responsibilities in the future?

A three-interview organizational structure comprised of pilot focus group interviews, pilot individual interviews, and reflective prompts provided sources for data triangulation, strengthening credibility of findings (Brantlinger, Jimenez, Klinger, Pugach, & Richardson, 2005; Seidman, 2009). Table 1 displays the correspondence of data sources to the research questions addressed in this study (Anfara et al. 2002). These data sources provided opportunities to access the data at various levels in order to gain a panoramic descriptive account of these constructs for each participant (Smith et al., 2009).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Group Question Numbers</th>
<th>Individual Interview Question Numbers</th>
<th>Reflective Prompt Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1. How do UTA students’ views of teacher identity, or what it means to be a teacher, develop within dual contexts of lived experiences as high school students and student teachers?</td>
<td>1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10, 11,12,13,16,17,18</td>
<td>1,2,3,5,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2. In what ways do UTA students develop “prospective efficacy” beliefs, or the belief in their capabilities to fulfill teaching roles and responsibilities in the future?</td>
<td>2,5,6,7,9, 10,12,13,15,18</td>
<td>1,4,5,6,7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subjectivity. Smith et al. (2009) describe the relationship that the researcher has with the data as a “double hermeneutic”, whereby the researcher tries to make sense of the participant making sense of the phenomenon or lived experience (p.35). Naturally, the researcher’s personal ideology impacts his or her interpretation of the participant’s lived experiences reflected through data sources. Additionally, the researcher’s analytical lens is critical when coding and analyzing data (Saldaña, 2009). Saldaña (2009) describes
various lenses through which researchers code data; some coding schemes relevant to this study include *in vivo* coding, *descriptive* coding, and *values* coding. Each has advantages based upon the purpose and research questions of the study. *In vivo* coding maintains the integrity of the participant’s language by using words or phrases taken directly from the transcript or reflection. Descriptive coding applies broad language that encapsulates the views of multiple participants. Values coding, as its name implies, places a subjective label on the data. Although Saldaña (2009) distinguishes between these coding lenses, clearly each of the three contains some element of the others. For example, the act of deciding which words to highlight in *in vivo* coding involves a level of subjectivity and description.

This study also involved acts of deconstruction, or dissecting text for tacit meanings, which can also be facilitated through analytic memoing (Brantlinger et al., 2005). Although analytic memoing is a preferred method of accounting for researcher bias, assumptions, values and beliefs that may influence the interpretive process, I elected to forego memoing per se because in my view, memoing would have reinforced the impact of my personal ideology upon the data (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). I was committed to transparency and following the process as a means to deconstruct the powerful forces of post-positivism during data analysis. In this study, multiple iterations of reviewing and analyzing the data against literature-based categories inductively, deductively, and “abductively” meant that coding was fluid, particularly where my interpretations placed data in grey areas and/or multiple categories (Basit, 2003; Leech & Onwuegbuzie, 2007; Saldaña, 2009). I also conducted an interrater reliability check prior to coding the data in order to gauge the consistency of my interpretations with those of
Interrater reliability. Preliminary data analysis involved conduct of an interrater reliability check to determine the consistency of interpretations of interview data. I worked with two individuals with extensive prior experience conducting and analyzing qualitative data. The first individual, my major professor, has intimate knowledge of my pilot study (the IRB required students to have a professor serve as part of the study team), and has accrued more than 20 years experience in quantitative and qualitative research methods as evidenced in prior training, teaching, and publications. The second rater was at the time a doctoral candidate in the same department as me, with formal advanced training in discourse analysis, educational measurement, and qualitative inquiry methods. Additionally, the second rater successfully defended a qualitative dissertation and obtained an earned doctor of philosophy degree from that institution.

I met with the co-raters to review the interview protocol for individual interviews. The transcribed interview for the first student interviewed in the pilot individual interviews was used to develop a coding schema to begin to analyze the data (Mayan, 2009). The co-raters obtained consensus regarding the interpretive convergence with initial coding of the first interview (Saldaña, 2009). The initial data and preliminary coding schema was refined through iterative constant comparison (Corbin & Strauss, 2008) with categories from the review of literature. Follow-up interviews also served as a means to validate findings through member checking (Saldaña, 2009). Constas (1992) describes the process of categorizing data as way of “describing the empirical complexities” associated with managing multiple data sources (p. 255). I wrote a summary of each literature-based category (Mayan, 2009) based on my review of
literature and used as the benchmark for convergence with pilot focus group data, pilot individual interview data, and reflective journal response data from this study (Mayan, 2009).

**Coding processes.** I employed both inductive and deductive processes to code the manifest content throughout analysis (Thomas, 2006; Elo & Kyngäs, 2008). Elo and Kyngäs (2008) illustrate the steps involved by first developing analysis matrices; in this case, structural coding sheets (Saldaña, 2009). The next steps are to gather the data according to content and to begin to group, categorize, and develop abstractions (main categories) leading to conceptual mapping and/or a model for answering the questions under investigation (Elo & Kyngäs, 2008). Specifically, I began with multiple readings of interview transcripts, listening to the recorded interviews, and structurally coding focus group and individual interview text against literature-based categories defined operationally (Smith et al., 2009). I concluded data analysis by structurally coding data from the reflective journals; subsequently returning to the first individual case to begin to pattern and theme the data (Smith et al., 2009).

In the next sections, I describe the structural coding schema used in this study. I followed the recommendations prescribed in MacQueen et al. (1998), which helped to minimize the impact of the double hermeneutic intrinsic to IPA research methodology by increasing levels of objectivity to the process. Table 2 and Table 3 display coding frequency for each level of data collection; i.e., pilot focus groups, pilot individual interviews, and individual reflective journal responses relative to research questions one and two, respectively. Finally, I narrate the data analysis processes I used in each level of analysis.
Structural Coding Sheet Components and Operational Definitions

This study is a phenomenological multiple case study. Therefore, my research questions drove my review of literature, which serves as the basis for the Structural Coding Sheets that I developed to code data from each data source. In my review of literature, I outlined critical elements factoring into teacher identity formation, information sources for efficacy beliefs including concomitant needs for urban school contexts and teacher education, along with the conceptual relationship between teacher identity and prospective efficacy beliefs as they relate to commitment to the profession. The superordinate factors influencing teacher identity formation include dimensions of self, lay theories, accrediting agency influence (NCATE), and institutional contexts and cultures. Prospective efficacy, or one’s future-oriented beliefs regarding capability to be effective in future contexts, emanates from Bandura’s (1977) and others’ framing of information sources which underscore efficacy beliefs. In this study, the discussion centers on specific issues concerning urban school contexts and teacher education, findings in teacher efficacy studies, and the impact of teacher identity and prospective efficacy on commitment to the profession.

I adapted a structural coding model, which “applies a content-based or conceptual phrase representing a topic of inquiry to a segment of data to both code and categorize the data corpus (Saldana, 2009, p.66).” Structural coding is valuable for coding large datasets such as transcribed interviews (MacQueen et al., 1998). Recommendations for implementing structural coding methods to facilitate subsequent, in-depth analysis include a) using the research questions as the basis for coding, thus capturing all of the text associated with each question, b) including the entire verbal exchange between the
interviewer and the interviewee to maintain the flow and context of the dialogue and to preserve integrity of the participant’s voice in the exchange, and c) using linguistic cues to signal related text in order to help avoid misinterpretations and omissions (MacQueen et al., 1998).

The Structural Coding Sheets used in this study display the frequency of statements relative to superordinate and subordinate factors within each category under investigation; i.e., teacher identity formation and prospective efficacy. I used the following subheadings and operational definitions to code data in each category of subordinate factors:

**Literature-based categories for teacher identity.**

**Self and subordinate categories.**
- Developmental Capacity – Meaning making by precollegiate teachers reflect different developmental capacities among them
- (RE)Constructive Nature of Identity Formation – Teacher identity develops and changes over time and situations
- Personal Knowledge Sources – Personal understandings gleaned from social, historical and political knowledge sources impact teacher identity formation
- Activation/Transformation – Teacher identity can develop differently depending upon the predominating perspective of either activating or transforming into a teacher self

**Lay theories and subordinate categories.**
- Images of Teachers and Teaching – Personal, cultural, and historical images of teaching are encountered and enacted through teacher identity formation
Apprenticeship of Observation – Students view studentship as apprenticeship; thus, believing that being a student assigns complete understanding and full-membership into teaching ethos

Tacit Knowledge – knowledge gleaned through observation as students, which are hidden from students’ consciousness, but which informs students’ theories about teaching

Untutored Interpretations – students develop interpretations of personal, lived schooling experiences without benefit of formal instruction and/or guidance

Contradictions with Teacher Education – Well-established preconceptions about teachers and teaching may override critical elements of teacher education program curricula

Accrediting agencies and subordinate categories (NCATE).

Standards-based curricula – Standards for practice are established and practiced as part of teacher training

D-Identity – Language and discourse articulate what teachers should know and be able to do

I-identity – Teachers’ work is defined according to ascribed roles in the institution

Dispositions – The notion that teachers must be able to teach all students is a driving theme for standards and curricula

Institutional contexts and cultures and subordinate categories.

Normative Structures – The values, beliefs, and dispositions within the school are demonstrated through language and actions performed by teachers and
through which teachers make identity claims to specific cultures and teaching roles

- **School Culture** – The culture of schools where teachers work shape the roles that teachers assume and are influenced differentially by factors such as subject-matter status, motivation, commitments and job satisfaction

Table 2 displays coding frequency for each level of data collection; i.e., pilot focus groups, pilot individual interviews, and individual reflective journal responses relative to research question one concerning teacher identity. The first column displays the focus group responses for each superordinate category, Self, Lay Theories, NCATE, and Institutional Contexts and Cultures, respectively. The columns labeled with participants’ pseudonyms display combined responses from pilot individual interviews and reflective journals for each participant. The final column displays total responses from each superordinate category during the study.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superordinate Categories</th>
<th>Participants’ Response Frequencies</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1. How do UTA students’ views of teacher identity, or what it means to be a teacher, develop within dual contexts of lived experiences as high school students and precollegiate student teachers?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felecia</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rafael</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monique</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raul</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackie</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erica</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josef</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asiah</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay Theories</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCATE</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Contexts and Cultures</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Monique volunteered to participate in the study; however, she was absent from school on each day of data collection for the third phase. Josef and Asiah participated only in the third phase of data collection.
Literature-based categories for prospective efficacy.

Information sources and subordinate categories.

- Mastery Experiences/Performance Accomplishments – Teachers gain efficacy information from successful personal performances
- Vicarious Experiences – Teachers gain efficacy information from seeing others perform successfully
- Verbal Persuasion – Teachers gain efficacy information from others telling teachers that they are capable of performing successfully
- Psychological States – Teachers gain efficacy information from personal emotional responses to performance
- Collective Efficacy – Teachers gain efficacy information based on whether or not he or she believes the faculty as a whole capable of successful performance

Efficacy needs for urban school contexts and subordinate categories.

- Outcome Expectancy – Teachers can believe that certain actions will produce certain outcomes; however, the willingness to act (agency) depends on efficacy beliefs regarding the needed action
- Dispositions – Teachers’ beliefs regarding students’ learning capabilities may interact with efficacy beliefs, thus influencing agency to act on behalf of all students
- Developmental Propensity – Preservice and novice teachers tend to overestimate difficulties related to teach students from diverse racial/ethnic, language, and socioeconomic backgrounds
• Context Specificity – Teachers’ efficacy beliefs vary according to grade level, content-area, type of school (rural, suburban, urban), etc.

• Systems of Support – Collegial and community support influence the efficacy beliefs of novice teachers

**Efficacy needs for teacher education and subordinate categories.**

• Diversity Same as Special Needs – Traditional teacher education trains teachers to teach students with “typical” learning needs. Therefore, teachers equate student diversity with special learning needs, which require special preparation to work effectively with diverse students.

• Ideological Preparation – Early and continuous exposure to urban school contexts help to prepare students for the challenges typically associated with urban settings

**Findings in teacher efficacy studies and subordinate categories.**

• Problem Anticipation – Preservice teachers efficacy beliefs are independent from problems they will face when they become teachers; i.e, high-efficacy teachers believe teaching will be less difficult than low-efficacy teachers

• Psychological Connectedness – Commitment to teaching may be a function of the extent to which preservice teachers engage in reflection and make emotional connections to teaching via meaning making experiences

• Values and Ideologies – Commitment to teaching may be a function of teachers possessing a core identity whereby teachers are guided by a core set of values, established standards of practice, willingness to reflect and to adapt teaching to the needs of students, and intellectual and emotional engagement
• Calling to Teach – Commitment to teaching may be strengthened by teachers’ beliefs that they were destined to teach, particularly because they possess certain personality traits that will ensure their success as teachers.

Table 3 displays coding frequency for each level of data collection; i.e., pilot focus groups, pilot individual interviews, and individual reflective journal responses relative to research question two concerning prospective efficacy. The first column displays the focus group responses for each superordinate category, Information Sources, Efficacy Needs for Urban School Contexts, Efficacy Needs for Teacher Education, and Findings in Teacher Efficacy Studies, respectively. The columns labeled with participants’ pseudonyms display combined responses from pilot individual interviews and reflective journals for each participant. The final column displays total responses from each superordinate category during the study.

Table 3
Response Frequency - Literature-Based Categories for Prospective Efficacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superordinate Categories</th>
<th>Participants’ Response Frequencies</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focus Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Sources</td>
<td>Felecia 10</td>
<td>Rafael 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy Needs for Urban School Contexts</td>
<td>Urban 1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy Needs for Teacher Education</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings in Teacher Efficacy Studies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *Monique volunteered to participate in the study; however, she was absent from school on each day of data collection for the third phase. Josef and Asiah participated only in the third phase of data collection.
Level I Data Analysis—Pilot Focus Group Interview

The first step to addressing the research questions was to code the pilot focus group interview data against subcategories for teacher identity and prospective efficacy derived from the review of literature. I coded the pilot focus group interview data holistically, rather than according to individual responses, because the nature of focus groups complicates distinguishing individual voices, both literally and figuratively. Moreover, the primary function of the pilot focus group interview was to provide what Seidman (2006) refers to as the “focused life history” of the participant, tasked to contextualize as well as to contemporize each participant’s experience relative to the topic under investigation (p.17). For this study, the focus group essentially represented one voice aimed at obtaining the pulse of participants’ experiences in UTA Cohort I as they pertained to teacher identity formation and prospective efficacy beliefs.

I followed a logical process to code the pilot focus group data. First, I read the transcripts thoroughly. Next, I listened to the audio version of the interviews while following along with the transcribed interviews. I then returned to reading the transcriptions while using the highlighting and “Review” functions of Microsoft to categorize students’ responses, notating the single subcategory, and in some cases multiple subcategories within which I interpreted comments to belong. Initially, I used one forward slash mark to denote one comment for the subcategory into which it was placed. I subsequently calculated total responses and collapsed totals into cells for each superordinate category, as depicted in Table 2 and Table 3 above.

Level II Data Analysis—Pilot Individual Interviews

Level II analyses consisted of coding participants’ (n=7) pilot individual
interviews using the same structural coding sheets developed from the review of literature regarding teacher identity and prospective efficacy that I used to code the pilot focus group interview for UTA Cohort I. For the purposes of this study, pilot individual interviews subscribed to eliciting detailed information regarding the participants’ experiences in the UTA (Seidman, 2006). Pilot individual interview questions were constructed to move participants through a progression of thought, which first queried his or her reasons for enrolling in UTA, and overall perceptions about education, teachers, and teachers’ roles and responsibilities in education. Questions then asked about UTA participants’ personal experiences with teachers. This line of questioning inquired into UTA participants’ understandings of what it means to be a “good or effective” teacher and how these participants believed teachers came to be so. The final questions in the pilot individual interview protocol solicited answers to questions about participants’ experiences in the UTA in terms of the purpose of the program, the benefits of the program, particularly in terms of knowledge and skills, and the program’s influence on the student’s commitment to entering the teaching profession.

I followed the same process to code individual interview transcriptions as I used to code the focus group data. First, I read the transcripts thoroughly. Next, I listened to the audio version of the interviews while following along with the transcribed interviews. I then returned to reading the transcriptions while using the highlighting and “Review” functions of Microsoft to categorize students’ responses, notating the single subcategory, and in some cases multiple subcategories within which I interpreted comments to belong. Initially, I used one forward slash mark to denote one comment for the subcategory into which it was placed. I subsequently calculated total responses and collapsed totals into
cells for each superordinate category, as depicted in Table 2 and Table 3 above.

**Level III Data Analysis—Reflective Journal**

Level III data analysis involved collecting, coding and interpreting participants’ (n=9) responses to reflective journal prompts, which were developed based upon the review of literature. The original cadre of participants (n=7) participated in pilot focus group and pilot individual interviews that shed light on teacher identity formation and prospective efficacy beliefs to that point in time; thus, laying the foundation for further explorations of participants’ experiences in the UTA (Seidman, 2006). I developed reflective journal prompts geared towards eliciting deeper thought and meaning making by students. Seidman (2006) stresses that meaning making occurs in each interview, however, interview three brings meaning making to the forefront. As such, the reflective prompts allowed participants opportunities to merge understandings of past and present experiences to project or anticipate future beliefs and actions regarding teacher identity and prospective efficacy beliefs. The reflective prompts posed to each participant follow. I included the following statements on Prompts 2-7 because each asks participants to think critically and make judgments that participants may have deemed as risky:

*Remember that there are no incorrect responses. What is important is that you think about this topic and share openly and honestly what you know and believe about it.*

Prompt 1  Think about your philosophy of teaching. Talk about your teaching philosophy in terms of who or what influenced your desire to want to become a teacher, what you will do to make sure that you will be the best teacher that you can be, how you will use the experiences of UTA to become a great teacher, etc.
Prompt 2  Think about the teaching profession. What should every teacher know and be able to do? Name, describe (explain what each thing is) and discuss (talk about why the thing is important) 3 things that every teacher should know. Name, describe (explain what each thing is) and discuss (talk about why the thing is important) 3 things that every teacher should be able to do.

Prompt 3  Think about what you are looking forward to most about becoming a teacher. Talk about at least 3 things that you look forward to when you become a teacher and discuss why you are looking forward to these things.

Prompt 4  Think about the knowledge and skills that you will need when you become a teacher. Name and discuss the 3 areas where you will be most effective.

- What are the three areas?
- Why do you believe that you will be effective in these areas?
- What helped you to become effective in these areas?
- What strategies will you use to continue to develop in each area?

Name and discuss the 3 areas where you will be least effective.

- What are the three areas?
- Why do you believe that you will be least effective in these areas?
- What will help you to become effective in these areas?
- What strategies will you use to develop in these areas?

Prompt 5  Think about the many things that you have learned about the teaching profession through reading, instruction, and experiences since enrolling in UTA. What are the most valuable things that you have learned as a UTA
student? Talk about the most valuable understandings about the teaching profession that you have gained as a UTA student, why these understandings are valuable to you, and how you will use these understandings when you become a teacher.

Prompt 6 You will return to teach in an “urban” school after completing your teaching degree. What makes a school “urban”? In what ways are urban schools similar to other schools? In what ways are urban schools different from other schools? What will you need to know and be able to do to be an effective teacher in an urban school?

Prompt 7 Do you believe that all students can learn? What will be your role as a teacher in making sure that all students learn? Talk about the specific ways that you will make sure that each student in your class learns regardless of race/ethnicity, gender, ability, first language, etc.?

Students responded to reflective journal prompts for seven days over a three week period. Students who returned parental consent and assent letters were included in the study. Initially, I used one forward slash mark to denote one comment for the subcategory into which it was placed. I subsequently calculated total responses and collapsed totals into cells for each superordinate category, as depicted in Table 2 and Table 3 above.

One important element to Level III data collection was that the classroom teacher asked that I allow all students to participate as part of her culminating instruction. I agreed to do so. Therefore, all students in Cohort I responded to reflective journal prompts if present at school; however, only those students with consent and assent submitted their responses to me for analysis. The remaining students submitted his or her
responses to the classroom teacher. As stated on the approved documents for the Institutional Review Board (IRB), and as I explained to the classroom teacher and students during my orientation for the current study, each student owned their responses. Hence, study participants were in complete control as to whether they would share their responses with their teacher. To my knowledge, none of the study participants chose to do so.

**Reporting Findings**

In this study, research literature on teacher identity and self-efficacy provide foundational support for categories, defined operationally in a previous section of this chapter, developed through analysis of the data. In essence, these categories comprise themes, or “thread(s) that integrate and anchor” the categories (Mayan, 2009, p.97; Saldaña, 2009). An overview of findings is presented for each of the two research questions in narrative form citing specific comments from each participant at each level of data collection; i.e., pilot focus group, pilot individual interviews, and reflective journals. A cross-case synthesis of findings follows, providing an integrated analysis respective to the most prevalently noted categories (Yin, 2009). Emergent themes relative to the research questions are discussed. Finally, implications for teacher education for urban contexts, teacher recruitment and retention as discussed.

**Confidentiality**

The Institutional Review Board (IRB) required signed parent consent and student assent documents for each participant in the study. The parent consent and student assent documents outlined the parameters for the study in terms of rationale for the study, reason that students were asked to participate, benefits and risks associated with the
study, and steps taken to ensure that the participants’ information was to be kept private. Copies of all documentation of IRB approval of the pilot study and this study appear in Appendix E.

**Credibility and Trustworthiness**

I adhered to credibility measures in an effort to increase the credibility and trustworthiness of findings from the study (Brantlinger et al., 2005). First, this study incorporated triangulation of data as a means of looking for convergence among the pilot focus group interviews, pilot individual interviews, and reflective journals. As mentioned earlier, member checks in the form of having participants review pre-collected data and amend any of their responses were conducted for the pilot individual interview data (Leech & Onwuegbuzie, 2007). Additionally, I chose to use a more objective coding and analysis method to offset possible impact of my personal ideology upon the data. The participants maintained their reflexive journals and were encouraged to review their journals and update liberally as they saw fit. I maintained an audit trail so that other researchers wishing to replicate the study could do so (Yin, 2009). The data in the form of all documents and information related to the study has been stored securely in accordance with Institutional Review Board (IRB) guidelines. Inherent to this phenomenological study is the notion of “particularizability”, or the degree to which the reporting of the cases provide readers the ability to determine the level of transferability to their cases (Brantlinger et al., 2005). Finally, I conducted this study for my dissertation as partial fulfillment of requirements for conferral of a doctor of philosophy degree; therefore, my major professors conducted external audits of the research at critical points, providing guidance as needed. The aforementioned measures not only strengthen
credibility and trustworthiness of the study, but increase the quality and rigor as well (Anfara et al., 2002).

**Ethical Considerations and Procedures**

I completed a Research Request Form required by the school district. Once the school district approved the research, I followed all guidelines of the Institutional Review Board (IRB) seeking IRB approval to conduct the study. Upon IRB approval of the study, I obtained written parental consent and student assent to participate in the research for the pilot and for this study. Assurances of confidentiality and anonymity were included in the consent and assent forms for the pilot study and this study. Moreover, I informed participants of their rights to choose to participate or not to participate at informational meetings held prior to beginning the pilot study and this study, and consistently reminded participants of their rights to withdraw from the study at any time. Additionally, I adhered to storage and confidentiality agreements in accordance with IRB guidelines.

**Limitations**

Reflection is useful, complicated, and essential to teaching. Van Manen (1995) asserts that the nature of pedagogy requires teachers to exercise reflective practice as a matter of course. As such, using reflection for this study was both limiting and encouraging. On one hand, the age and development of the participants in the study meant that reflection was challenging for them. The challenge was more pronounced for some students than for others. As time passed, some students became more comfortable with writing their reflections as evinced by how quickly they began writing, or not, as well as the detail of thought in reflections.

Another limitation of this study was the use of self-reporting. Particularly for
precollegiate students, self-reporting may have been impacted by what participants believed I or their teacher wanted them to say. I attempted to elicit authentic responses from participants by interrogating participants’ meaning making regarding teacher identity formation and prospective efficacy beliefs through various data sources.

Conclusion

This chapter discusses the conceptual framework and methodology used in the study. Interpretive phenomenological case study methodology was employed to address the research questions how UTA students’ views of teacher identity develop within dual contexts of lived experiences as high school students and student teachers, and in what ways UTA students develop “prospective efficacy” beliefs for the future? Details regarding the site, participants, data collection and analysis procedures have been provided. I conclude the chapter by delineating steps that I took to strengthen credibility and trustworthiness, address ethical concerns, and limitations of the study. The next chapter presents my findings regarding the questions under investigation in light of data analysis.
Chapter Four

Presentation of Findings

This chapter presents findings based on my investigation of the individual lived experiences of participants (n=9) enrolled in an Urban Teaching Academy (UTA). I examined development of teacher identity and prospective efficacy beliefs among precollegiate student teachers through an Interpretive Phenomenological lens, using case study methodology (Smith et al., 2009; Yin, 2009). Specifically, I sought to determine:

1. How do UTA students’ views of teacher identity, or what it means to be a teacher, develop within dual contexts of lived experiences as high school students and student teachers?

2. In what ways do UTA students develop “prospective efficacy” beliefs, or the belief in their capabilities to fulfill teaching roles and responsibilities in the future?

This chapter is organized in the following manner. In section one, I present an overview of findings concerning research question one in which I investigate teacher identity formation among UTA student participants. In the next section, I present an overview of findings concerning my second research question investigating prospective efficacy beliefs among UTA student participants. Important findings for each research question are addressed in terms of superordinate categories, including specific participant comments that illuminate qualitatively the scope of participant responses relative to
subordinate categories within each superordinate category. I conclude the chapter with a cross-case synthesis of findings centered on literature-based emergent themes derived from combined data.

**Overview of Findings—Question One: Teacher Identity**

The next sections present an overview of findings on teacher identity from respective data sources; i.e., Pilot Focus Group Interviews, Pilot Individual Interviews, and Reflective Prompt Responses. My review of literature rendered superordinate categories of *Self, Lay Theories, Accrediting Agencies (NCATE),* and *Institutional Contexts and Cultures* as primary contributors to teacher identity formation. Descriptions of the two more prevalent superordinate categories *Self* and *Lay Theories* follow.

The superordinate category, *Self,* includes dimensions of teacher identity in respect to one’s developmental capacities which change over time as a result of various sources of personal, social, cultural, historical, and political knowledge sources. During the course of teacher identity formation, participants either activate or transform into a teacher self along a continuum ranging from self-as-student to self-as-precollegiate student teacher to self-as-teacher.

The second superordinate category, *Lay Theories,* begins with participants’ images of teachers and teaching based on information sources, including personal schooling experiences. The images of teacher and teaching form from untutored interpretations of what it means to be teachers, which exist as tacit knowledge within participants’ consciousness and which over time become stable and resistant to conflicting knowledge, such as might be encountered in teacher education curricula.

Each section of the overview contains specific participant responses. Specific
participant responses serve as artifacts of the verbal exchange between the interviewer and the interviewee, thereby helping to preserve the contextual integrity of responses in light of the research questions under investigation within the study (MacQueen et al., 1998; Saldana, 2009). I took steps to safeguard the authenticity of each participant’s voice by using unabridged versions of verbal and written responses. In many instances, participant responses depart from so-called Standard English, adhering rather to individual as well as social group parlance. In this way, I sought not only to protect the participants’ individual identities, but also to interpret participants’ meanings as accurately as possible albeit within a double hermeneutic existence (Smith et al., 2009).

**Pilot Focus Group**

The pilot focus group interview for Cohort I of the Urban Teaching Academy (UTA) lasted approximately 43 minutes. I began with another set of introductions because a couple of weeks had passed since my informational meeting, thus allowing time for return of consent and assent letters and scheduling of the pilot focus group interviews. I stated the ground rules and invited participants to pose any questions and/or comments regarding expectations for the discussions. Finally, I reaffirmed verbal assent with the students.

**Pilot focus group comments on teacher identity.** I categorized the majority of pilot focus group comments relative to Teacher Identity in the superordinate categories of *Self* and *Lay Theories*. Within the category, *Self*, I noted the frequency of comments related to *Personal Knowledge Sources* (10), *Developmental Capacity* (3), and *(RE)Constructive Nature of Teaching* (2). I did not classify any comments related to *Activation/Transformation* (0). Within the category, *Lay Theories*, I noted the frequency
of comments related to *Tacit Knowledge* (7), *Images of Teachers and Teaching* (6), and *Untutored Interpretations* (2). I did not classify any comments related to *Apprenticeship of Observation* (0) or *Contradictions with Teacher Education* (0). There are gray areas among subordinate categories; hence, I coded comments according to the operational definition of each category as well as the context of the comment.

One example of a participant’s comment that I attributed to *Self* came in response to the first question from the interview protocol: What is a typical day like in UTA? Raul provided a temporal linear response to this question, stating that participants complete bellwork, if assigned, and if not, the participants wait until the teacher comes into the classroom and makes an assignment. Raul goes on to say that the participants ask questions when needed, and

… he’ll give us an answer, give us techniques we can use later on. All this goes on and we take it to the classroom when it’s time to teach. We actually get to experience what it’s really like in the classroom and being in front of students and get to create our curriculum based on the book. It’s like being in the teaching career already.

This response was one that I considered to be in a gray area because Raul appears to access his prior knowledge regarding what should occur in the classroom by referring to bellwork and the teacher making assignments. Additionally, the teacher serves as a knowledge source in deciding the overall instructional content and format; i.e., what should be taught, assigned, and assessed in the course. Part b of Raul’s response appears to refer to lay theories in terms of the textbook as the primary knowledge source upon which teachers rely to plan and deliver instruction. In this case, the textbook appears also
to represent a primary knowledge source for Raul from a student’s perspective. Raul’s response demonstrates the duality of experience, as he speaks as both a student and as a precollegiate student teacher.

In another exchange, I coded as Self, Felecia’s comments about her decision to pursue a career in teaching. Felecia shared that teaching was not her first choice for a career; however, personal circumstances resulted in her placing more emphasis on her work in the UTA. During this explanation, Felecia states,

…I actually want to become a special needs teacher because my little sister’s autistic and the teachers don’t understand the way that she is. I think with me growing up in the house with her, having other kids in the classroom, teaching in a classroom with kids like that, I’ll be able to understand it because I’ve had it throughout her whole life and I grew up in a house with an autistic child.

These comments not only implicate personal lived experiences as sources of knowledge and motivation, but also highlight the need for specialized curricula in teacher education based on context. In this particular case, the context refers to the student population with whom Felecia would work. Felecia acknowledges the need for teachers of students with special needs to have specialized knowledge to achieve successful student outcomes with students with disabilities. Although Felecia’s desire to become a teacher for students with disabilities is understandable, this stance appears to indicate that Felecia views students with disabilities as requiring separation rather than inclusive practices. Felecia makes no mention of working with a teacher certified in general education, or of herself obtaining a dual degree. Consequently, Felecia’s comments suggest that lay theories grounded in images of Teachers and Teaching for students with
disabilities depict separation and exclusion as status quo.

In a final example, participants responded to a question that I posed following the protracted exchange regarding the TV Production teacher. I asked the participants how they would handle the situation when confronted with students who lacked interest and/or motivation for the course that they are teaching. Raul responded,

I would try to compare my subject, like if it’s TV Production, I would try to compare my TV production skills with something they’re interested in. Like if they’re interested in math, throw some math in the TV production and make them see how TV production can be more than just tv’s and cables and stuff. I’d try to compare it to what they’re interested in.

I coded Raul’s comments as *Lay Theories* (*Tacit Knowledge*). Raul’s comments underscore one of the most accepted concepts of contemporary pedagogy; i.e., teachers should facilitate students’ making connections between content and their personal lives. These comments also suggest that Raul was drawing upon *Self* (*Knowledge Sources*), in that he previously expressed his interests in computers and technology, stating that his father owns a computer company. Raul undoubtedly has a broad knowledge-base regarding the topic and is therefore able to extract broader understandings that might bring a level of practicality to the teaching scenario, consequently increasing the potential to create learning sequences that will help to motivate learners. In this sense, Raul portrays a teacher image as one who can bridge personal knowledge with technical knowledge in ways that meet students’ learning needs.

**Pilot Individual Interview Comments on Teacher Identity**

Prior to beginning each pilot individual interview, I reaffirmed each participant’s
assent to volunteering for the study. Upon receiving verbal assent, I explained the
Demographic Questionnaire and requested that he or she complete it. I made small talk
with each participant and began the interview once he or she had completed the
questionnaire. The approximate duration for each pilot individual interview was as
follows: Felecia (25 min 30 sec), Rafael (18 min 35 sec), Monique (16 min 18 sec), Luis
(16 min 37 sec), Raul (19 min 39 sec), Jackie (20 min 33 sec), and Erica (20 min 41 sec).
Highlights from each pilot individual interview follow.

**Felecia.** I categorized the frequency of Felecia’s responses to individual interview
questions related to Teacher Identity within the superordinate category of Self, with
responses in subordinate categories of (RE)Constructive Nature of Identity Formation (2)
and Knowledge Sources (4). I coded Felecia’s remaining responses relative to Teacher
Identity within the superordinate categories of Lay Theories with corresponding
subordinate responses of Untutored Interpretations (3) and Contradictions with Teacher
Education (3). Finally, Felecia made two additional comments, which I coded as
superordinate category of Institutional Contexts and Cultures, subordinate categories of
Normative Structures (1) and School Culture (1). Table 4 depicts a graphic representation
of findings for Felecia.

For example, when asked how teachers are important for achieving the purposes
of education, Felecia responds that teachers serve both to teach and to inspire students.
Felecia states, “But a teacher is only there to teach their material and, in the process,
inspire students.” Felecia’s response similarly signals her performance goals upon
entering the profession as well as the influence of personal knowledge sources on these
goals, as she continues by stating,
Like, that’s what I wanna do as a teacher. I wanna inspire, I wanna inspire my students, you know, coming from my story, you know, coming from a single dad home, you know, not, not, playing a reverse role. You know, you can always come out of it with whatever. You know a teacher al… For me, I wanna inspire my students. I wanna inspire my students. Like, if I have a student that’s like off to their self, or like, you know, down and discouraged, I wanna be able to inspire that student to say, ‘My teacher inspired me to do this.’ I want my students, when they graduate to say, ‘My teacher… I wanna thank my teacher, Ms. So-and-so for helping me.’

Table 4

Teacher Identity Superordinate and Subordinate Category Response* Frequency—Felecia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superordinate Category</th>
<th>Subordinate Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Developmental Capacity</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(RE)Constructive Nature of Identity Formation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge Sources</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activation/Transformation</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay Theories</td>
<td>Images of Teachers &amp; Teaching</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apprenticeship of Observation</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tacit Knowledge</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Untutored Interpretations</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contradictions with TE</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCATE</td>
<td>Standards-based</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D-Identity (discourse/language)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I-Identity (institutional role theory)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dispositions (All students can learn)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Contexts</td>
<td>Normative Structures</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Cultures</td>
<td>School Culture</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *Data Source: Individual Interviews

These statements suggest that Felecia sees inspiring students as central to a teacher’s role. However, Felecia does not appear to have refined notions of the ways in which teachers can inspire students, nor of how she will do so in the future.

Rafael. I categorized the frequency of Rafael’s responses to individual interview questions related to Teacher Identity within the superordinate category of Self, with
responses in subordinate categories of Developmental Capacity (1), (RE)Constructive Nature of Identity Formation (2) and Knowledge Sources (5). I coded Rafael’s additional responses relative to Teacher Identity within the superordinate category of Lay Theories with corresponding subordinate responses of Images of Teachers and Teaching (1), Tacit Knowledge (1), Untutored Interpretations (2), and Contradictions with Teacher Education (2). Finally, Rafael made several comments, which I coded as superordinate category of Institutional Contexts and Cultures, subordinate category, Normative Structures (8).

Table 5 depicts a graphic representation of findings for Rafael.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superordinate Category</th>
<th>Subordinate Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Developmental Capacity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(RE)Constructive Nature of Identity Formation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge Sources</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activation/Transformation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay Theories</td>
<td>Images of Teachers &amp; Teaching</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apprenticeship of Observation</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tacit Knowledge</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Untutored Interpretations</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contradictions with TE</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCATE</td>
<td>Standards-based</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D-Identity (discourse/language)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I-Identity (institutional role theory)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dispositions (All students can learn)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Contexts and Cultures</td>
<td>Normative Structures</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School Culture</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *Data Source: Individual Interviews

Rafael states that the roles and responsibilities of a teacher include subject-area teaching proficiency and connecting with students. “Well, first of all, a teacher must be able to teach their subject. That’s the priority.” Additionally, Rafael charges teachers with the responsibility to motivate students to learn, stressing that subject-area knowledge and expertise are insufficient for ensuring that students learn. Rafael sees making connections as a means to motivating students.
But regardless from that, I believe that a teacher should basically have a connection with their students so that the student is willing to learn, not just go to, go… A student must want to participate in order to learn. If the student doesn’t wanna learn, the student will never learn.

Rafael punctuates his assertions regarding teachers’ roles and responsibilities by stating emphatically, “Yes, it’s on the teacher. If from the start, you’re soft with your students, then the students will show back sort of authority over you. You’ve gotta establish authority and, you know, build that bondage [sic] of who’s who.”

Rafael’s responses appear to echo comments made by Felecia in that he mentions a teacher’s responsibility to inspire students, and in turn, to motivate students to learn. Rafael indicates next that a teacher he believes to be effective played a similar role for him, stating,

I’m thinking of a teacher right now. It’s an old teacher of mine. Well, he, he basically established what, a bondage [sic] that, it wasn’t basically like a [pause] teacher/student bondage [sic], it was basically like a master to, basically like, an apprentice...‘cause I was, I was like… He taught me more than just schoolwork. He taught me things about life, things I could relate to, and that really helped me pass on and on.

Hence, Rafael uses his relationships with former teachers as knowledge sources when it comes to his perceptions of teachers’ responsibilities to students; ultimately believing that the teacher-to-student connection, or, in other words, the didactical aspect to teaching, is vital to student learning.

Monique. I categorized the frequency of Monique’s responses to individual
interview questions related to Teacher Identity within the superordinate category of Self, with responses in subordinate category of Knowledge Sources (1), and (RE)Constructive Nature of Teaching (2). I coded Monique’s remaining responses relative to Teacher Identity within the superordinate category of Lay Theories with corresponding subordinate responses of Images of Teachers and Teaching (1), Tacit Knowledge (3), Untutored Interpretations (3) and Contradictions with Teacher Education (1). Finally, Monique made an additional comment, which I coded as superordinate category of Institutional Contexts and Cultures, subordinate category, Normative Structures (1).

Table 6 depicts a graphic representation of findings for Monique.

Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superordinate Category</th>
<th>Subordinate Category</th>
<th>Frequency—Monique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Developmental Capacity</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(RE)Constructive Nature of Identity Formation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge Sources</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activation/Transformation</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay Theories</td>
<td>Images of Teachers &amp; Teaching</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apprenticeship of Observation</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tacit Knowledge</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Untutored Interpretations</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contradictions with TE</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCATE</td>
<td>Standards-based</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D-Identity (discourse/language)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I-Identity (institutional role theory)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dispositions (All students can learn)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Contexts and Cultures</td>
<td>Normative Structures</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School Culture</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *Data Source: Individual Interviews

For instance, Monique states that teachers that she considered to be effective, Okay, um, it was my middle-school teacher. She wasn’t like a tea…she was more, she was a teacher, but she was more, she became like your friend and it wasn’t just like she was so strict. She’d try to help you learn and she taught different ways and things like that.
When asked to clarify her meaning, Monique responds, “Like, ‘cause some kids are visual learners, so she taught visually, hands on, and different things so we can actually get to learn it better.” Monique’s response suggests that she interprets as effective, teachers who implement a variety of teaching methods to meet the needs of individual students. She states as basis for this belief, her personal experience with and knowledge regarding teachers who practiced differentiated instruction. Monique’s references to effective teachers’ capacity to teach in different ways that meet students’ learning needs ascribe pedagogical flexibility and competence to effective teachers. Moreover, similarly to Felecia and Raul, Monique includes an interpersonal dimension to her assessment of teacher effectiveness, as she thinks of effective teachers as being both ‘friend’ and ‘teacher.’

**Luis.** I categorized the frequency of Luis’s responses to individual interview questions related to Teacher Identity within the superordinate category of Self, with responses in subordinate category, Knowledge Sources (5). I coded Luis’s remaining responses relative to Teacher Identity within the superordinate category of Lay Theories with corresponding subordinate responses of Images of Teachers and Teaching (2), Apprenticeship of Observation (3), Untutored Interpretations (3) and Contradictions with Teacher Education (1). Finally, Luis made three additional comments, which I coded as superordinate categories of NCATE (I-Identity – 1), and Institutional Contexts and Cultures (Normative Structures – 2). Table 7 depicts a graphic representation of findings for Luis.

In response to my question regarding the importance of teachers to education, Luis states,
Yes, teachers are important, ‘cause if we didn’t have teachers, then it would be kind of difficult for our people to learn, learn from other people. Like, if we did it, and, um, when we were, we have apprentices, but it’d be kind of difficult, ‘cause those apprentices, some of them may not like what they do. So, but, if we teach them, they essentially will start going to stuff that they enjoy to do.

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superordinate Category</th>
<th>Subordinate Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Developmental Capacity</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(RE)Constructive Nature of Identity Formation</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge Sources</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activation/Transformation</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay Theories</td>
<td>Images of Teachers &amp; Teaching</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apprenticeship of Observation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tacit Knowledge</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Untutored Interpretations</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contradictions with TE</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCATE</td>
<td>Standards-based</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D-Identity (discourse/language)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I-Identity (institutional role theory)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dispositions (All students can learn)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Contexts and Cultures</td>
<td>Normative Structures</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School Culture</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *Data Source: Individual Interviews

Here, Luis appears supportive of formal education as a knowledge source, as opposed to learning solely through apprenticeship or modeling. Luis expounds on this line of reasoning when he states that teachers become effective by first attending college, recognizing the institutional identity associated with degree conferral. Luis continues, …but they also have to learn by having experience. They can’t just go in, um, go and just let, let automatically. They have to have experience to learn and also be through certain bad and good teachers so they can learn what, what, um, what they have to do, and what they must do to have good, effective students in the class.

Luis implies that engagement in practica experiences as well as experiences of effective
teaching practices as students influence teachers’ potential to become effective. Luis’s comments also point to possible contradictions with teacher education. By stressing the importance of both personal schooling experiences and experiential knowledge as preservice teachers, Luis underscores the idea that although teacher education provides foundational training and preparation, personal and professional lived experiences ultimately define the ways in which teachers enact their teaching role.

**Raul.** I categorized the frequency of Raul’s responses to individual interview questions related to Teacher Identity within the superordinate category of Self, with responses in subordinate category of Knowledge Sources (1). I coded Raul’s remaining responses relative to Teacher Identity within the superordinate category of Lay Theories with corresponding subordinate responses of Images of Teachers and Teaching (3), Apprenticeship of Observation (2), Tacit Knowledge (2), Untutored Interpretations (1) and Contradictions with Teacher Education (2). Finally, Raul made additional comments, which I coded as superordinate category of NCATE (I-Identity – 1) and Institutional Contexts and Cultures (Normative Structures – 1). Table 8 depicts a graphic representation of findings for Raul.

Raul states matter-of-factly, teachers’ roles and responsibilities are, “To have the class management, of course, and be able to teach and be prepared and know your subject so that you can give the students what you know.” Raul reiterates notions of planning, preparation, and content knowledge and expertise as important teacher attributes, stating that a teacher that he considers effective,

…he knows his subject. And, I like hard things like [pause] like if there’s, if something is hard for me to understand, I’m gonna find a way to understand it,
and that’s what this teacher does. He lectures and he won’t, he’ll push us to, to the point that we need to learn that subject, or we won’t pass. That, that’s like the type of, the, the college movement, that’s what I like.

Raul explains that he enjoys a challenge and he believes that teachers should challenge their students.

Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superordinate Category</th>
<th>Subordinate Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Developmenal Capacity</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(RE)Constructive Nature of Identity Formation</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge Sources</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activation/Transformation</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay Theories</td>
<td>Images of Teachers &amp; Teaching</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apprenticeship of Observation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tacit Knowledge</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Untutored Interpretations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contradictions with TE</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCATE</td>
<td>Standards-based</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D-Identity (discourse/language)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I-Identity (institutional role theory)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dispositions (All students can learn)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Contexts and Cultures</td>
<td>Normative Structures</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School Culture</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data Source: Individual Interviews

Additionally, Raul states that college is necessary to becoming a teacher. He places great significance to formally educating teachers as indicated in the above-reference to the challenge of the so-called “college movement”, as well as in stating that the UTA program should involve more than concentrated preparation for practica experiences, with the balance of instruction entailing bookwork. Raul states,

I see that we need more, um, activities, more than just going, um, preparing to go teach one day, and then the rest of the year we just practicing out of the book. It’s like, we need a, um, a stay…uh, a standard curriculum.

In contrast to others in the program, Raul appears to value the formal aspects of
becoming a teacher more than the experiential dimensions of teacher preparation. Raul’s stance regarding knowledge sources for a teacher self is evinced further when he discusses the benefits of enrollment in the UTA, stating that the ‘business etiquette’ classes have been most beneficial to him. He states that he still hasn’t decided to become a teacher and that he will be able to use lessons learned in the etiquette classes in other professions, noting, “It, it teaches, um, it teaches how to stand up and speak up and [pause] your hands should have…firm…firmly handshaking people…Um, firm handshakes” as “being more professional.”

**Jackie.** I categorized the frequency of Jackie’s responses to individual interview questions related to Teacher Identity within the superordinate category of Self, with responses in subordinate category of Knowledge Sources (1). I coded Jackie’s remaining responses relative to Teacher Identity within the superordinate category of Lay Theories with corresponding subordinate responses of Images of Teachers and Teaching (2), Tacit Knowledge (1), and Untutored Interpretations (4). Finally, Jackie made one additional comment, which I coded as superordinate category of Institutional Contexts and Cultures (Normative Structures – 1). Table 9 provides a graphic depiction of findings for Jackie.

When asked about the roles and responsibilities of teaching, Jackie responded, “I would say to, um, get the students to know the material and then once they know it, you gotta make sure they understand it.” Jackie goes on to say that former teachers she considered as good or effective demonstrated proficiency in implementing an array of teaching methods that accommodated diverse learning needs. Jackie describes effective teachers, stating,

The type of teacher she was, she was like more energetic, and she didn’t just sit
there and teach. Like, she, it was like, I mean we learned one thing one day and the next day, we’ll learn it again, but in a different style. But the first day, it’d probably be hands-on. The second day, it probably like note taking, and the third day probably like something [pause] of, all, of all like movement stuff. Like we’ll learn the same thing, but like different ways, because if I’m doing it like, I mean, I understand one way, but she’ll, I’ll have to do it again another way. And she’ll like, she entertain us while we do our work, so it’s like, it’s not like that we’re just sitting there, like, ‘Oh, my gosh, we gotta go to class, like yuck can’t wait til I get there, then… Sometimes, you go in, she’s an open person, so if you have anything to talk about you can just come and talk to her about anything, really. It’s not, she don’t like say, ‘Oh, you’re wrong’, like that. She’ll tell us when we do wrong, but she’ll also be like, “You gotta look at it both ways,” and she’ll help us understand our problems.

Table 9

*Data Source: Individual Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superordinate Category</th>
<th>Subordinate Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Developmental Capacity</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(RE)Constructive Nature of Identity Formation</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge Sources</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activation/Transformation</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay Theories</td>
<td>Images of Teachers &amp; Teaching</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apprenticeship of Observation</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tacit Knowledge</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Untutored Interpretations</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contradictions with TE</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCATE</td>
<td>Standards-based</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D-Identity (discourse/language)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I-Identity (institutional role theory)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dispositions (All students can learn)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Contexts and Cultures</td>
<td>Normative Structures</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School Culture</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jackie’s comments suggest that former teachers serve as knowledge sources concerning
ways that teachers need to address individual student needs as well as teachers’ responsibilities to ensure that all students learn. Moreover, Jackie appears to subscribe to public images of effective teachers as active rather than idle, engaged rather than detached, and caring rather than dispassionate; crediting such dispositions as proof of teacher effectiveness. Affective dimensions to teacher identity, such as showing caring towards students and being willing to do what it takes to ensure learning, appear to resonate with Jackie similarly as with other participants in the study, including Felecia, Rafael, Monique, and Luis.

**Erica.** I categorized the frequency of Erica’s responses to individual interview questions related to Teacher Identity within the superordinate category of Self, with responses in subordinate category of (RE)Constructive Nature of Identity Formation (1), and Knowledge Sources (5). I coded Erica’s remaining responses relative to Teacher Identity within the superordinate category of Lay Theories with corresponding subordinate responses of Untutored Interpretations (5). Finally, Erica made one additional comment, which I coded as superordinate category of Institutional Contexts and Cultures (Normative Structures – 1). Table 10 provides a graphic depiction of findings for Erica.

Erica maintains that the roles and responsibilities of teachers involve content knowledge and the ability to make a lasting impression on students. When you become a teacher, you have to, you have to know your stuff, for one, and for two, you have to be that wonderful teacher that’s like, one they can remember, you know? I can’t really explain, but you have to be that one that people, that students can remember.
However, when asked to discuss qualities of effective teachers that she has had as a student, Erica is hard-pressed to identify a teacher that she considers to have been effective. Erica states that she has never had an effective teacher, and settles on describing ‘nice’ teachers as effective.

“I had good teachers, because they were nice to me, but you know, there’s teachers, you know, that really aren’t that nice, so it’s like kind of hard to be learning in an environment with a teacher that’s really not that nice. So, I guess for a teacher to be the best, it’s like knowing you’re, not, like, knowing your stuff and teaching it as well as you can.”

This discussion concludes with Erica acknowledging that she makes good grades and a teacher taught her to read; therefore, “I do stay after school a lot to have extra tutoring, so the best teacher stays after school and help that individual one-on-one.”

Personal schooling experiences, which Erica considers as negative, serve as knowledge sources for Erica’s understandings of what teachers should know and be able
to do. Consistent with other participants in the study, Erica’s views on teacher identity rest largely upon former teachers’ success in making personal connections and convincing her that they cared about her. Affective traits appear to supersede technical knowledge and skills for Erica, for although she later confesses that teachers helped her by tutoring her afterschool, her initial response focused on difficulties associated with learning in an environment led by a “teacher that’s really not that nice.”

**Reflective Journal Responses on Teacher Identity**

Following foundational data collection from pilot focus group and pilot individual interviews (Seidman, 2006), I developed literature-based reflective journal prompts (see Appendix F) geared towards eliciting deeper thought and meaning making by participants (n=9). Seidman (2006) stresses that interview three brings meaning making to the forefront. As such, the reflective prompts allowed participants opportunities to merge understandings of past and present experiences in order to project or anticipate future beliefs and actions regarding teacher identity and prospective efficacy beliefs. Students responded to reflective journal prompts for seven days over a three week period. Students who returned parental consent and assent letters were included in the study.

I present findings from reflective journals in terms of response frequencies and brief commentary for each participant (n=8) in the areas of teacher identity and prospective efficacy. Although nine students returned assent and consent documents, Monique did not attend school on each of the seven days of data collection. Additionally, Raul experienced the life-changing event of his father’s death and did not attend school on the final days of data collection; therefore, Raul did not complete journal responses for Prompts #5, #6, and #7. Although I followed-up with absent students to complete missed
prompts, I made a judgment call, in consultation with the UTA teacher, that such a request would have been inappropriate in Raul’s case.

**Felecia.** I categorized Felecia’s responses to reflective journal prompts related to Teacher Identity in superordinate categories of *Self* and *Lay Theories*. The frequency of coded responses in corresponding subordinate categories in *Self* include Knowledge Sources (12), Activation/Transformation (2). Coded responses corresponding to *Lay Theories* include Images of Teachers and Teaching (2), Tacit Knowledge (1), Untutored Interpretations (5), and Contradictions with Teacher Education (1). Table 11 presents findings for Felecia.

### Table 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superordinate Category</th>
<th>Subordinate Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Developmental Capacity</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(RE)Constructive Nature of Identity Formation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge Sources</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activation/Transformation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay Theories</td>
<td>Images of Teachers &amp; Teaching</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apprenticeship of Observation</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tacit Knowledge</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Untutored Interpretations</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contradictions with TE</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCATE</td>
<td>Standards-based</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D-Identity (discourse/language)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I-Identity (institutional role theory)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dispositions (All students can learn)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Contexts and Cultures</td>
<td>Normative Structures</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School Culture</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* *Data Source: Reflective Journal*

Specifically, Felecia relies heavily upon personal knowledge sources to make meaning of what it means to be a teacher. She states that having a sibling with a disability enables her to “get the full effect of how to handle an autistic child.” Felecia goes on to say that her familiarity with disabilities will garner parents’ confidence in her abilities to work with students with disabilities. She states, “…I feel that growing up in a household
with a special needs child, I will do a parent a big favor by becoming a teacher and knowing the workings of an autistic child.” Felicia’s reliance on knowledge sources includes her personal knowledge of students with disabilities (autism) as well as self-awareness as suggested in comments regarding her ability to “multitask” as in listening while appearing not to, as well as the relatability factor whereas Felecia believes that age propinquity to high schoolers guarantees that she will be able to relate to them.

I know I will be young so I will be able to relate to them more than older teachers can. I see students now that give teachers problems in class and I am always the person who is able to calm that person down and get them to do at least a little bit of work.

This statement suggests Felecia believes that her leadership skills as a student will transfer seamlessly to her role as teacher.

**Rafael.** I categorized Rafael’s responses to reflective journal prompts related to Teacher Identity in superordinate categories of *Self* and *Lay Theories*. The frequency of coded responses in corresponding subordinate categories in *Self* include RE(Constructive) Nature of Teaching (1), Knowledge Sources (1), and Activation/Transformation (1). Coded responses corresponding to *Lay Theories* include Images of Teachers and Teaching (1), Tacit Knowledge (3), and Untutored Interpretations (1). Table 12 presents findings for Rafael.

Rafael expresses beliefs supporting the notion that every teacher needs a particular technical skills-set to be effective. For example, Rafael states, “Teachers should be able to read, write, and speak because those are the three basic things a teacher has to know for any subject they are teaching.” According to Rafael, basic skills are
necessities for teaching and teachers who do not possess basic skills will be ineffective in their jobs.

As a teacher, you can’t teach a student if you don’t speak well. If your handwriting is too sloppy, they might not understand it and if you read any instructions to them and you aren’t a capable reader, they might interpret your instructions wrong.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superordinate Category</th>
<th>Subordinate Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Developmental Capacity</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(RE)Constructive Nature of Identity Formation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge Sources</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activation/Transformation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay Theories</td>
<td>Images of Teachers &amp; Teaching</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apprenticeship of Observation</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tacit Knowledge</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Untutored Interpretations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contradictions with TE</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCATE</td>
<td>Standards-based</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D-Identity (discourse/language)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I-Identity (institutional role theory)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dispositions (All students can learn)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Contexts and Cultures</td>
<td>Normative Structures</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School Culture</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *Data Source: Reflective Journal

Conversely, while Rafael believes that teachers must come to the job with basic skills, he states that he welcomes the opportunity to learn as a teacher. This goal to learn as a teacher comes along with a desire to “give kids opportunities” and to “change lives”, which Rafael sees as existing hand-in-hand with teaching. “Why do I say that? Well, I want them to be successful in life so I’m going to teach them the best I can to give them the opportunity of them reaching the successful life they desire…” Moreover, Rafael believes that effective classroom management is a combination of “making class fun” and “yet a learning experience.” Rafael states that further evidence of his classroom
management skills will be in maintaining a safe learning environment by not letting any of his students “get in an unsafe situation” and by “enforce(ing) the no bullying rule.”

Luis. I categorized Luis’s responses to reflective journal prompts related to Teacher Identity in superordinate categories of Self and Lay Theories. The frequency of coded responses in corresponding subordinate categories in Self include Knowledge Sources (9), and Activation/Transformation (2). Coded responses corresponding to Lay Theories include Images of Teachers and Teaching (1), Tacit Knowledge (4), and Untutored Interpretations (1). Table 13 presents findings for Luis.

Table 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superordinate Category</th>
<th>Subordinate Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Developmental Capacity</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(RE)Constructive Nature of Identity Formation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge Sources</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activation/Transformation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay Theories</td>
<td>Images of Teachers &amp; Teaching</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apprenticeship of Observation</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tacit Knowledge</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Untutored Interpretations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contradictions with TE</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCATE</td>
<td>Standards-based</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D-Identity (discourse/language)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I-Identity (institutional role theory)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dispositions (All students can learn)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Contexts and Cultures</td>
<td>Normative Structures</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School Culture</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *Data Source: Reflective Journal

Luis focuses on personal knowledge sources including experiences as a student in general and as a member of the Urban Teaching Academy (UTA). For instance, Luis states that throughout his school career, he has helped others with their problems and he doesn’t play favorites among his classmates.

The reason I believe I am effective in this area is because I help everyone I know with their problems. If they tell me what’s wrong I am there helping no matter
what. Second, I am effective in helping my entire class and not pick favorites because I see them equally and it has happened to me when my teachers choose favorites, the rest were treated unfairly.

Moreover, UTA serves as a knowledge source for Luis as he states that he has learned how to prepare a lesson plan and has learned how he must conduct himself as a teacher. I must dress formally as I teach. I cannot get in trouble with the law in any way. I also cannot go out to clubs because I may well be setting an example for my students so their parents may complain cause they saw me doing something that may affect their children in the classroom when I am doing it outside of it.

Luis sees these rules of conduct as “really bad downers” but stresses that he will not do any of the things he mentions, “at least to their (students’) knowledge.” Furthermore, Luis states that teachers are human and should be allowed to have fun so he will still participate in fun activities with other adults.

**Raul.** I categorized Raul’s responses to reflective journal prompts related to Teacher Identity in superordinate categories of **Self** and **Lay Theories**. The frequency of coded responses in corresponding subordinate categories in **Self** include Knowledge Sources (1), and Activation/Transformation (8). Coded responses corresponding to **Lay Theories** include Images of Teachers and Teaching (2), Tacit Knowledge (4), and Untutored Interpretations (1). Table 14 presents findings for Raul.

Raul makes comments that signal his status as either activating and/or transforming into his teacher self. He states that his teaching philosophy has changed over time from having no vision to wanting to know more. “Getting into the program and actually learning from it created and gained leadership skills, responsibility and
timeliness influencing me in a good direction making me want to get to know a little more about this teaching stuff.” Raul states that he is still undecided about whether he will become a teacher. However, if he chooses to do so he will become an effective teacher by “…taking my early experiences in UTA and the future study in education.” Raul goes on to say, “…time equals experience, so the more time I spend teaching, being in front of children or teenagers, managing classrooms, etc., the more knowledge I will attain to become a great teacher.” Raul’s comments suggest that he embraces the idea of being a lifelong learner. He sees the benefits of participating in UTA, but recognizes a need for further education and continued experiences in order to develop into an effective teacher.

Table 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superordinate Category</th>
<th>Subordinate Category</th>
<th>Frequency—Raul</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Developmental Capacity</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(RE)Constructive Nature of Identity Formation</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge Sources</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activation/Transformation</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay Theories</td>
<td>Images of Teachers &amp; Teaching</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apprenticeship of Observation</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tacit Knowledge</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Untutored Interpretations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contradictions with TE</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCATE</td>
<td>Standards-based</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D-Identity (discourse/language)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I-Identity (institutional role theory)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dispositions (All students can learn)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Contexts and Cultures</td>
<td>Normative Structures</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School Culture</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data Source: Reflective Journal

Jackie. I categorized Jackie’s responses to reflective journal prompts related to Teacher Identity in superordinate categories of Self, Lay Theories, and NCATE. The frequency of coded responses in corresponding subordinate categories in Self include (RE)Constructive Nature of Teaching (1), Knowledge Sources (8), and
Activation/Transformation (1). Coded responses corresponding to Lay Theories include Images of Teachers and Teaching (3), Apprenticeship of Observation (2), Tacit Knowledge (3), and Untutored Interpretations (7). I coded one in the NCATE category related to I-Identity (1). Table 15 presents findings for Jackie.

Table 15
Teacher Identity Superordinate and Subordinate Category Response* Frequency—Jackie

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superordinate Category</th>
<th>Subordinate Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Developmental Capacity</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(RE)Constructive Nature of Identity Formation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge Sources</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activation/Transformation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay Theories</td>
<td>Images of Teachers &amp; Teaching</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apprenticeship of Observation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tacit Knowledge</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Untutored Interpretations</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contradictions with TE</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCATE</td>
<td>Standards-based</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D-Identity (discourse/language)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I-Identity (institutional role theory)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dispositions (All students can learn)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Contexts and Cultures</td>
<td>Normative Structures</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School Culture</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *Data Source: Reflective Journal

Jackie draws upon personal knowledge in conceptualizing what it means to be a teacher. For example, Jackie mentions that teachers are role models. She bases this perspective on the fact that many teachers have been role models for her, both in school and outside of school. “It’s a lot of time where I went to a teacher for help outside of school. Yes, they all was there for me, until this day I still get advice from a couple of my old teachers.” Additionally, Jackie believes that teachers should use various strategies to address students’ learning styles because she has observed her teachers doing so over the years. She states that the teacher’s job is to make sure that students understand the material. Jackie notes, “…teachers should do many activities to make the students feel comfortable about the material.” She later discusses learning styles and asserts,
...I believe I’m good in this area because I had a lot of teacher over the years and they use all kind of method. The strategy I use is to see how my students learn and I’ll use that the most.

Jackie appears to embrace the idea of teaching to students’ learning styles on one hand, but on the other hand also views this as a means of adding “adventures” to her classroom, stating, “I don’t want to do the same thing every day. I want my class to be very adventures and I don’t want my students to predict what I’m going to be doing that day.” Jackie’s comments suggest that her experience with teachers that helped her with problems and used a variety of teaching methods reinforces her beliefs that all teachers should conduct themselves similarly.

**Erica.** I categorized Erica’s responses to reflective journal prompts related to Teacher Identity in superordinate categories of *Self* and *Lay Theories*. The frequency of coded responses in corresponding subordinate categories in *Self* include (RE)constructive Nature of Teaching (1), Knowledge Sources (8) and Activation/Transformation (1). Coded responses corresponding to *Lay Theories* include Images of Teachers and Teaching (3), Tacit Knowledge (5), Untutored Interpretations (2), and Contradictions with Teacher Education (1). Table 16 presents findings for Erica.

Erica begins by stating that she wondered why she entered the UTA in the first place, asking herself, “Why am I here?” However, as time progresses, Erica warms to the prospect of becoming a teacher. She attributes her growing desire to become a teacher to models within the UTA and her school, “But as time went by, I saw myself being just like (UTA teacher’s name), (UTA district coordinator’s name) and numerous other wonderful teachers.” Additionally, Erica mentions the practica experiences at the feeder
elementary school as informing her current attraction to teaching, stating, “And teaching hands on have gave me knowledge to say that, ‘Yes, I want to become a teacher.’” These statements allude not only to teacher models as knowledge sources, but also to the (RE)constructive Nature of Teaching in that Erica identifies as a teacher over time.

Table 16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superordinate Category</th>
<th>Subordinate Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Developmental Capacity</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(RE)Constructive Nature of Identity Formation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge Sources</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activation/Transformation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay Theories</td>
<td>Images of Teachers &amp; Teaching</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apprenticeship of Observation</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tacit Knowledge</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Untutored Interpretations</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contradictions with TE</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCATE</td>
<td>Standards-based</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D-Identity (discourse/language)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I-Identity (institutional role theory)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dispositions (All students can learn)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Contexts and Cultures</td>
<td>Normative Structures</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School Culture</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *Data Source: Reflective Journal

Erica’s reliance upon personal knowledge sources is further shown in her discussion of what teachers should be able to know and do. Specifically, she uses examples from her current schooling experiences to support her beliefs that teachers should, “automatically know that it’s not going to be easy…every student will be different, and …how to handle a hectic situation.” In the case of teachers knowing it’s not going to be easy, Erica argues, “They (students) have split personalities. One moment they will be your best friend then the next moment they will be mad at you because you let someone go to the bathroom before you let them.” This is one of numerous practical anecdotes Erica offers to support her beliefs about what it means to be a teacher.

Josef. I categorized Josef’s responses to reflective journal prompts related to
Teacher Identity in superordinate categories of *Self* and *Lay Theories*. The frequency of coded responses in corresponding subordinate categories in *Self* include three comments in Knowledge Sources (4) category. Coded responses corresponding to *Lay Theories* include Images of Teachers and Teaching (2), Tacit Knowledge (2), and Untutored Interpretations (1). Table 17 presents findings for Josef.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superordinate Category</th>
<th>Subordinate Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Developmental Capacity</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(RE)Constructive Nature of Identity Formation</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge Sources</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activation/Transformation</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay Theories</td>
<td>Images of Teachers &amp; Teaching</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apprenticeship of Observation</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tacit Knowledge</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Untutored Interpretations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contradictions with TE</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCATE</td>
<td>Standards-based</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D-Identity (discourse/language)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I-Identity (institutional role theory)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dispositions (All students can learn)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Contexts and Cultures</td>
<td>Normative Structures</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School Culture</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: *Data Source: Reflective Journal

Josef’s responses reveal that he imagines teachers as influential, empathetic, and ethical. For example, Josef states that teachers should be able to “show major influence toward the student, meaning that the student shouldn’t have any problems respecting you or asking you your opinion on life.” Here, Josef’s statements suggest that teachers should be role models for students so that students will see them as sources of comfort as well as advice. Josef refers to teachers’ interactions with students at school as well as their public persona as informing students’ perceptions on teachers as acceptable role models, “…and not only that, but he should be humble in what he/she does in the presence of students.” Josef’s comments regarding what teachers should know and do portray a grandiose image
Josef’s discussion of what he looks forward to in teaching reveals also this grandiose image of teachers and teaching. He mentions an uncle who motivated him, as a knowledge source fueling his desire to, “…motivate our children into becoming a strong powerful force in the eyes of mankind, showing people who they are and what they are capable of being.” Further, Josef believes that teachers are empowered to be change-agents in students’ lives as well as in society.

I would like to be reliable in such a way where I as a teacher can protect the mind of a child to guide him/her toward a better ending…you are on the right track being able to contradict someone’s thought is a sign of being a teacher. Josef believes that the way for teachers to operate reliably in the lives of students is to ask and answer questions. “I always ask this question, who’s the better teacher, the one who ask the question or the one who answers it. Good teachers ask questions, but it’s that great teacher who answers that question.”

Asiah. I categorized Asiah’s responses to reflective journal prompts related to Teacher Identity in superordinate categories of Self and Lay Theories. The frequency of coded responses in corresponding subordinate categories in Self include Knowledge Sources (9) and Activation/Transformation (2). Coded responses corresponding to Lay Theories include nine comments within the category, Tacit Knowledge (9) and Contradictions with TE (1). Table 18 presents findings for Asiah.

Asiah describes teachers’ responsibilities to impart knowledge that students will use throughout their lives because the fruits of knowledge will have long-term impact on the students and society. Hence, Asiah states,
I will teach them whatever the curriculum is to the best of my ability. I would never give up on a child if they were struggling and would be willing to go the extra mile by staying after school to help that child learn and succeed.

Table 18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superordinate Category</th>
<th>Subordinate Category</th>
<th>Frequency—Asiah</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Developmental Capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(RE)Constructive Nature of Identity Formation</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge Sources</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activation/Transformation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay Theories</td>
<td>Images of Teachers &amp; Teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apprenticeship of Observation</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tacit Knowledge</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Untutored Interpretations</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contradictions with TE</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCATE</td>
<td>Standards-based</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D-Identity (discourse/language)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I-Identity (institutional role theory)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dispositions (All students can learn)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Contexts and Cultures</td>
<td>Normative Structures</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School Culture</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data Source: Reflective Journal

She goes on to describe the ways in which she would manage the classroom environment by “…walk(ing) around the classroom to make sure everyone is on task and speak(ing) in a loud voice to grab their attention and keep them awake and in line.” Asiah draws from personal knowledge sources in this regard, citing her experiences “as a student in a rowdy classroom” in which she “couldn’t imagine being the teacher in that kind of situation.” Moreover, Asiah states, “I will use the experiences of UTA to become a great teacher by using my teaching experiences in classrooms and knowledge I have gained and putting them into practice.”

According to Asiah, experiential activities reward teachers in ways that textbooks cannot. She describes her first teaching experience and the first time “you have the floor to yourself” as “exhilarating”; noting, “You don’t get that kind of feeling or experience
by reading a textbook.” Additionally, Asiah believes that each of these experiences will help her to be better prepared over time, and advantage her as a future teacher because she began in the 9th grade. She states specific ways that she will make sure that all students have an “opportunity” to learn.

I would teach something and explain it in multiple ways so that everyone might understand and not move on until they do so no one gets left behind. I would do activities for the hands on learners and lecture for the ones that do better listening.

I would also show examples on the board for those who are visual learners.

Asiah concludes by stating, “It is my job to prepare them for whatever life may throw at them.” Asiah asserts her willingness to teach all students and teach them well. “In conclusion, it will be my role to make sure all students learn and I will make sure each student learns regardless of race, gender, etc.”

**Overview of Findings – Question Two: Prospective Efficacy**

The next sections present an overview of findings corresponding to prospective efficacy from respective data sources; i.e., Pilot Focus Group Interviews, Pilot Individual Interviews, and Reflective Prompt Responses. Participant responses were structurally coded according to predominate literature-based categories. The first major category, Information Sources, is based on Bandura’s (1977, 1993) conclusions regarding the sources of information upon which individuals base beliefs regarding capabilities to perform successfully. Individuals form efficacy beliefs based on experiences in which they themselves perform successfully (most influential source), vicariously through others, or through persuasion by individuals he or she deems as highly competent in performing the needed action. Moreover, the literature supports the notion that urban
school contexts may be subject to specific needs, including the following subordinate categories:

- **Outcome Expectancy** – Teachers can believe that certain actions will produce certain outcomes; however, the willingness to act (agency) depends on efficacy beliefs regarding the needed action.
- **Dispositions** – Teachers’ beliefs regarding students’ learning capabilities may interact with efficacy beliefs, thus influencing agency to act on behalf of all students.
- **Developmental Propensity** – Preservice and novice teachers tend to overestimate difficulties related to teach students from diverse racial/ethnic, language, and socioeconomic backgrounds.
- **Context Specificity** – Teachers’ efficacy beliefs vary according to grade level, content-area, type of school (rural, suburban, urban), etc.
- **Systems of Support** – Collegial and community support influence the efficacy beliefs of novice teachers.

The third superordinate category derived from my review of literature involves teacher beliefs about working with students in urban schools, both of which have implications for teacher education. For example, because traditional teacher education programs prepare teachers to teach students with “typical” learning needs, teachers may equate student diversity with special learning needs, in turn requiring special preparation to work effectively with diverse students. Similarly, literature suggests that early and continuous work in urban school contexts helps preservice teachers to prepare ideologically for working in such settings. Finally, the literature reveals certain characteristics that
successful teachers in urban settings demonstrate. Efficacy studies show that commitment to the profession may be influenced by Psychological Connectedness (emotional connections through reflection), Values and Ideologies (core identity with established student-centered value system and standards of practice), and Calling to Teach (personality traits support destiny to teach). Conversely, efficacy studies show also that discrepancies between problems that preservice teachers anticipate having and those they actually experience may hamper commitment to the profession. This differential in Problem Anticipation may result in attrition during novice years, especially in low efficacy preservice teachers.

I sought to preserve the contextual integrity of responses in light of the research questions under investigation by including exact comments from each participant (MacQueen et al., 1998; Saldana, 2009). Moreover, keeping both verbal and written comments intact was useful in maintaining the integrity of participants’ individual identities, whether or not comments corresponded to so-called Standard English. My goal as the researcher was to ensure that my interpretations of participants’ comments approximated their intended meanings as precisely as possible.

**Pilot Focus Group Comments on Prospective Efficacy**

I categorized the majority of focus group comments relative to Prospective Efficacy in the superordinate categories of *Information Sources*. Within the category, *Information Sources*, I noted comments related to *Mastery Experiences/Performance Accomplishments* (4), *Verbal Persuasion* (1), and *Psychological States* (1). I noted no comments within subordinate categories of *Vicarious Experiences* (0) and *Collective Efficacy* (0). I noted one comment in *Context Specificity* (1), a subordinate category
within the superordinate category, *Efficacy Needs for Urban School Contexts*, which was not a direct topic in the focus group protocol. Similarly, I noted one comment in *Diversity Same as Special Needs* (1), a subordinate category to *Efficacy Needs for Teacher Education* and *Diversity Same as Special* (1). I coded comments according to the operational definition of each category as well as the context of the comment.

In one example, Erica discusses a new teacher that most members of the cohort judge to be ineffective. A number of subordinate categories emerge within the discussion.

The flow of the focus group interview led me to ask the participants whether they attended all classes together or only the UTA course. The participants mentioned TV Production as an elective course that they were required to take, however, Raul and Felecia stated that they were no longer enrolled in the course. I asked the participants how they could make the best of the situation by learning something that they can apply to their teaching careers. Erica stated that she saw the experience with the TV Production course as a prime example of the type of teacher that she did not want to become. Erica states,

> I know not to talk to my kids the way that he talked to her just then. I look at him, I observe, and I’m like, ‘No that’s not how you do it.’ But at the same time he’s teaching me like, ‘Oh I know not to do that to my students, like that’s rude, like don’t do that.’ Some stuff you say you ain’t supposed to say because people have feelings and he has to see that.”

I coded this statement as *Informational Sources (Psychological States)* because Erica is basing future projected behavioral responses on her emotional reaction to personal lived experiences as a student. Erica’s adverse reaction to the teacher’s apparent offensive
interaction styles conceivably will inform the ways in which Erica anticipates interaction with her students in the future, as well as what Erica deems as effective interaction styles. Moreover, the TV Production course is included in the curriculum for UTA, with the intent that UTA students will apply learning from the course in the future as teachers. Therefore, Erica is experiencing the TV Production course through bifurcated lens as student and as precollegiate student teacher, making meaning concurrently from both perspectives.

Erica makes another statement related to Prospective Efficacy when asked whether she wants to become a teacher. Erica discusses how she thought that the program was good when she began, but that at the same time she was undecided about teaching ‘little kids’. However, upon completing the first practica experience, a one-day teaching experience at a feeder elementary school in partnership with a social activist organization, she became convinced that she would like to become a teacher.

But the second year, when I went to the little elementary, most likely I’m going to teach elementary kids, because they listen. When I went to go teach, I was like, they are so adorable and they listen, and I was like, ‘oh I want to become a teacher now.’ I thought about it over the year and it’s like, I’ll become a teacher, it’s okay. I have nothing else planned so I’ll become a teacher.

I coded these remarks to both Information Sources (Master Experiences/Performance Accomplishments) and Efficacy Needs for Urban Contexts (Context Specificity). First, the experience of actually working with elementary students in a pseudo-instructional role and meeting with success, created a belief that Erica could work with elementary students and be the kind of teacher she would want to be. Second, the feeder school is located in
the same ‘urban’ community as Erica’s high school. The elementary students who attend will one day attend Erica’s high school and will bring any appending challenges that students from low socioeconomic communities often bring to school. Furthermore, Erica describes student characteristics that make teaching elementary students palatable; i.e., they are adorable and they listen.

Participants’ comments in the focus group interviews occurred primarily in two related areas for Teacher Identity: Self and Lay Theories. Information Sources accessed primarily through Mastery Experience/Performance Accomplishments provided the foci for Prospective Efficacy beliefs among UTA Cohort I students participating in the study. The individual interview protocol is comprised of questions that delve deeper into the topic. The next section provides overviews for participants who participated in the individual interviews based on the literature-based superordinate and subordinate categories.

**Individual Interview Comments on Prospective Efficacy**

**Felecia.** I coded Felecia’s responses to individual interview questions related to Prospective Efficacy in superordinate categories (a) Information Sources (Mastery Experiences/Performance Accomplishments – 3; Vicarious Experiences – 1; Psychological States – 1; Collective Efficacy – 1), (b) Efficacy Needs for Urban School Contexts (Outcome Expectancy – 1; Dispositions – 1; Context Specificity – 1), and (c) Efficacy Needs for Teacher Education (Ideological Preparation – 3). Table 19 provides a graphic depiction of prospective efficacy findings from Felecia’s individual interviews. Felecia responds to the question regarding her level of commitment to becoming a teacher,
I definitely wanna finish now. I definitely wanna finish now, because I actually wanna come back here to [name of school] and teach. I actually wanna come back here to [name of school] and teach. And, and, I wanna come back because I – I’m not gonna, I don’t wanna say it like that, but I’ve never been in such a [pause] an urban area, you know, in an urban area, and like, you know, I have friends, you know, I have friends that are, that live in an urban area. You know, I have friends, you know, and stuff like that, but I’ve not, I’ve never been in an urban area, and now that I see like, you know, I have friends and stuff that come from there, you know, and they’re, they’re like, you know, my struggle and there’s nobody to help me. I wanna be able to come back and show the student, ‘I graduated from here. I was a graduate from here, and I’m coming back to teach here.’ You know, ‘I’m coming back to teach here,’ so, like kids that come here, you know, ‘Oh, you know my mom?’ ‘Yes [pause] I know your mother. Me and her went to school here.’

Table 19

*Prospective Efficacy Superordinate and Subordinate Category Response* Frequency—Felecia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superordinate Category</th>
<th>Subordinate Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information Sources</td>
<td>Mastery Experiences</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vicarious Experiences</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Verbal Persuasion</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychological States</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collective Efficacy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy Needs for Urban School Contexts</td>
<td>Outcome Expectancy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developmental Propensity</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dispositions (All students can learn)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Context-specificity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Systems of Support</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy Needs for Teacher Education</td>
<td>Diversity/Special</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ideological Preparation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings in Teacher Efficacy Studies</td>
<td>Problem Anticipation</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychological connectedness</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Set of values and ideologies</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Calling</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* *Data Source: Individual Interviews*
This response demonstrates connections that Felecia makes between her experiences as a precollegiate student teacher and her personal knowledge of the experiences of friends attending schools in urban areas. Through these remarks, Felecia asserts her desire to become a role model for students attending urban schools; i.e., to show students that one can attend an urban school and be successful.

**Rafael.** I coded Rafael’s responses to individual interview questions related to Prospective Efficacy in superordinate categories (a) Information Sources (Mastery Experiences/Performance Accomplishments – 5; Vicarious Experiences – 1; Psychological States – 1), (b) Efficacy Needs for Urban School Contexts (Dispositions – 1; Context Specificity – 2), (c) Efficacy Needs for Teacher Education (Ideological Preparation – 1), and Findings in Teacher Efficacy Studies (Psychological Connectedness – 1). Table 20 provides a graphic depiction of prospective efficacy findings from Rafael’s individual interviews.

Table 20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superordinate Category</th>
<th>Subordinate Category</th>
<th>Frequency—Rafael</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information Sources</td>
<td>Mastery Experiences</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vicarious Experiences</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Verbal Persuasion</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychological States</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collective Efficacy</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy Needs for</td>
<td>Outcome Expectancy</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban School Contexts</td>
<td>Developmental Propensity</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dispositions (All students can learn)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Context-specificity</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Systems of Support</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy Needs for</td>
<td>Diversity/Special</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Education</td>
<td>Ideological Preparation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings in Teacher</td>
<td>Problem Anticipation</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy Studies</td>
<td>Psychological connectedness</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Set of values and ideologies</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Calling</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data Source: Individual Interviews*
When asked how teachers become effective, Rafael posits that teachers need to have had examples of effectiveness in their schooling. However, he qualifies his position, maintaining that some teachers are unable to achieve the level of effectiveness that they desire. When asked to give an example of what he means, Rafael answers,

Like some teachers want to teach, but sometimes they have a soft voice… so they can’t… Or, sometimes, they want to teach, and they don’t know their material as well, like, like subs. Subs, they go into a class, but they don’t know the materials well, so they’re basically in there…

When pressed further, Rafael reverts to the basics; i.e., “Um [pause] like I said before, you know, establish your classroom rules. Once you have your classroom rules down, make sure everybody follows them, and, humm, make sure you’re basically teaching effectively with the voice of authority.” Additional dialogue on the topic of the ways in which teachers become effective concluded with Rafael stating that a former teacher and his mother, who teaches Spanish at the university, took it upon themselves to learn what they needed independently.

Well, she [mother] basically took her own time to basically learn the subject. ‘Cause as it, being a teacher is a fulltime job; it’s not just at school, after school you need to go over stuff, make sure…you don’t just go over the next day’s stuff; you go over the next week and week and know your subject by memory, not just by book.

This response alludes to Rafael’s belief that information sources including role models and performance accomplishments are important to being an effective teacher.
Interestingly, Rafael makes no mention of formal education as a means to teacher effectiveness.

**Monique.** I coded Monique’s responses to individual interview questions related to Prospective Efficacy in superordinate categories (a) Information Sources (Mastery Experiences/Performance Accomplishments – 5; Vicarious Experiences – 1), (b) Efficacy Needs for Urban School Contexts (Context Specificity – 3), and (c) Efficacy Needs for Teacher Education (Ideological Preparation – 3). Table 21 provides a graphic depiction of prospective efficacy findings from Monique’s individual interviews.

Table 21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superordinate Category</th>
<th>Subordinate Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information Sources</td>
<td>Mastery Experiences</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vicarious Experiences</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Verbal Persuasion</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychological States</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collective Efficacy</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy Needs for Urban School Contexts</td>
<td>Outcome Expectancy</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developmental Propensity</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dispositions (All students can learn)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Context-specificity</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Systems of Support</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy Needs for Teacher Education</td>
<td>Diversity/Special</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ideological Preparation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings in Teacher Efficacy Studies</td>
<td>Problem Anticipation</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychological connectedness</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Set of values and ideologies</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Calling</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Data Source: Individual Interviews*

In continuing the conversation regarding teacher effectiveness, Monique states that teachers become effective by practicing and making changes when needed, “No (not every teacher starts out as a good teacher), it’s like they practice like, they learn from their mistakes, like, they teach a different way, they try to switch it up so they can learn and…” Monique comments suggest further that she sees teaching effectiveness as a
matter of trial and error, through which teachers attain mastery. If one method or strategy
doesn’t ‘work’, then try something different, thus perfecting the craft of teaching.

**Luis.** I coded Luis’s responses to individual interview questions related to
Prospective Efficacy in superordinate categories (a) Information Sources (Mastery
Experiences/Performance Accomplishments – 3; Vicarious Experiences – 1;
Psychological States), (b) Efficacy Needs for Urban School Contexts (Context Specificity
– 2), (c) Efficacy Needs for Teacher Education (Ideological Preparation – 2), and (d)
Findings in Teacher Efficacy Studies (Psychological Connectedness – 1). Table 22
provides a graphic depiction of prospective efficacy findings from Luis’s individual
interviews

Table 22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superordinate Category</th>
<th>Subordinate Category</th>
<th>Frequency—Luis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information Sources</td>
<td>Mastery Experiences</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vicarious Experiences</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Verbal Persuasion</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychological States</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collective Efficacy</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy Needs for</td>
<td>Outcome Expectancy</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban School Contexts</td>
<td>Developmental Propensity</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dispositions (All students can learn)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Context-specificity</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Systems of Support</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy Needs for</td>
<td>Diversity/Special</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Education</td>
<td>Ideological Preparation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings in Teacher</td>
<td>Problem Anticipation</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy Studies</td>
<td>Psychological connectedness</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Set of values and ideologies</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Calling</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: *Data Source: Individual Interviews

Luis answers that teachers have to want to become a teacher in the first place in
order to be successful in the UTA program. When asked how entering the program for
the ‘wrong’ reasons might adversely influence UTA students’ success, Luis responds,
It’ll keep them from being successful, because if they don’t like children and they choose a career, they chose this career, then it’d be kind of difficult for them. ‘Cause then it, they wouldn’t really have fun and they’ll like basically be sad…will be, mad and bored and the students will have to suffer ‘cause of it.

In other words, teachers have to want to teach, and wanting to teach facilitates enactment of the roles and responsibilities associated with teaching. Moreover, teacher dissatisfaction will negatively impact teacher performance, which will place students at a disadvantage.

Raul. I coded Raul’s responses to individual interview questions related to Prospective Efficacy in superordinate categories (a) Information Sources (Mastery Experiences/Performance Accomplishments – 3; Psychological States – 1), (b) Efficacy Needs for Urban School Contexts (Outcome Expectancy – 2; Context Specificity – 2), (c) Efficacy Needs for Teacher Education (Ideological Preparation – 4), and Findings in Teacher Efficacy Studies (Psychological Connectedness – 2). Table 23 provides a graphic depiction of prospective efficacy findings from Raul’s individual interviews.

Raul states that if he decides to pursue a teaching career, he will teach high school. When asked about the types of community and students that he believes that he will be effective in working with, Raul responds,

I was, like… It’s like I, I’d try to like start low and then go up high. I’d like, I’d probably start in the urban section and [pause] go to a suburb and then back to urban, then probably rural, um…It just…I just be skipping around.

To my follow-up question as to what he thinks of when he thinks of an urban community or school, Raul replies,
I think that urban is harder to motivate students than a, than a less packed school.

It’s like… Less… Like more… Like in an urban school, there’s more gossip and more, more things, more things going around than a, than a suburban school. It’s like… how can I say? There’s more things going on in an urban school. That’s what I’m trying to say.

Table 23

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superordinate Category</th>
<th>Subordinate Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information Sources</td>
<td>Mastery Experiences</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vicarious Experiences</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Verbal Persuasion</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychological States</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collective Efficacy</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy Needs for Urban School Contexts</td>
<td>Outcome Expectancy</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developmental Propensity</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dispositions (All students can learn)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Context-specificity</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Systems of Support</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy Needs for Teacher Education</td>
<td>Diversity/Special</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ideological Preparation</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings in Teacher Efficacy Studies</td>
<td>Problem Anticipation</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychological connectedness</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Set of values and ideologies</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Calling</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data Source: Individual Interviews

Comments regarding the difficulty of motivating students in urban schools and the many things that ‘go on’ in urban school contexts denote Raul’s perceptions regarding specialized skill-sets needed by teachers in urban settings.

**Jackie.** I coded Jackie’s responses to individual interview questions related to Prospective Efficacy in superordinate categories (a) Information Sources (Mastery Experiences/Performance Accomplishments – 5; Verbal Persuasion – 1), (b) Efficacy Needs for Urban School Contexts (Outcome Expectancy – 2; Context Specificity – 2) and Findings in Teacher Efficacy Studies (Psychological Connectedness – 3). Table 24 provides a graphic depiction of prospective efficacy findings from Felecia’s individual
interviews.

Table 24

Prospective Efficacy Superordinate and Subordinate Category Response* Frequency—Jackie

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superordinate Category</th>
<th>Subordinate Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information Sources</td>
<td>Mastery Experiences</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vicarious Experiences</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Verbal Persuasion</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychological States</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collective Efficacy</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy Needs for Urban School Contexts</td>
<td>Outcome Expectancy</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developmental Propensity</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dispositions (All students can learn)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Context-specificity</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Systems of Support</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy Needs for Teacher Education</td>
<td>Diversity/Special</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ideological Preparation</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings in Teacher Efficacy Studies</td>
<td>Problem Anticipation</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychological connectedness</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Set of values and ideologies</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Calling</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data Source: Individual Interviews

Jackie states that both effective and ineffective teachers influenced her decision to become a teacher. On one hand, Jackie helped other students in class after finishing assignments early. Some teachers acknowledged this by allowing Jackie to work with others and by encouraging her to become a teacher. On the other hand, Jackie responds that she learned from teachers with whom she experienced problems. Jackie responds,

I had a lot of teachers that influenced me to become a teacher, because I help others while in class, so they like, ‘Oh, you’re really good;’ but, then again, I also had some teachers that also influenced me because they would like never, I bumped heads with them like every day. So, they also influenced me, ‘cause I feel like a teacher shouldn’t really bump heads with a student alot, because they do, they know… And I also had some other teachers that also influenced me, because I feel like if your whole class is doing a bad job, you’re not doing something right in your job. And that’s what made me become a teacher.
Hence, Jackie interprets poor achievement and/or student conduct as indicators of poor teacher performance.

**Erica.** I coded Erica’s responses to individual interview questions related to Prospective Efficacy in superordinate category of (a) Information Sources (Mastery Experiences/Performance Accomplishments – 3; Vicarious Experiences – 1; Psychological States – 1), and (b) Efficacy Needs for Urban School Contexts, Context Specificity (2). Table 25 provides a graphic depiction of prospective efficacy findings from Erica’s individual interviews.

Table 25

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superordinate Category</th>
<th>Subordinate Category</th>
<th>Frequency—Erica</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information Sources</td>
<td>Mastery Experiences</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vicarious Experiences</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Verbal Persuasion</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychological States</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collective Efficacy</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy Needs for Urban School Contexts</td>
<td>Outcome Expectancy</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developmental Propensity</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dispositions (All students can learn)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Context-specificity</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Systems of Support</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy Needs for Teacher Education</td>
<td>Diversity/Special</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ideological Preparation</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings in Teacher Efficacy Studies</td>
<td>Problem Anticipation</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychological connectedness</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Set of values and ideologies</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Calling</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** *Data Source: Individual Interviews

Erica confesses that her experiences in UTA have resulted in deeper understandings of the challenges involved in teaching.

I never knew teaching was so hard until you get into the classroom and you’re like, ‘Oh, my gosh. [UTA teacher’s name],” and what they’re doing, you have to look, and he’s telling you like, “It’s a teacher-ful experience,” and I love it.
Successful, positive experiences associated with UTA activities have helped to strengthen Erica’s commitment to teaching. As Erica says, “I wanna complete it ‘cause I think I really wanna become a teacher now. I’m gonna complete my four years.” Erica mentions aspects to urban schooling that appeal to her,

I would teach in an urban school, because it’s required; but then again, at a public school—not to be funny, kids are kind of stuck up—so it’s like, since your mom paid for it, I have to do this and I have to do that as a teacher. But I don’t wanna be like stuck on the curriculum so much. I wanna be like a fun teacher. So, a fun teacher can actually do that in the urban setting.

Moreover, Erica states that she thinks of an urban school as one where, “The kids are more relaxed and it’s a diversity school.” This response suggests that Erica sees urban school contexts as conducive to her future teaching style.

**Reflective Journal Comments on Prospective Efficacy**

I present in the following subsections, findings in terms of response frequencies and brief commentary for each participant (n=8) in the area of prospective efficacy. Although nine students returned assent and consent documents, Monique did not attend school on each of the seven days of data collection. Additionally, Raul experienced the life-changing event of his father’s death and did not attend school on the final days of data collection; as a result, Raul did not complete journal responses for Prompts #5, #6, and #7. Although I followed-up with absent students to complete missed prompts, I made a judgment call, in consultation with the UTA teacher, that such a request would have been inappropriate in Raul’s case.

**Felecia.** I coded Felecia’s responses to reflective journal prompts related to
Prospective Efficacy in superordinate categories of (a) Information Sources (Performance Accomplishments – 2; Vicarious Experience - 2), (b) Efficacy Needs for Urban School Contexts (Outcome Expectancy – 3; Dispositions – 4; Context-specificity – 3), and (c) Findings in Teacher Efficacy Studies (Psychological Connectedness – 1; Values and Ideologies – 3). Table 26 provides a graphic depiction of prospective efficacy findings from Felecia’s reflective journal responses.

Table 26

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superordinate Category</th>
<th>Subordinate Category</th>
<th>Frequency—Felecia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information Sources</td>
<td>Mastery Experiences</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vicarious Experiences</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Verbal Persuasion</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychological States</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collective Efficacy</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy Needs for</td>
<td>Outcome Expectancy</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban School Contexts</td>
<td>Developmental Propensity</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dispositions (All students can learn)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Context-specificity</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Systems of Support</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy Needs for Teacher Education</td>
<td>Diversity/Special</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ideological Preparation</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings in Teacher Efficacy Studies</td>
<td>Problem Anticipation</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychological connectedness</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Set of values and ideologies</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Calling</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *Data Source: Reflective Journal

Felecia makes numerable comments relative to efficacy needs for urban school contexts. Her comments suggest a dichotomy between her understandings of an urban school and her beliefs regarding the characteristics of students who attend urban schools. For example, Felicia states that urban schools in comparison to other schools “are not as fortunate,” students in urban schools “may not have the relationship with teachers so that they can get what they have missed,” and “…there may be a large population of African Americans but that doesn’t make the school dangerous at all.” Felecia continues, “At our school we have plenty African American dance, theatre arts, and band majors and that
has nothing to do with who they are or the color of their skin so urban schools are often underestimated.” On one hand, Felecia points to the shortcomings of urban schools. On the other hand, she suggests that these shortcomings don’t necessarily lead to poorer outcomes for student in urban schools. She sees her school as an example of students in urban schools having opportunities to participate in the magnet program. However, she also believes that teachers in urban schools need more “patience and understanding because the student may come from a low background” and she will have to tread carefully when speaking with students as “some conversations should be either avoided or not brought up because of different religious backgrounds.” Felecia appears to have a conflicted view of how to deal with various dimensions of diversity in urban school contexts.

**Rafael.** I coded Rafael’s responses to reflective journal prompts related to Prospective Efficacy in superordinate categories of (a) Information Sources (Performance Accomplishments – 1), (b) Efficacy Needs for Urban School Contexts (Outcome Expectancy – 1; Dispositions – 1; Context-specificity – 1), and (c) Findings in Efficacy Studies (Psychological Connectedness – 1; Values and Ideologies – 6). Table 27 provides a graphic depiction of prospective efficacy findings from Rafael’s reflective journal responses.

Rafael makes a number of statements alluding to his values and ideologies concerning teaching. On one hand, Rafael states that, “Following the curriculum is key because it’s how you get done teaching all you need to teach in the one year they give you.” On the other hand, although it’s important to follow the curriculum, “…if you have extra time, as an educator, use it wisely to explain the subject matter a bit more careful so
students get it. You know, give alternate ways of getting the same results, give examples, and so on.” Rafael’s position regarding adhering to the curriculum seems to contrast with his position,

It is a fact of life that not all students can learn. We, as teachers, try to make learning possible for all students but there are always slower learners and just students that won’t want to learn at all. And with the ‘No Child Left Behind’ law we have to teach those that don’t want to learn.

Table 27

Prospective Efficacy Superordinate and Subordinate Category Response* Frequency—Rafael

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superordinate Category</th>
<th>Subordinate Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information Sources</td>
<td>Mastery Experiences</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vicarious Experiences</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Verbal Persuasion</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychological States</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collective Efficacy</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy Needs for Urban School Contexts</td>
<td>Outcome Expectancy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developmental Propensity</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dispositions (All students can learn)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Context-specificity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Systems of Support</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy Needs for Teacher Education</td>
<td>Diversity/Special</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ideological Preparation</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings in Teacher Efficacy Studies</td>
<td>Problem Anticipation</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychological connectedness</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Set of values and ideologies</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Calling</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data Source: Reflective Journal

Furthermore, Rafael asserts that he will “ignore the students that don’t want to learn and teach to the students that are in my class for a purpose.” Rafael’s beliefs in the technical aspects of teaching appear to apply here in that he will teach what he has to teach, but will focus on those students that want to learn or track students according to whether or not they want to learn.

If I see they are trying to learn but are slower that the others, I would just move them to a lower level class like honors or regular instead of an AP class. But if
they just don’t want to learn or are showing no interest in the subject, I would ignore them and their grades would suffer from it.

**Luis.** I coded Luis’s responses to reflective journal prompts related to Prospective Efficacy in superordinate categories of (a) Information Sources (Performance Accomplishments – 1), (b) Efficacy Needs for Urban School Contexts (Dispositions – 1; Context-specificity – 1), (c) Efficacy Needs for Teacher Education (Ideological Preparation – 1), and (d) Findings in Teacher Efficacy Studies (Values and Ideologies – 2). Table 28 provides a graphic depiction of prospective efficacy findings from Luis’s reflective journal responses.

Table 28

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superordinate Category</th>
<th>Subordinate Category</th>
<th>Frequency—Luis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information Sources</td>
<td>Mastery Experiences</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vicarious Experiences</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Verbal Persuasion</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychological States</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collective Efficacy</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy Needs for</td>
<td>Outcome Expectancy</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban School Contexts</td>
<td>Developmental Propensity</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dispositions (All students can learn)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Context-specificity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Systems of Support</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy Needs for</td>
<td>Diversity/Special</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Education</td>
<td>Ideological Preparation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings in Teacher</td>
<td>Problem Anticipation</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy Studies</td>
<td>Psychological connectedness</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Set of values and ideologies</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Calling</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* *Data Source: Reflective Journal*

In terms of prospective efficacy, Luis relies upon mastery experiences/performance accomplishments as an information source. He states that mathematics is his best subject; therefore, he will be able to help his students in mathematics. Luis plans to teach kindergarten. However, he states that experiential opportunities provided through the UTA are helping him to decide whether he will
pursue certification for teaching kindergarteners. Luis states,

First the UTA has given me experience with kindergarteners so I know what to expect with them. We go to (names of schools) and we teach K-3 for (community service organization), which gave me lessons, and I must teach them and how to do it. I want to teach kindergarteners so I am getting the hand on experience now to see if I still want to teach them.

Hence, Luis refers to specific contextual factors; i.e., grade level and urban school, which influence his feelings of efficacy for these contexts and his decisions about teaching.

**Raul.** I coded Raul’s responses to reflective journal prompts related to Prospective Efficacy in superordinate categories of (a) Information Sources (Dispositions – 1; Context-specificity - 2), (b) Efficacy Needs for Teacher Education (Ideological Preparation – 1), and (c) Findings in Teacher Efficacy Studies (Values and Ideologies – 2). Table 29 provides a graphic depiction of prospective efficacy findings from Raul’s reflective journal responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 29</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prospective Efficacy Superordinate and Subordinate Category Response</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Superordinate Category</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy Needs for Teacher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings in Teacher Efficacy Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: *Data Source: Reflective Journal
Raul sees the teaching as a rules-driven profession. What can and cannot be done is all in the rule book. Every teacher should read the rules so that if any situation pops up, for example, a student harasses you or a student misbehaving in class, what is a teacher to do? Raul discusses that teachers should know what actions they can take in given situations, and by knowing the extent of their authority, teachers will maintain their integrity and will be successful in their jobs. He states, 

Most of the time, the people who recognize their powers and restraints in their fields is when they proceed to do well in the careers, acknowledging that just because a student curses at you or threatens to hit doesn’t mean you have the right to react in an unprofessional way.

Raul believes that teachers must uphold certain standards of practice in order to be successful. These standards are stated in the teacher handbook, according to Raul, and teachers who are “ethical, liable, and understanding” will operate effectively with the parameters established within the rules.

Jackie. I coded Jackie’s responses to reflective journal prompts related to Prospective Efficacy in superordinate categories of (a) Information Sources (Performance Accomplishments – 1), (b) Efficacy Needs for Urban School Contexts (Outcome Expectancy – 1; Dispositions – 1; Context-specificity – 1), (c) Efficacy Needs for Teacher Education (Ideological Preparation – 1), and (d) Findings in Teacher Efficacy Studies (Psychological Connectedness – 1; Values and Ideologies – 2). Table 30 provides a graphic depiction of prospective efficacy findings from Jackie’s reflective journal responses.

Jackie clearly considers teachers’ use of a variety of teaching methods to be an
asset. Additionally, she states that she is good at mathematics so she will be able to teach mathematics to others. Jackie testifies, “...no matter how hard math is I understand it and I can explain it to other without a problem and I really don’t have a strategy it just come naturally.” She believes that she will be able to teach mathematics to her students based on her personal mastery of the subject. Although Jackie has stated she will teach according to the learning needs of her students, she admits that she will be less effective in “reading, lecturing, and listening” when she becomes a teacher. Her perspective shifts from teacher to student as she discusses the topic of teacher effectiveness. For example,

Another thing is lecturing; I see it just like reading. I can’t pay attention when someone talking or trying to explain something without showing me because it will go in one ear and out the other like blah blah blah is all I hear.

Jackie merges beliefs about her personal learning style with beliefs regarding her facility to teach in future contexts.

Table 30

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superordinate Category</th>
<th>Subordinate Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information Sources</td>
<td>Mastery Experiences</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vicarious Experiences</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Verbal Persuasion</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychological States</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collective Efficacy</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy Needs for</td>
<td>Outcome Expectancy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban School Contexts</td>
<td>Developmental Propensity</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dispositions (All students can learn)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Context-specificity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Systems of Support</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy Needs for</td>
<td>Diversity/Special</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Education</td>
<td>Ideological Preparation</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings in Teacher</td>
<td>Problem Anticipation</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy Studies</td>
<td>Psychological connectedness</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Set of values and ideologies</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Calling</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data Source: Reflective Journal
Erica. I coded Erica’s responses to reflective journal prompts related to Prospective Efficacy in superordinate categories of (a) Information Sources (Performance Accomplishments – 1), (b) Efficacy Needs for Urban School Contexts (Outcome Expectancy – 9; Developmental Propensity – 1; Dispositions – 1; Context-specificity – 1), and (c) Findings in Teacher Efficacy Studies (Problem Anticipation – 1; Values and Ideologies – 5). Table 31 provides a graphic depiction of prospective efficacy findings from Erica’s reflective journal responses.

Table 31

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superordinate Category</th>
<th>Subordinate Category</th>
<th>Frequency—Erica</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information Sources</td>
<td>Mastery Experiences</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vicarious Experiences</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Verbal Persuasion</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychological States</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collective Efficacy</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy Needs for Urban School Contexts</td>
<td>Outcome Expectancy</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developmental Propensity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dispositions (All students can learn)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Context-specificity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Systems of Support</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy Needs for Teacher Education</td>
<td>Diversity/Special</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ideological Preparation</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings in Teacher Efficacy Studies</td>
<td>Problem Anticipation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychological connectedness</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Set of values and ideologies</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Calling</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *Data Source: Reflective Journal

Erica conveys a positive outlook on her future teacher self, stating, “Becoming a teacher, I’m looking forward to all the positive things. I’m going to make sure these things happen.” Her ways of making sure that she will be her (my) “students’ favorite teacher” will be to draw from her strengths; i.e., “Lecture, assignments, and notes are three areas I feel I will accomplish best.” Erica references preparation as critical to effective teaching, as in, “Knowing the knowledge before you teach the lesson is very helpful…Study the lesson before you teach it so you can show the students you’re
capable of being the teacher.” She will study the content as well as rehearse delivery of instruction, “Lecturing to my class won’t be boring. I practiced at home to my children and husband how I was going to do it in front of the class.” Moreover, Erica will implement practices that she believes will ensure students’ learning; in one example, using “manipulatives” as part of instruction.

Giving assignments helps me help them have fun during the lesson. The assignments can be done with candy or cell phones or anything that they may use that make the assignment better for them so that they can comprehend. This skill will help them remember what I’m teaching.

Erica clearly believes that she will be able to access tools that will facilitate learning when she becomes a teacher.

**Josef.** I coded Josef’s responses to reflective journal prompts related to Prospective Efficacy in superordinate categories of (a) Efficacy Needs for Urban Education (Systems of Support – 1), and (b) Findings in Teacher Efficacy Studies (Psychological Connectedness – 1; Values and Ideologies -1; Calling to Teach – 1). Table 32 provides a graphic depiction of prospective efficacy findings from Josef’s reflective journal responses.

Josef states that he is:

the type of person who loves to work with kids and talk to them, motivate them, lead them into becoming a somebody in today’s society and basically, I just want to be one of the best African American male teachers to influence other young African Americans.
Table 32

Prospective Efficacy Superordinate and Subordinate Category Response* Frequency—Josef

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superordinate Category</th>
<th>Subordinate Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information Sources</td>
<td>Mastery Experiences</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vicarious Experiences</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Verbal Persuasion</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychological States</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collective Efficacy</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy Needs for Urban School Contexts</td>
<td>Outcome Expectancy</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developmental Propensity</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dispositions (All students can learn)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Context-specificity</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Systems of Support</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy Needs for Teacher Education</td>
<td>Diversity/Special</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ideological Preparation</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings in Teacher Efficacy Studies</td>
<td>Problem Anticipation</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychological connectedness</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Set of values and ideologies</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Calling</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *Data Source: Reflective Journal

He places some responsibility for students’ learning on parents, families and communities, stating that he has observed students at his high school who “don’t cooperate…they act like they don’t want to learn but they really do.” Continuing, Josef summons the adage that parents are the first teachers. “So it’s up to them first to have a desire to help them (students) realize that the only way of life is education and once that is imputed in them, then it will come out in the classroom.” Although he states what teachers should know and do in identical phraseology throughout his reflections (e.g., copy and paste, add tidbit), Josef mentions no specific ways that he will perform his responsibilities as a teacher. The lack of specificity by Josef leaves little room for parsing his comments regarding his prospective efficacy beliefs. Josef may have taken this approach because this is his first year in UTA.

Asiah. I coded Asiah’s responses to reflective journal prompts related to
Prospective Efficacy in superordinate categories of (a) Information Sources (Performance Accomplishments – 2; Vicarious Experiences – 3), (b) Efficacy Needs for Urban School Contexts (Outcome Expectancy – 4; Dispositions – 5; and Context-specificity – 6), and (c) Findings in Teacher Efficacy Studies (Values and Ideologies – 5). Table 33 provides a graphic depiction of prospective efficacy findings from Asiah’s reflective journal responses.

Values and ideology figure prominently in Asiah’s reflections. For instance, her comments regarding what she looks forward to in teaching, highlight Asiah’s beliefs’ that teachers can contribute significantly to students’ lives.

I want to open their eyes to new concepts and to broaden their minds. To shine light on ideas they may not have thought of before, and if so, dig deeper into it and have a better understanding or to consider the possibilities.

Table 33

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superordinate Category</th>
<th>Subordinate Category</th>
<th>Frequency—Asiah</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information Sources</td>
<td>Mastery Experiences</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vicarious Experiences</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Verbal Persuasion</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychological States</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collective Efficacy</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy Needs for Urban School Contexts</td>
<td>Outcome Expectancy</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developmental Propensity</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dispositions (All students can learn)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Context-specificity</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Systems of Support</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy Needs for Teacher Education</td>
<td>Diversity/Special</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ideological Preparation</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings in Teacher Efficacy Studies</td>
<td>Problem Anticipation</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychological connectedness</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Set of values and ideologies</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Calling</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data Source: Reflective Journal

Asiah continues to index the ways in which she, as a teacher, will expand the horizons, if you will, for her students. Going beyond her ideas regarding transmission of knowledge,
Asiah shares her desire to serve as a motivating factor for students to enjoy attending school as well as to gain from attendance.

I would like to be a teacher to see if I could get through to students that may not have been understood or looked over. I want to teach them so that they have a deep understanding of things and don’t just sit in class watching the clock tick nodding and pretending they know what’s going on.

Asiah relies on personal knowledge sources such as experiences as a student in determining that she will be effective in “having patience, being heard, and making everyone involved.” Similarly, personal schooling experiences inform also her belief that she will be least effective in “classroom management, keeping lessons exciting, and helping them (students) with concepts I’m not too sure of myself.” Asiah comments that some personality traits such as being patient with others will be helpful to her as a teacher, while other traits such as being a “pushover” may be a hindrance to her as a teacher. Moreover, she states, “Also all through my school life I have been used to taking notes every single day and being lectured so I think it will be kind of hard to be creative with lessons every single day.” This statement accentuates the possibility that Asiah will have to balance dissension between her student-self and her teacher-self upon entering the profession.

**Cross-Case Synthesis of Findings**

This section presents a cross-case synthesis of findings. In studies with multiple cases, cross-case analysis provides a straightforward, means to address the intricacies of large datasets while strengthening the rigor of analysis (Yin, 2009). The structure of this study, wherein each participant served as the unit of analysis, with each participant
functioning individually as an embedded case within the whole case, created an ideal situation for conduct of a cross-case synthesis (Yin, 2009). The process of structurally coding data from each level of interviews; i.e., pilot focus group, pilot individual interviews, and reflective journals, in light of the research questions, allowed for close examination of meaning-making by participants through multiple iterations. Granted, cross-case syntheses rely heavily upon “argumentative interpretation”; hence, the review of literature regarding core concepts under investigation in this study, teacher identity and prospective efficacy, serves as the linchpin for each level of analyses and identification of themes (Yin, 2009, p. 160).

I identified three areas of concern that, in addition to the literature, guided my thinking in this study. These areas include special circumstances related to the dual nature of participants’ lives as students and as precollegiate student teachers, which positioned participants to make sense simultaneously of dual contexts. Additionally, I was concerned with whether the UTA would provide a setting for participants to develop identity capital for becoming teachers or if, in contrast, a bureaucratic agenda for the program might undermine identity formation by participants (Beauchamp & Thomas, 2009; Cote, 1996; ten Dam & Blom, 2006). The extent to which participation in the UTA would prove either beneficial or detrimental to teacher identity formation, prospective efficacy and commitment to the profession by providing participants with advance exposure to the accoutrements associated with working in urban settings was also of major concern going into the study (Beauchamp & Thomas, 2009; Beijaard et al., 2004; Beijaard et al., 2000; Day et al., 2006; Ellsasser, 2008; Geisel & Meijers, 2005; Smarorinsky et al., 2003). These concerns, together with the literature, informed my
I will discuss the most salient findings in this cross-case synthesis. As noted in the first section of this chapter, important findings for the first research question under investigation, “How do UTA students’ views of teacher identity, or what it means to be a teacher, develop within dual contexts of lived experiences as high school students and precollegiate student teachers,” occur primarily in the superordinate categories of Self and Lay Theories. I will discuss details regarding specific findings across cases in each area. The second research question investigated in this study, “In what ways do UTA students develop “prospective efficacy” beliefs, or the belief in their capabilities to fulfill teaching roles and responsibilities in the future?” rendered important findings in each superordinate category. Therefore, I will provide in-depth discussion of cross-case findings for Information Sources, Efficacy Needs for Urban Contexts. The synthesis presents common threads that emerged from the data. Additionally, I present additional themes as abstractions based on my sense making as researcher.

**Teacher Identity and Self**

Participants’ comments denote the major role that self plays in teacher identity formation. Most notable is the prevalence of knowledge sources in participants’ meaning making processes. The literature supports self as a central locus for teacher identity formation. In fact, definitions of teacher identity generally consign ‘self’ as the genesis of meaning making within a multifaceted construction of teacher identity (Akkerman & Meijer, 2011; Beauchamp & Thomas, 2009; Beijaard et al. 2004; Brown, 2006; Flores & Day, 2006; Geijsel & Meijers, 2005; Hamman et al., 2010; Malderez et al. 2007; Rodgers & Scott, 2008). In this study, participants’ responses suggest that they made meaning of
what it means to be a teacher primarily from personal, sociocultural, historical and political knowledge sources within dual contexts as students and as precollegiate student teachers. Examples of meaning-making based upon whether participants were closer to either activating or transforming into a teacher self were noted also, albeit to a lesser degree. Intermingling of participants’ perspectives as students and as precollegiate student teachers appears throughout the multiple discourse pathways used in the study.

**Teacher influence spans from individuals to society.** Participants’ meaning making regarding self stemmed from global views of teachers as models for civilized society, as well as to directly personal, individual understandings, wherein they experienced teachers who inspired, encouraged, and motivated them as students. For example, Rafael referred to his mother, who is a teacher, as an influential figure,

They [parents] never really talked to me about becoming a teacher, since, before, I wanted to become a computer engineer and studying computer science…but after I, I looked at my mom as a sort of hard worker, and she basically really inspired me that once you got something down, you know, go for it, so… I really saw her and basically said, you know, I like the teaching field. I see how, how much helping people has done for her, so I really wanna do the same. …Um, yeah, she really is (happy that he is in UTA). She thinks of herself as a, sort of influence towards me, and I told her that, ‘cause some kids go to her, and, basically, they talk to her, even, even after the years of her teaching them. They basically go back to them as a, you know, mentor, or whatnot.

Luis spoke of a teacher who recognized and acknowledged his potential, noting this teacher as an example of effectiveness,
Well, my, my teacher, he was, he was amazing – this was through my fifth grade year. He’s the one that helped me go into, um, teaching. Everything like he went through and he taught us like, he knew I wanted to be a safety patrol, so I worked hard to go and like prove myself to be one of those people, so whenever I did that, he showed me that I have to work hard for what I want, and all those different things. How I have to, have to answer to myself…Yeah. He also taught very well. The main thing I liked most was how he taught mathematics… Yes, I actually learned [laugh].

These comments underscore participants’ knowledge reference points concerning teacher identity stemming first from a narrow individual lens and expanding to broader global lens. In a way, participants’ individual views can be collapsed into global perspectives as they tended to view teachers as essential to the future of their students, and in turn, to society.

**Constructing teachers as the other.** As high school students and precollegiate student teachers, participants maintained a future-oriented stance towards teachers and their work. The evolutionary track of teacher identity among participants derived from a combination of practical, theoretical, and experiential knowledge gained through the UTA program. Hence, although participants have formal understandings of what it means to be a teacher, these understandings remain proximate to development of self, yet distal to development of a teacher self (Geijsel & Meijers, 2005; Rodgers & Scott, 2008). For instance, when asked how the program was faring, Rafael stated that some added components to the UTA program were unexpected, but were needed,
Right now the program is going pretty smoothly, but since it’s a pretty new program, there’s some curves being thrown in there, like the whole technology side of it, which it’s not bad. It’s good ‘cause, you know, as teachers we need to teach, but as basically, as society is moving on with technology, and we need to be able to use that.

Moreover, comments such as, “Yes, they are important because teachers help in the process of learning. They help us understand, like, what we need to know for the future,” as stated by Erica, demonstrate participants’ lens for viewing teachers’ role in society. Note that Erica refers to teachers as “they”, whereas Rafael refers to “we” when discussing teachers needing to use technology, denoting that these students may have been at different stages of either activating or transforming into a teacher self. At least in Erica’s eyes, teachers are the other, an identity to attain. However, Rafael makes an identity claim as a teacher, by including himself as a teacher rather than referring to teachers as a separate entity (Akkerman & Meijer, 2011; Cohen, 2008; Smarorinsky et al., 2003). This brings the analysis to consideration of whether participants are gaining identity capital as teachers in terms of lay theories regarding teacher identity.

**Teacher Identity and Lay Theories**

Scholars have noted that knowledge sources other than formal education inform preservice teachers’, in this case including study participants, conceptualizations regarding teacher identity (Holt-Reynolds, 1992; Lortie, 1974; Sugrue, 1997). Cote (1996, p.425) proposes “identity capital” as a more comprehensive model (in comparison to human capital and cultural capital) of the type of capital needed by citizens to realize social status goals in current historical contexts, explaining,
The key is for the individual to form and sustain an identity pragmatically situated in a social/occupational matrix. Accordingly, the individual invests in a certain identity (or identities) and engages in a series of exchanges at the level of identity with other actors. To do this in a complex, shifting social milieu requires certain cognitive skills and personality attributes that are not imparted by human or cultural capital, and are certainly not imparted by mass/public educational systems. With this portfolio, an individual should be in a much better position to move at will through the dimensions of place and space in the late-modern world (cf., Giddens, 1991), and may do so by engaging in tactics like self-monitoring (Snyder, 1974) and using situated identities (i.e. adjusting one’s behaviors to suit those of others in particular situations; cf., Gecas and Burke, 1995).

This description alludes also to the inadequacy of formal education solely to prepare individuals to accomplish their goals in society. Participants noted various dimensions of teacher identity that may constitute the identity capital attributed to teaching. One prevalent area mentioned by participants concerns what teachers actually do in their roles as teachers.

**Teaching improves with practice.** Participants made multiple references to writing and implementing lesson plans, managing students’ behavior in the classroom, and delivering direct instruction. As an illustration, when asked which activities participants enjoyed most as students in the UTA program, Felecia responded,

> Um, the fact that we are able to, like, go… Like, we’re able, we’re actually able to go and teach in elementary schools, we’ve taught here, um, we’ve taught our own classes, we’ve made up our own lesson plans – that we, we’re actually
getting the real feel of being a teacher. Like, we’ve, we’ve had our, um…

We’ve, we’ve done evaluations. We get, we get feedback, whether good or bad. Similarly, Raul, Rafael, Monique, Jackie, Luis, and Erica each indicated satisfaction with experiential opportunities provided by the UTA program. Raul reiterated Felecia’s contention that these experiences gave participants authentic teaching exposure, “I enjoy doing activities with the (community service organization) because it gives us, um, opportunity to actually go into the classroom and see what it’s really like to be a teacher.” Jackie added humor to the topic when she explained that although she enjoyed the classroom practica experiences, she and her classmates encountered difficulties with a class of third-graders during the last practicum experience. When I asked her how it had gone, Jackie stated,

It kind of went over all right. Yeah, our class was a little bit out of control and…

Yes, but the way she (classroom teacher) had it, she wanted us to have, she wanted us to handle how to be able to settle them down, because teachers need to, have to know…So, the, what we used, like the clapping and, you know, sing-along and stuff like that.

I asked whether the tactics worked, to which Jackie replied, “No,” giving us both a chuckle. Erica offered a slightly different perspective on this last practicum experience. Erica stated that her experience went well, as “The third-graders are like more, you know, they’re older and, and…like, I guess ‘cause if they’re older, I like it more. But it was fine.” However, when asked about the group size for UTA students, Erica answered that the UTA students worked in groups of two or three, and “Yeah, ‘cause we really did, we had to help each other a lot. We was like, ‘Oh, my gosh, what to do now?’ So, we, we
needed that group.” Participants’ comments regarding planning and implementing instruction linked to comments regarding the roles and responsibilities of a teacher.

**Teachers control students’ learning.** Participants placed the onus for students’ learning primarily on teachers’ shoulders, viewing it as teachers’ responsibility to “teach their subject” as stated by Rafael, to “make sure you know what you need to know to accomplish everything” as stated by Monique, and to “be able to teach and be prepared and know your subject, so that you can give the students what you know” as stated by Raul. According to Jackie, teachers must not only teach as in, “get the students to know the material,” but also, “then once they know it, you gotta make sure they understand it.” Interestingly, Jackie separates knowing from understanding, which I interpreted to mean that in Jackie’s mind, teachers must teach the content and assess student’s understanding of the content. Hence, simple delivery of instruction is not enough to ensure understanding. Teachers must determine that students understand the concepts as well as the content of instruction. Although participants stressed teachers’ responsibilities to plan and implement effective instruction, they also pointed to the interpersonal aspects of teaching as equally important.

**Teachers who care and connect with students get better results.** Making personal connections with students was an additional area for which participants held teachers responsible. Moreover, participants equated the interpersonal strengths of teachers with teacher effectiveness. Erica stated emphatically,

> When you become a teacher, you have to, you have to know your stuff, for one, and for two, you have to be that wonderful teacher that’s like, one they can
remember, you know? I can’t really explain, but you have to be that one that people, that students can remember.

The other participants expressed this sentiment that teachers should inspire, motivate, and encourage students by being both competent and caring. Luis pointed out that teachers should function simultaneously as parent and friend to students.

The role of the teacher should be like a parent. They have to go, they watch over, they mentor all children, but don’t touch ‘em, and make sure they have all the limits, and also, but they have to set high standards for the students so they go and achieve…

Luis went on to say that teachers should listen to students and provide counseling to students with problems. In another example, Felecia stated,

For me, it’s inspiring the students. Inspiring, inspiring a student and helping that student to know that if they feel like they don’t have somebody at home to talk to, if they feel like they’re not able to go to the guidance counselors, they feel like…

Each of the participants included some aspect of interpersonal connectedness in their responses to questions about teacher effectiveness. Rafael spoke poignantly about a teacher that he considered most effective, “He taught me more than just school work. He taught me things about life, things I could relate to, and that really helped me pass on and on…Yeah.” In a final example, Felecia stated that teachers become effective by being able to “know and read their students,” stating further,

I have teachers now that, from day one, they didn’t want a connection with their students, haven’t had a connection with their students. They’ll come in and they’ll give you work, and they just keep on going. Teachers have to, have to not
connect with each and every one, just as might have a personal relationship with each and every one of their students, but have a relationship with your students where your students are able to see you in the hallway and say, ‘Hi, Miss so-and-so, or, uh, you’re, or… As a teacher, be able to see their students in the hallway and say, ‘Hi,’ you know, be able to speak to your students and be able to have that relationship with your students where your students are like, you know, ‘I like that teacher. That teacher is…You know?’ And, and you’re not always gonna have students that like you, but you all wanna just be able to have students to say, ‘Oh, I like that teacher,’ or, ‘I like going to his class.’

Participants repeatedly referred to an ethic of care as essential to teaching, viewing care as a mandate for teachers to be effective.

**Effective teachers demonstrate caring, expertise and versatility.** Participants viewed interpersonal acumen demonstrated by showing care for students as well as passion for the profession as indicators of teacher effectiveness. A number of participants indicated that teachers could be effective only if they were fervent in the desire to teach. Additionally, some students mentioned that teachers become effective through experience; i.e., hands on experience as well as experience of differently competent teachers as students. Erica, one of the participants with a particularly compelling schooling biography based on her self-identified negative experiences, offered the notion that teachers become effective by “being a cool teacher.” I pressed her on this point, asking her what she meant by the statement, to which Erica responded, “I don’t know. Just being an awesome teacher is the only way you can be.” I was determined to obtain a more definitive response on this point because of my prior knowledge about Erica’s
schooling history, so I asked her how the teachers that she had experienced could have become more effective. To this Erica responded,

Well, they could… Okay, that’s a better question. They could have, you know, been more hands-on with their work, so like students can understand more of what they’re, like, more what they’re trying to teach. Or they could be like, um [pause] when they’re teaching something, they can break it down into sections so that students can understand. And when, when you done teaching, ask the student what they’ve learned or how, ‘What did you get out of it?’ or something like that.

Erica’s response suggested that being a “cool” teacher was to her similar to other participants’ beliefs regarding teachers having a passion to teach. When pressed, Erica was able to verbalize specific ways that teachers can be effective.

Monique indicated that teachers can be more effective not only by “practicing” and “learning from their mistakes,” but also by being accountable. She provides an example of a time when she experienced an ineffective teacher,

Um, like [pause] I felt like how he is, he’s like, he give us homework, but it’s like he just tell us to do it. He don’t, we don’t turn it in, so it was like if he let us know that it’s gonna be a grade, he just, just, say, okay, and then a couple weeks later we get a test on homework that we never turned in, so he’ll know if we did it or not.

Monique demonstrates in this response that teachers who require students to complete perfunctory assignments as opposed to assignments where students can demonstrate proficiency on academic standards are, in effect, ineffective. This response also alludes to participants, including Monique, comments that teachers should know their subject area
Effective teachers are passionate about their work. Various participants alluded to deeply rooted passion demonstrated by teachers in terms of the drive shown in meeting day-to-day teaching responsibilities. Passionate teachers do what is necessary to help their students learn. Doing what it takes refers to formal knowledge acquisition as well as on-the-job training through experience. Raul remarked,

First, they need to go to college to learn how to be a teacher and know what a teacher needs to do to [pause] to teach…and they just [pause]…that’s basically it. You needed to go to college and be, and want to do it. You need to want to do it. You’ve gotta want to be a teacher. Have the passion to, for, for people to learn.

I followed-up on this response by asking Raul whether he believed that simply attending college and obtaining teaching credentials would make one an effective teacher. He replied,

Like I say, you need to want to do it. Like the ones who want to do something, will do something better than a person who is forced to do it…You know, it’s like if you want to do it, you’re gonna learn more about it. You’re gonna find a easier and effective way to do it and you basically [pause] look forward to teaching better.

Thus, Raul associates effective teaching with having a level of desire or passion to teach that will serve as a motivating factor for becoming the best. As Jackie puts it, “Well, the teacher I think that got good, because it’s a passion. And if you don’t have passion, I feel like that you’re not really gonna be into your job, right?” Some participants believe that passion propels teachers to seek knowledge and know-how in order to become
increasingly effective.

**Teachers can learn to be effective based on lived experiences as students and as teachers.** Monique and Luis responded that teachers can increase effectiveness by drawing upon professional experiences as teachers in the classroom and from personal experiences as former students. Monique framed her response, “No, it’s like they practice like, they learn from their mistakes, like, they teach a different way, they try to switch it up so they can learn and [inaudible]…” Luis responded similarly, stating,

Well, I think it’s one of two ways. One is they go to college or they learn, but they also have to learn by having experience. They can’t just go in, um, go and just let, let automatically. They have to have experience to learn and also be, be through certain bad and good teachers so they can learn what, what, um, what they have to do, and what they must do to have good, effective students in the class.

I sought to clarify this comment with Luis by restating what he said and that he was indeed referring to teachers needing to experience both good and bad teachers as students in order to become effective teachers in the future. Luis confirmed,

Yeah, so, they, they’re the student, they have to go through like a bad teacher where they just sit there and just doesn’t do nothing at all. Yeah, so they can learn and…They can learn what things to do and what not to do.

**Self and Lay Theories Figure Prominently in Teacher Identity Formation**

As I synthesized participants’ responses in light of aspects to the identity capital, or “what individuals ‘invest’ in ‘who they are’,” a profile of what these students believe it means to be a teacher began to emerge. Participants spoke of drawing upon personal
experiences, obtaining formal education and training, and approaching the profession as passionate and caring individuals as essential elements to being a teacher. Included among the technical features participants associated with teaching were subject-matter and pedagogical (planning, execution, and evaluation of teaching and learning processes) expertise wherein teachers demonstrate content knowledge and implement instructional methods and techniques to teach content to students. Moreover, participants emphasized the implications associated with teachers having didactical (support students' social, emotional, and moral development) strengths, thus allowing teachers to make personal connections with students. Participants consistently asserted attributions of effectiveness to the possession of didactical acumen by teachers.

My first research question regarding teacher identity formation among UTA students presupposed that enrollment in the UTA might better prepare participants to understand and therefore, to negotiate the oftentimes jarring terrain of urban schooling contexts (Beauchamp & Thomas, 2009; Beijaard et al., 2004; Beijaard et al., 2000; Day et al., 2006; Ellsasser, 2008; Geijsel & Meijers, 2005). Recognition that differences in teacher identity formation depend upon teachers’ location in the preparation and training process, as well as familiarity and beliefs about capabilities to teach successfully in urban contexts in the future, served as the basis for my second research question regarding prospective efficacy beliefs among students in the UTA (Hamman et al., 2010; Olsen, 2008). A synthesis of participants’ responses appears in the next sections.

**Prospective Efficacy and Information Sources**

I conceived of the term “prospective efficacy” to make a distinction between precollegiate/preservice teachers’ experiences in comparison to inservice teachers’
experiences. The difference between prospective efficacy and efficacy beliefs comes down to the question asked and the reliability of the answer. In the case of efficacy, one asks, “Am I capable of performing successfully?” In some cases, even, “How well am I able to perform successfully?” In contrast, prospective efficacy, poses the question, “Will I be able to perform successfully in the distant future,” or “How well will I be able to perform in the distant future?” Prospective efficacy begs the question of not only successful performance, but also of temporal sustainability (Akkerman & Meijer, 2011; Brown, 2006). The temporal aspect to prospective efficacy requires forecasting into the future. This forecasting involves both looking back, looking inward, and projecting into the future (Conway, 2001; Urzúa & Vásquez, 2008). In order to move forward with confidence, individuals must believe that they will be able to execute current skills, knowledge, and expertise to fulfill responsibilities successfully in the distant future. Hence, prospective efficacy implies confidence, proficiency, and commitment sustained over extended time.

My definition of prospective efficacy, or the belief in one’s capability to perform successfully in the future, is consistent with original research on efficacy conducted by Bandura (1977;1993) and reaffirmed in various forms by others since (see Evans & Tribble, 1986; Gibson & Dembo, 1984; Goddard, 2001; Goddard et al., 2000, 2004; Goddard & Skrla, 2006; Knoblauch & Woolfolk Hoy, 2008; McKinney et al., 2008; Siwatu, 2007; Siwatu, 2011; Soodak & Podell, 1994; Torre Cruz & Casanova Arias, 2007; Tournaki & Podell, 2005; Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2007; Weinstein, 1988; Woolfolk Hoy & Spero, 2005). Generally, one’s efficacy beliefs develop based on information sources, including performance accomplishments, vicarious experiences,
verbal persuasion, and psychological states (Bandura, 1977; Goddard et al., 2000). Moreover, mastery experiences exert the greatest impact on self-efficacy beliefs, and once self-efficacy beliefs are established, they are resistant to change (Bandura, 1977). Another salient aspect of self-efficacy for urban contexts concerns the notion that one can have outcome expectancy that certain actions will produce the desired results, however, the agency to take action hinges on ones efficacy beliefs regarding the needed actions (Bandura, 1977). Therefore, early efficacy-building experiences in contexts such as urban schools can help to maintain efficacy beliefs, and in turn, agency to work as teachers in urban schools (Bandura, 1977; 1993; Goddard et al., 2000; Knoblauch & Woolfolk Hoy, 2008; McKinney et al., 2008; Milner, 2005).

**Prospective efficacy and performance information.** Participants’ comments regarding practica experiences, noted in previous sections, suggest that practica experiences not only informed participants’ image of teachers and of teaching, but also provided information on participants’ teaching performance. Overall, participants expressed satisfaction that each achieved personal success with practica experiences in the classroom. Even when they encountered difficulties, participants reported receiving support from the teacher and feedback from UTA teachers. Comments regarding benefits of being in the program provide additional evidence of participants’ satisfaction and appreciation of the program content and experiences.

For example, Felecia describes the purpose of UTA in this way,

UTA has a lot of purposes. Um, UTA, it, it doesn’t only build just your, your teaching or how, how effective, how effectively you teach, um, how, how well you know your subject. It gives you confidence. UTA gives you confidence.
Luis takes it further, stating that the UTA not only allows students to make informed decisions about entering the teaching profession, but also states, “They get hands on experience. They can be ahead of the class in college. They can be ahead, they can be prepared and all that other stuff.” Erica shares that not only does the UTA provide students with experience, but also, “…prepares us for that experience in the future, for us to be better than any other teacher…upcoming.”

Moreover, participants believed that being in the UTA provided them with opportunities to understand teaching from a teacher’s perspective. Jackie, Erica, Luis, Raul, Monique and Felecia each mentioned this in their responses. Jackie claimed that she had changed since becoming involved in the UTA,

I look at both sides, instead of one side. Like now, not be, like, now that I sit in classes and I hear like my friends talking and I can see my teacher like getting aggravated, I be like, ‘Okay, now if that was me, I wouldn’t want the same thing.’ I look at it both ways instead of one.

Monique, Luis, and Erica each stated a new level of appreciation for what teachers “go through.” “Well, um, well, I learned, like, how teachers be stressing. And I understand like why they be so hard on us and [pause] like that they, they have to go through with the lesson plans and all of that,” comments Monique. Luis says,

Well, it’s teaching me how, like, how students, how teachers, what teachers have to go through, and how they have to prepare ahead of time, and how it, what, how hard it is to just keep a class on task and all that other stuff.

Lastly, Erica exclaims,

Oh, I’m benefitting a lot. It’s…I love UTA. It’s the best class I’ve done had yet,
to tell you the truth. I love this class. It’s like… I learn something new every day in this class. It’s, it’s very neat that [pause] [UTA teachers] actually have us, depends on, I can’t believe like… And I never knew teaching was so hard until you get into the classroom and you’re like, ‘Oh, my gosh. Mr. [UTA teacher],’ and what they’re doing, you have to look, and he’s telling you like, ‘It’s a teacherful experience,’ and I love it.

Felecia discusses observations by the university liaison, stating,

You know, it’s always a follow-up with it and, um, it, it gives you a lot of experience, a lot of early on experience because, um, a USF teacher, uh, Dr. [professor’s name]…I think it must be [professor’s name], she comes in and she like, ‘But it’s so ironic. My students are just learning this—me and my students are just talking about this, and you guys are learning it here in high school,’ you know, and this, and it, that, that’s about the jump, head start for us. By, by the time we get to college, you know, we’re, we’re in the classroom. I’m like, ‘Oh, we learned this,’ you know, and we’re not just gonna be like, you know, ‘Oh we learned this can we go,’ no, we might go helping or answering questions.

These responses suggest that participants developed prospective efficacy though multiple information sources provided by the program (Bandura 1977; Goddard et al., 2000).

As their comments intimate, practica experiences provided participants with performance accomplishments through personal performance. Additionally, observing and interacting with teachers in the classrooms where they served practica provided vicarious information regarding their performances. Finally, the feedback provided by mentor teachers and validation by the university professor added verbal persuasion as an
information source regarding participants’ performances. These multiple information sources may explain the positive outlook on the program experiences, as participants appear to believe that they can be successful as teachers in urban settings where they served practica (Torre Cruz & Casanova Arias, 2007). The practica experiences followed with constructive feedback apparently strengthened participants’ outcome expectancy regarding methods they employed in the classroom as well as prospective efficacy beliefs that they will be able to perform successfully in the future. Hence, involvement in the UTA appears to strengthen participants’ agency for working in urban contexts in the future (Bandura, 1977). The next section discusses participants’ responses regarding anticipated overall teacher effectiveness.

**Prospective efficacy beliefs interface with notions of self.** Participants’ responses concerning areas where they were most and least effective are quite revealing of their prospective efficacy beliefs. The “Self” is prevalent in participants’ responses, regardless of the certainty with which they express intentions to become teachers; however, self ranges from self-as-student (individual) to self-as-precollegiate student teacher (student in UTA) to self-as-teacher (future teacher) and points between. In cases such as Raul, participants rely more heavily upon their assessment of personality traits as either strengths or weaknesses to derive meaning regarding anticipated areas of effectiveness as teachers. For example, Raul states that he will be most effective as a teacher because of his “charisma, confidence, and awareness.” As Raul explains his charisma,

I am capable of speaking in front of people when I know what I am talking about and also able to be clear and effective while I talk. I know many students who are
almost failing classes and when asked why they are failing, they reply, ‘because…

(That teacher) doesn’t know how to explain, and when I ask too many questions he/she gets mad.’ I doubt that every student who has this complaint is lying; students need to understand the teacher to learn, so I believe that charisma and clarity in front of a classroom is a requirement.

In other cases including Rafael, Erica, and Asiah, participants frame their responses primarily in terms of specific teacher knowledge, skills, and strategies where they consider themselves more or less effective. Rafael presents a good example of one who appears firm in his intent to enter the field. When asked about areas in which he will be most and least effective as a teacher, Rafael states,

I would be effective in knowledge because I’m very smart and know just about anything. I would be very effective when it comes to safety because I wouldn’t let any of my students get in an unsafe situation. I would enforce the no bullying rule and never put me, my students, or any other student for that matter in danger. Last, I would be very effective in classroom management because I will make class fun yet a learning experience. I will keep my students engaged in varying types of assignments and activities we do.

Rafael appears just as grounded in identity as a teacher when speaking of areas where he will be least effective, responding that he will be least effective at projecting his voice, keeping pace with the curriculum, and grading papers in a timely fashion. In discussing anticipated difficulties with keeping pace with the curriculum, Rafael asserts,

I would also not be effective with keeping the tempo the curriculum requires. The reason for this is that I don’t want to move too far to where I lose my students. I
see that a lot now and days. I would go at a slower temp as long as they retain the subject better that way.

Moreover, Rafael indicates that he would be slow at grading because, “I’m just plain lazy. By the way, I’m also working on that.”

Erica, who in the beginning was skeptical regarding entering teaching and as time passed became increasingly enthusiastic about becoming a teacher, provides concise responses concerning areas of effectiveness and ineffectiveness. Moreover, Erica states her rationale for citing specific areas in which she would be effective as a teacher, indicating that she would be most effective at “lecture, assignments, and notes.” Her rationale for citing lecturing, assignments and notes are that she would have practiced her lecture at home the previous evening, assignments will help her help her students have fun in her class, and that notes will provide students something to refer to when completing assignments. Erica frames responses as though already a teacher. For instance, when speaking of notes, Erica states, “Notes also helps them remember because it’s being read to them, summarized, and written at the same time. Making sure they have everything they need in their notes is important. If it’s on the test it’s in your notes.”

After stating that giving students assignments helps her help her students, Erica states, “The assignments can be done with candy, or cell phones, or anything they may like to use that make the assignment better for them so they can comprehend. This skill will help them remember what I am teaching them. If you don’t want to attend class to do work, then don’t show. My class is fun so I shouldn’t have that problem.

Erica identifies specific “strategies” that she considers necessary for students to learn.
She envisions her role as a teacher and although she accepts responsibility for planning and preparation, she places some of the responsibility for learning on her future students.

Asiah relates her effectiveness and ineffectiveness as a future teacher to specific knowledge, skills, and strategies; yet, she cites personal schooling experiences to explain her choices. Asiah indicates,

I believe I will be effective in these areas because I am good at having patience for struggling students, I can have a loud voice when necessary to keep their attention and make sure everyone can hear me, and I will make sure every student gets to participate.

Asiah states further that she has become effective in these areas, “…because I have experienced good teachers that have helped me when I was struggling in class…and feeling important and involved is something I experienced growing up.” Asiah’s comments suggest that she believes that personal schooling experiences will impact her effectiveness as a teacher. One statement zeroes in on this when she comments that she will be less effective at keeping lessons exciting. Her reason for believing this, “All through my school life I have been used to taking notes every single day and being lectured so I think it will be kind of hard to be creative with lessons every single day.”

Finally, participants such as Luis, Felecia, and Jackie speak strictly from a student’s perspective, stating areas wherein as students they experienced strength and/or weakness, and projecting these areas onto their anticipated performance as teachers. Although Luis expresses solid intent to enter teaching, he generally relates future effectiveness in terms of knowledge and skill proficiencies as a student; hence, he appears developmentally to continue to view his future as a teacher through a student’s
lens. For instance, Luis indicates that he will be good at teaching mathematics, “...because this is my strongest subject.” Conversely, Luis mentions lack of spelling skills as an area of ineffectiveness, “My spelling is atrocious. I have to have a dictionary by me at all times. Equally go home and find all the words I don’t know and right them over and over till I know them.”

In a similar way to Luis, Felecia does not waver in expressing her intent to enter teaching. However, she bases her responses regarding areas where she believes she will be effective or ineffective heavily on what she perceives as personal strengths and weaknesses. Felecia’s statements are consistent with comments such as, “Every teacher has their own special gift that they can give to students and that they bring to the table when it comes to their students,” in which she places strong emphasis on teachers connecting with students on a personal level. Felecia states that she plans to become an English teacher. Her areas where she believes that she will be effective are as “a good listener, a good mentor, and a stickler on grammar,” as opposed to areas where Felecia believes that she would be less effective, including, “keeping on task, the speed of things I do, and time management.” In each of the examples, Felecia references relationships with friends and family members to illustrate her point. Felecia declares, “I have always prided myself on being able to multitask, such as when my friends are talking to me and they think that I’m not listening, and then I’m able to repeat everything they just said to me. I think this will help me in being a high school English teacher.” Additionally, Felecia relates being a stickler on grammar to how she speaks currently, “Grammar has always been something that I have tried to correct myself on even when I speak or when my friends speak I still have something’s to work on when it comes to speech but I think
this could really benefit high school English students.”

Both Luis and Felecia mention that they are good students in specific subjects and therefore will be able to teach that subject effectively. Luis indicates that he is good at mathematics and Felecia mentions her strong points in English. Jackie continues this trend by stating that one area of effectiveness for her will in mathematics. According to Jackie, “And last, math, no matter how hard math is I understand it and can explain it to other without a problem and I really don’t have a strategy it just come naturally.” Jackie indicates also that she will be effective at “connecting with the student” and “the different type of learning style.” Jackie expresses the areas where she will be least effective using a definite student voice. Although she includes lecturing as one of the areas where she will be least effective, Jackie states as her rationale, “I see it just like reading. I can’t pay attention when someone talking or trying to explain something without showing me because it will go in one ear and out the other ‘blah, blah, blah’ is all I hear.” Her response suggests that Jackie is speaking about the fact that she finds it difficult to focus on lectures as a student, just as she does while reading, rather than speaking about whether she will be able to deliver lectures effectively as a teacher, although the question asks about her in/effective areas as a teacher. Jackie has been steadfast in expressing her intent to enter teaching; however, she frames responses based on her own learning style and academic strengths and weaknesses as a student.

In this section, I discussed findings regarding participants’ prospective efficacy beliefs and notions of self. Participants discussed anticipated effectiveness as teachers from perspectives of self-as-student, self-as-precollegiate student teacher, and/or self-as-teacher. Findings suggest that participants approached effectiveness issues from each
perspective at various points in time; however, the perspective lens used does not appear to depend upon the level of commitment to entering the profession. I discuss next participants’ comments regarding prospective efficacy needs specifically for urban school contexts. An important aspect to preparation for urban contexts concerns participants’ ideological preparation for specific contexts.

Efficacy Needs for Urban School Contexts.

Understanding urban school contexts requires early and ongoing experiences. Along with providing participants with multiple information sources regarding performance, enrollment in the UTA also allowed participants to begin to develop ideologically for urban contexts (Goddard & Skrla, 2006; McKinney et al., 2008). Early and continuous exposure to urban school contexts as students and as precollegiate student teachers, for example, during practica experiences, helped to prepare students for the challenges typically associated with urban settings. Participants engaged in anticipatory reflection through coursework and practica experiences; thus, allowing dialogical relationships to begin to develop between personal, historical, sociocultural, and political information sources and contextual experiences over time (Akkerman & Meijer, 2011; Brown, 2006; Conway, 2001; Olsen, 2008; Urzúa & Vásquez, 2008). As such, reflections articulated through interviews and written reflections provided devices for expressing narratives of precollegiate student teachers’ lived experiences (Akkerman & Meijer, 2011; Beijaard et al., 2004; Conway, 2001; Florio-Ruane & Williams, 2008).

Participants assumed “I-positions” at various junctures, indicating participants’ placement concerning prospective efficacy beliefs; i.e., gauging whether participants
spoke of their capabilities to perform successfully as students, precollegiate student teachers, or as teachers (Akkerman & Meijer, 2011; Brown, 2006). As such, the extent to which precollegiate student teachers were likely to use experiences in the UTA as impetus for envisioning actions that they would take to address situations in future contexts was useful for determining prospective efficacy beliefs (Akkerman & Meijer, 2011; Hamman et al., 2010; Urzúa & Vásquez, 2008). If able to envision future actions, the question remains whether participants will exercise agency to achieve determinable outcomes with students (Akkerman & Meijer, 2011; Bandura, 1977; Beijaard et al., 2004; Brown, 2006; Flores & Day, 2006; Florio-Ruane & Williams, 2008; Goddard, 2001; Rodgers & Scott, 2008).

**Commitment to teaching in urban schools requires prospective efficacy and agency.** Participants’ agentive power hinges upon individual prospective efficacy beliefs regarding teaching in urban schools contexts. As noted previously, throughout the study, participants commented on beliefs regarding strengths and weaknesses in teaching skills and knowledge. Participants attributed areas of relative strength and weakness to knowledge sources including self and lay theories gleaned from experiences as students and as precollegiate student teachers. Moreover, participants implicated practica experiences as an information source integral to development of prospective efficacy beliefs regarding teaching. If efficacy beliefs are to translate into action, participants must first believe themselves capable of performing indicated actions successfully. Hence, prospective efficacy for participants in the study refers to the degree to which participants believe they will know *what to do* as well as *how to do* teaching in urban school contexts in the distant future. Ultimately, the steadfastness of participants’ prospective efficacy
beliefs will inform participants’ willingness to do teaching in urban schools contexts.

In this regard, Goddard et al. (2000) and others have found that teacher efficacy is context-specific and change-resistant (Bandura, 1977; Knoblauch & Woolfolk Hoy, 2008; Milner, 2005). Thus, earlier rather than later development of prospective efficacy beliefs in relation to the contexts in which participants intend to teach will facilitate formation of participants’ “agentive self”, thereby enhancing the likelihood that participants will exercise agency as teachers in urban school contexts (Hull & Katz, 2006, p.47). Questions such as those asking participants to explain what makes a school urban, in what ways urban schools are similar and different from other schools, and what they will need to be an effective teacher in an urban school are important for understanding participants’ prospective efficacy beliefs regarding teaching in urban schools contexts. Additionally, participants’ responses regarding whether they believe all students capable of learning, as well as the role that participants will play in ensuring that all students learn provide insight into prospective efficacy beliefs. The following sections examine participants’ responses to these questions.

**What makes a school “urban”?** Participants provide responses that reveal their conceptualizations about urban schools, particularly the students and school climate. When asked to explain what makes a school urban, in what ways urban schools are different from other schools, and what they will need to be an effective teacher in an urban school, participants’ such as Jackie, Josef, and Asiah respond in their written reflections with pat definitions for urban schools, as learned through the program. An important aside is that during the individual interviews conducted during the pilot at the end of their second year in the UTA, participants express less concrete understandings of
what makes a school “urban.” Participants generally struggle with responses, focusing on the types of students attending and type of community in which an urban school would be located.

For instance, during the pilot individual interview, Felecia insists,

Um, most people would always say that “urban” means like the, um, the, uh, mostly Black area, or something like that. And I don’t, I don’t look at it as that. I don’t look at it as being such an, such an urban area, where it’s like in…like, you know, just impossible to teach. This [current school] is a performing arts school…This is a performing arts school, and this, this is far from…I see this school as far from, far from being urban. It may be in an urban area, but I see this school as far from urban.

In contrast, Luis responds,

Urban school, it’ll be, it’ll be like [current] High School where, um, they’ll be, they’ll be a lot of students, but…Let me see. It’s gonna be surround…surrounded by buildings so it will be kind of difficult to really keep that school protected and different stuff. I, ‘cause I would think that, um [pause] like we, like the school’s right in front of the projects, like Just, they’re right there from the projects. It’s kind of, uh, dangerous. That’s where, that’s basically what I think whenever I think of urban setting.

Moreover, Monique replies that she wants to return to a school like her middle school to teach, which incidentally, is an urban school. Monique states that, “yes”, her middle school is in an urban area, populated by mostly “African American” students. Yet, Monique does not consider her former middle school to be an urban school. She does
consider schools in areas such as [name of suburban local community] to be urban.

Monique focuses primarily on the locale, rather than other more common referents, when discussing urban schools. Finally, Raul refers to greater prevalence of “gossip” and “more things going on” at an urban school, making it “harder to motivate students than in a more packed school.” One student, Erica, indicates that teachers in urban schools can be more relaxed and more flexible with curricula. Common ideas about urban schools that emerged during pilot individual interviews include that urban schools are located in urban communities, populated with mostly Black students and contain chaotic environments.

One year later, during the reflective journal phase of data collection, students provide increased specificity about urban schools. As Josef writes,

An urban school is located in an urban area rather than a rural, small town, or suburban area. The school has a relatively high rate of poverty (as measured by Free and Reduced Lunch data provided by the NYSED), relatively high proportion of students of color. The school has been designated as “High Need” but, not all schools will meet all five of these characteristics but the goal is to place students in schools giving priority to schools that come closest to having these characteristics.

Jackie provides a nearly verbatim response, adding that urban schools, “…have a quite high percentage of students who are Limited English Proficient.” Moreover, Jackie states, “I learned that in UTA previously.”

Participants’ definitions were factually consistent with definitions provided in the literature; i.e., urban schooling contexts are characterized by large concentrations of
students from culturally and linguistically diverse (CLD) backgrounds located in city centers characterized by high poverty and crime rates (Brunetti, 2006; Conaway et al., 2007; McKinney et al., 2008; Siwatu, 2011; Zhou, 2003). Cultural and linguistic diversity refers contemporaneously to situations in which so-called ethnic minority students such as Blacks, Latina, and Asian American and/or students whose first language is other than English, comprise the majority population in schools. The next section discusses participants’ comments regarding distinctive characteristics of urban schools.

Note that participants mention limited resources, overcrowding, and large percentages of low performing students among characteristics that make urban schools different from other schools, and as reported in the literature, challenging to recruit and retain effective teachers (Hirsch, 2006; Ingersoll, 2001; USDOE, 2003; 2004; Wirt et al, 2004; Zhou, 2003). Moreover, although studies show that preservice teachers overestimate the difficulties associated with teaching children from CLD backgrounds, student achievement outcomes demonstrate that high-efficacy teachers can work effectively with these students (Gibson & Dembo, 1984; Weinstein, 1988). Participants’ responses regarding urban schools reflect a metanarrative wherein participants believe that urban schools serve students from diverse backgrounds with diverse needs. This metanarrative suggests also that participants view urban schools as challenging, yet hold idealist views of their capabilities to work effectively in urban school settings in the future, similarly to Torre Cruz and Casanova Arias (2007). The next sections relate specific comments to this metanarrative.

**What makes urban schools similar to or different from other schools?**

Participants name obvious similarities between urban schools and others, such as in
Asiah’s response, “Urban schools are similar to other schools because they both still have teachers and administration, students and a building to use.” Erica states, “All schools have similarities in some kind of way. They have students that act the same, have the same attitudes, have the same actions, and have problems at home.” Luis refers to similarities between urban and other schools stating, “Urban schools have time for students to eat, time for them to walk to class, and also have time to help the students learn, but more for some than others.” Conversely, Jackie maintains, “All schools has about the same goal which is to help all students be successful in life. The only different is the location and how much they help the community (school wise).” Josef proclaims, “An urban school is in some ways similar to other schools because they both have diversity, potential, same goals, and reasoning. Then again they are different because of location; meet the requirements of becoming a diverse school and Limited English proficient students.” In other words, these participants’ responses suggest that urban schools have the same core infrastructure as other schools; however, components within the infrastructure are likely to differ because of special characteristics associated with urban schooling. Participants indicate that urban schools differ from other schools along dimensions of student population, facilities, materials and supplies, and opportunities.

For example, Rafael indicates that because urban schools are located in the city, …you will most likely have to teach different diversity of students also more students in general in the school. When in a country school you have 500 students per school and 15 students per classroom, in an urban school you have triple that amount in a school and up to 24 students a class.

Similarly, Luis asserts that because urban schools are in the city, “…they have violence
more often...Urban schools also get little funding from the state cause it students work so poorly most of the time. Urban schools also need much help to keep the school from going under.” Asiah concludes,

Urban schools may not have the equipment needed to teach such as textbooks, desks, chalk/markers, and other materials whereas richer schools may have these things (the basics) plus more, such as advanced technology like smart boards and computers. Also, urban schools are normally more rundown than a school that has more money. The urban school may also have more graffiti and vandalism on campus, when other schools may be clean and pretty. Urban schools may also have students that are in gangs or have higher rates of crime.

Although most participants respond in a detached voice concerning the similarities and differences between types of schools, Erica and Felecia appear to highlight the more positive characteristics associated with urban schools. Both participants allude to a dichotomy between urban schools and other schools in terms of how they are viewed in society and how students who attend are treated/educated.

The idea that urban schools are viewed differently and students attending urban schools are treated/educated differently appears to resonate with Felecia and Erica. According to Felecia,

Urban schools have very little similarities to other schools because if the school is labeled as an urban school people automatically put their defense up and approach the school with caution because it is labeled an urban school, but I don’t think that urban schools are bad at all. There may be a large population of African American but that doesn’t make the school dangerous at all. At our school we have plenty
African American dance, theatre, art, band majors and that has nothing to do with who they are or the color of their skin so urban schools are often underestimated. Although Felecia states that urban schools are not dangerous due simply to large numbers of African American students, she concedes that other schools may provide more student supports than urban schools.

Urban schools are not as fortunate as other schools such as rural or suburban area schools. They (rural or suburban area schools) may get better interaction with the teachers or they may have that relationship with the students where they are able to get extra work from them. In an urban school they may not have that relationship with students where they are able to get what they have missed.

Erica uses a book as a metaphor for preconceptions of race/ethnicity and class, which may confront students in urban schools, stating,

Students are being labeled based on their test scores and whether they can pay to enter a particular school or not. Some students are facing getting into a good school because they are being judged on the cover of their book and they haven’t even read it yet.

In the end Erica acknowledges, “Most students are better off going to an urban school because they learn how life really is in the real world. They learn that nothing is just giving to them because they have money in their pocket.” Felecia and Erica appear to grasp the challenges that accompany attending urban schools, yet remain optimistic regarding the resilience of teachers and students in urban schools to overcome those challenges.

What will I need to know and be able to do to teach in an urban school?
Participants allude to teachers in urban schools needing to understand and connect with students, to motivate students to attend school, and to teach students with academic challenges. Undertones in participants’ comments on the topic suggest that a number of participants assume a dispositional stance towards students attending urban schools characterized by deficit thinking (Bomer, Dworin, May, & Semingson, 2008; Weiner, 2006). Specifically, in ways akin to the deficit-model rooted in discourse about educating students with disabilities, participants refer to perceived deficits such as lack of motivation, underperformance in academics, dysfunctional family and community, unkempt facilities, and insufficient tangible resources within and around students attending urban schools (Delpit, 1988; García & Guerra, 2004; Gutiérrez & Rogoff, 2003; Trent, Artiles, & Englert, 1998). Only Felecia mentions the possible benefits of insider status for teachers in urban schools.

To begin, participants such as Asiah write of students attending urban schools as strange, unknown, alien, foreign; i.e.,

What I will need to know and be able to do to be an effective teacher in an urban school is understand where the students come from, like background knowledge. And not be judgmental and taken aback when I first step into the classroom and be shocked at what I see.

Asiah’s exact meaning regarding the notion of a teacher being “judgmental” or “taken aback” when entering the classroom is unclear. However, Asiah’s subsequent comments suggest that she expects to “see” evidence of students with significant social, personal, and academic needs.

I will need to be able to be patient with the students because they may need more
time to learn and understand concepts. I will also need to be able to be a disciplinarian because a lot of times, the kids misbehave and don’t care about school and they will be rowdy so I will have to get them to respect me and listen when I talk and get them to do their work.

Similarly, participants such as Luis and Jackie refer to personal and social challenges that teachers in urban schools will have to address. Luis alludes to attendance and truancy issues, “I will need to know how to keep my student off the streets and keep them in the classroom,” as well as motivational issues, “I need to know how to communicate with them as well as know what button to push to get them to work so that they want to work for themselves,” when speaking about teaching in urban schools. Jackie reiterates concerns regarding student motivation and attendance, stating that teachers in urban schools need to have “passion, time, very calm inside, and encouragement” because “…the majority of student don’t want to be there, (don’t) want to do something with themselves, and come to school just because.” In acknowledging her status as an insider, Felecia asserts, “Working in an urban school won’t be a threat to me because I grew up going to them.” Yet Felecia also believes that she will need “patience and understanding because the student may come from a very low background and I will need to know that some conversations should be either avoided or not brought up at all because of different religious backgrounds.” Each of the participants here expresses concerns regarding meeting the demands of working with students in urban schools; however, few cite concrete solutions.

In contrast, Rafael and Erica offer additional insight into ways that issues in urban schools manifest in schooling experiences for students and what teachers need to do to
address effectively issues such as overcrowding and emotional issues with which some students grapple. Rafael understands that having greater numbers of students implies greater diversity of student needs, “As a teacher in an urban school that (class size) is important because I will have to learn how to teach more students that might be going at a different pace.” On the other hand, Rafael sees no difference in the subject matter that teachers in urban schools teach, suggesting that although pacing of instruction might differ, strategies would remain consistent, regardless of the school setting.

Yet in both schools, you still have to teach the major subjects. Math, reading, history, and science are all important no matter what school you are at. All I can do is prepare myself by practicing and projecting my voice a little better.

Erica attests also to the difficulties that she associates with teaching in urban schools, writing,

Being an urban teacher isn’t easy; I know that for a fact. But you have to understand and be able to do anything when it comes down to teaching them. You have to teach them more than just what the book tells you to teach them.

Erica implies that teaching students in urban schools requires that teachers account for special needs of urban students, utilizing various resources to meet students’ academic as well as emotional needs,

Ninety percent of students in an urban school go through family struggles. So majority of the time you have to help them out mentally. Let them know that you will be there to comfort them when you can. Being an effective teacher of the student is the key to being a successful teacher.

Erica and Rafael appear to focus more holistically upon the subject matter,
pedagogical and didactical aspects to teaching in urban schooling contexts. While comments suggest they foresee challenges with teaching in urban schools, as well as the need for teachers to care for and to connect with students, Erica and Rafael seem to view caring and connecting as tools for achieving the fundamental goal of teaching and learning. The next section looks at participants’ views on students’ learning potential and their roles in ensuring that all students learn.

**Can all students learn and what will I do to ensure that all my students learn?**

Participants respond overwhelmingly that all students can learn and that the teacher is responsible for ensuring that all students learn. Participants indicate they will use various teaching methods and strategies and adjust instruction when necessary to accommodate individual learning needs. Participants who mention demographic diversity maintain that differences in race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status, ability, and first language will not impede their ability to teach students. Rafael singularly diverges from the remaining participants in his stance towards student learning potential, placing the onus for student learning primarily upon students rather than teachers.

Some participants state more explicitly than others that all students can learn. For example, Erica states, “Every student can do anything that strengthens them.” Josef exclaims, “So out of my understanding of course all students can learn because you learn something new every day not necessarily in a classroom but somewhere.” Asiah professes, “I do believe that all students can learn.” Finally, Felecia frames a critical response, stating, “It is never right to tell a student that they cannot learn and to deny them of the right to learn no matter how complex their learning ability may be.” These responses, as well as those of Jackie and Luis, who each implies that all students can
learn by moving directly to ways that they will ensure that all students learn, stand in stark contrast to Rafael’s comments.

Rafael’s responses appear from nowhere. In other words, Rafael’s responses not only suggest opposing views in contrast to other participants, but also, differ substantially from his own responses throughout the study. Here, Rafael states,

It is a fact that not all students can learn. We, as teachers, try to make learning possible for all students but there are always slower learners and just students that won’t learn at all. And with the “No Child Left Behind” law we have to teach those that don’t want to learn.

As will be discussed later, these comments are just the beginning of an unexpected stance, considering former responses.

Although Rafael indicates that teachers have to teach students who don’t want to learn, other participants stress their roles in ensuring that students learn despite personal challenges and learning difficulties that some have. Asiah writes that she will “teach something and explain it in multiple ways so everyone might understand and not move on until they all do so no one gets left behind,” demonstrating her willingness to differentiate instruction and adjust the pace of teaching and learning as needed. Jackie reiterates previous ideas, stating,

Some of the things I picked-up over the years that my teachers use are do more hands-on project, group work, using more color inside the classroom, and last lecturing…You see everyone learn different so inside the classroom you have to try all type of things.

Jackie’s’ statement shows that she will attempt to meet individual learning needs. Erica
provides concrete examples of ways that she will ensure that all students learn including, “building background knowledge,” “reviewing for tests,” and encouraging students to “ask any question that’s on their mind that they don’t understand about my lesson.” In contrast, Rafael continues his thoughts on student potential, ability, and motivation by stating, “My only strategy to this (having to teach students because of NCLB) is to ignore the students that don’t want to learn and to teach students that are in my class for a purpose.” Rafael will handle students that he believes don’t want to learn by ignoring them, but as seen next he will take a different approach with students who learn at a “slower” pace.

Participants such as Felecia, Asiah and Jackie will adjust instruction to meet individual learning needs. In stating that she will focus attention on students who have learning difficulties, Felecia also shows her awareness of specific challenges that may exist at different schooling levels.

Since I want to teach high school I know there will be many rebellious and hard-headed students and those will be the ones that I will take under my wing. Most teachers in high school don’t try their best to help the child learn, they just give up. I want to be the teacher that can say that the students have an A in my class or I can say that they work well in my class.

Asiah recognizes that, “Some students may require extra time and I would have afternoon sessions like ELP where they can learn and spend more time on certain things to better understand them.” The next comment, “I would do this for any student that needed it, not just certain ones or ones that I favored,” suggests that Erica will attempt to treat students equitably based upon individual needs, at any point in time. Rafael departs from the
remaining participants here also. Rafael reaffirms his stance that some students don’t want to learn, and declares,

If I see they are trying to learn but are slower than the other I would just move them to a lower level class like honors or regular instead of an AP class. But if they just don’t want to learn or are showing no interest in the subject, I would ignore them and their grades would suffer from it.

Rafael’s concluding statement on the topic, “It’s not the teacher’s fault students can’t learn. The students have to take a learning mentality so they can learn. My strategy is simple. You can’t slow down your class for certain individuals,” seems an indictment on students who have difficulties for any reason. Conversely, participants like Asiah, provide prototypical comments, “Ways that I would make sure each student in my class will learn regardless of race/ethnicity, gender, ability, first language, etc., will be that I will give each student individual attention to those who need it,” suggesting that students from diverse backgrounds will be treated as learners first. Felecia addresses her ethnicity as an African American head-on,

No matter what races or religion they have the right to have just as many opportunities as anyone else in the world. I want to be a student’s favorite teacher and make them feel that someone cares about them and that just because I am an African American teacher that only the Black kids that I can help but the other races as well.

Additionally, Erica stresses, “It doesn’t matter what your ethnicity, gender, your first language, how you look, dress, or where you come from. I strongly believe that you can do anything that strengthens you, if you believe.” Comments by Asiah, Felecia, and Erica
suggest that each recognizes that students from diverse backgrounds may have different levels of need; however, each will ignore the cacophony of problems and challenges that may occur, choosing to focus on the student as a person and a learner.

In this section, I provide a synthesis of prevalent participant responses concerning efficacy needs for urban school contexts. The basic premise of the UTA is to prepare high school students for success in higher education teacher education programs by providing theoretical and experiential knowledge and skills at the precollegiate level. Similar programs operate on the assumption that participant insider status helps to facilitate entrée through lived experience to idiosyncratic aspects of the district where participants return to teach (Hill & Gillette, 2005). Moreover, participants are expected to gain ideological preparation, merging personal ideology with demands associated with being able to work successfully as teachers in urban contexts. In so doing, the expectation is that participants will begin to develop agency required to act upon knowledge and skills learned through the UTA as they enter teacher education programs and subsequently the teaching profession. Overall, participants demonstrate that their understandings regarding urban schools are consistent with public depictions of the characteristics of urban schools, hold idealized images regarding their ability to teach in urban contexts, and adopt stereotypical stances regarding future interaction with diverse student populations.

In the next section, I discuss additional themes that emerge from my findings.

**Emergent Themes**

The synthesis of findings presents common threads that emerge from the data. Additional abstractions stemming from my personal sense making as the primary investigator for the study are discussed next.
Research Question One—Teacher Identity

My first research question asks how UTA students’ views of teacher identity, or what it means to be a teacher, develop within the dual contexts of lived experiences as high school students and precollegiate student teachers. My review of literature rendered a multidimensional picture of teacher identity and its influential factors. I investigated these factors using an interpretative phenomenological lens, using case study design (Smith et al., 2009; Yin, 2009). My interpretation of UTA participants’ teacher identity formation in terms of emergent themes based on my analysis is as follows.

Identity markers. Participants view teachers’ roles and responsibilities in terms of attributes associated with content knowledge, pedagogical skills, and/or relationships, which function as identity markers for teachers. The overriding theme regarding the first identity marker is teacher-as-content-expert wherein teachers must “know your stuff.” According to participants, if teachers do not have good command of the content that they are responsible for teaching, then they will not be effective. Teachers can attend college or study content prior to teaching once they are in the field. As such, teachers are seen as lifelong learners. Participants view the learning process for teachers to be ongoing and malleable.

The second area of identity markers pertain to pedagogical expertise or to teacher-as-technocrat. Identity markers in pedagogy include teachers’ planning lessons, delivering instruction so that students understand the content, tapping into students’ prior knowledge to make learning relevant, connecting learning to students’ interests to make learning fun, and differentiating instruction according to students’ learning styles. Included in this set of identity markers is teacher-as-transmitter. Participants express
throughout that teachers are responsible for student learning. Few placed responsibility for learning upon student shoulders. At this point, participants see teaching as teacher-centered as opposed to student-centered. Additionally, participants refer to teachers “following the rule book” and subscribing to societal mores regarding their conduct, even in their private lives. Participants were able to mention these various identity markers for pedagogy; however, few were able to provide specific ways that teachers can demonstrate them.

Finally, participants view teachers through a didactic lens, thus viewing teacher-as-relation, signifying their beliefs in relationships as essential to teaching. Moreover, participants tie relationships and caring to teacher effectiveness. Participants refer to the identity marker, relationships, in virtually every comment, whether discussing lesson planning, instructional delivery, classroom management, or working with students with special needs. For participants in the UTA, teachers must show that they care by giving extra time to students, by adjusting instruction for students, by talking with students about personal problems, etc. Relationships are at the core of UTA students’ beliefs about what it means to be a teacher.

Research Question Two—Prospective Efficacy

I will be able to teach my best subject to others. My second research question asks in what ways UTA students develop “prospective efficacy” beliefs, or the belief in their capabilities to fulfill teaching roles and responsibilities in the future. A prevalent theme regarding prospective efficacy is participants’ beliefs that they will be able to teach a subject if they are good in the subject as a student. A number of students mention that they are good in math or English as their rationale for choosing to teach math or English
when they become teachers. These students demonstrate a naiveté when it comes to domain-specific knowledge such that they make no connections between themselves performing well in a subject and how this came to be so. Only one student consistently referred to having been taught by teachers who addressed her learning style or who used variety in teaching methods as a means to differentiate instruction according to individual learning needs.

**I can learn how to teach through observation.** Participants believe that current teachers serve as models for how they should or should not teach; i.e., lay theories. Students mention ineffective teachers and wanting to make sure that they avoid the practices that for them as students make teachers ineffective. By the same token, teachers who participants perceive as effective are considered models for ways that participants should teach when they become teachers. The relational aspects to this cannot be understated, as participants view teachers whom they like, as effective and suitable models whereas teachers whom they do not like or with whom they do not have established relationships as unsuitable models. Hence, participants demonstrate little understanding of what makes teachers good or effective.

**I will be able to teach students in urban schools.** Students appear optimistic regarding their ability to teach students in urban schools. Student diversity will not be an issue because each will teach the student, rather than the ethnicity/race, gender, religion, ability, first language, etc. The community will have no bearings on teaching success. Urban schools may lack resources such as textbooks, materials, supplies and up-to-date technology, but this will not negatively impact the teaching and learning process. Participants intimate these dispositions in one way or the other throughout the study.
Although participants acknowledge widely cited challenges associated with urban schools, none express apprehension in meeting the challenges.

**I believe that all students can learn.** This includes all students in urban schools, despite challenges and hardships that students may encounter. Teachers can help students overcome hardships such as hunger, homelessness, violence and abuse that result from high poverty rates by showing students that they care and by establishing relationships with students. Participants seem to erase parents and caregivers from students’ lives, thereby failing to acknowledge significant others’ roles in ensuring that students learn. Only one student mentions the roles of parents and caregivers in students’ lives in terms of teaching students at home the value of education as well as a sound work ethic regarding schoolwork.

**Conclusion**

The purpose of this study was to address the research questions:

1. How do UTA students’ views of teacher identity, or *what it means to be a teacher*, develop within dual contexts of lived experiences as high school students and precollegiate student teachers?

2. In what ways do UTA students develop *prospective efficacy* beliefs, or the belief in their capabilities to fulfill teaching roles and responsibilities in the future?

This chapter presents findings derived from data obtained through pilot focus group interviews, pilot individual interviews and reflective journals of the participants (n=9) in the study. I first presented an overview of findings regarding each research questions at each level of data collection and analysis. I then provide a synthesis of the
findings, highlighting common threads according to the literature. Finally, I share additional thoughts regarding themes that I find particularly salient for this study. Chapter Five discusses implications of findings for adding to theoretical and practical knowledge concerning teacher identity and prospective efficacy, particularly as pertaining to teacher education, recruitment, and retention issues. Additionally, recommendations for further research conclude Chapter Five.
Chapter Five

Implications and Recommendations

Urban schools generally experience chronic shortages of well-qualified teachers. High percentages of historically marginalized students, plagued by high poverty rates and low academic performance, as well as substandard facilities and inadequate material resources, serve as causative factors inhibiting recruitment and retention of credentialed teachers in urban schools (Education Commission of the States [ECS], 1999; Guarino et al., 2006; Horng, 2009; USDOE, 2003; 2004; Wirt et al, 2004). Urban schools tend to employ larger percentages of novice and out-of-field teachers than schools located in communities that are more affluent. Although research regarding the impact of teaching credentials on student achievement is mixed, educators, policy-makers, and researchers generally agree that teacher quality in K-12 settings matters (Wayne & Youngs, 2003).

Limited evidence suggests that positive correlations exist between teaching credentials and student achievement in reading (Rockoff, 2003) and high school mathematics (Wayne & Youngs, 2003). Moreover, urban schools may have trouble with community building and organizational performance because of constantly dealing with the costly consequences of persistently high teacher attrition rates (Guarino et al., 2006; Ingersoll, 2001). Urban schools face an uphill battle to recruit and retain quality teachers who will commit to stay. Teacher identity and teacher efficacy, have been found to impact teacher commitment to teaching in urban schools (Day, Kington, Stobart,
Additionally, it has been shown that increased opportunities to participate in field experiences in urban schools can boost preservice teachers’ willingness to consider teaching in urban schools, as well as their confidence in teaching culturally diverse students (Bleicher, 2011).

Schools and districts attempt to meet chronic teacher shortages in urban schools by creating innovative teacher preparation schemes. The purpose of this study was to examine teacher identity formation and prospective efficacy beliefs among students enrolled in one such project, the Urban Teaching Academy (UTA). Specifically, the research questions addressed in the study were,

1. How do UTA students’ views of teacher identity, or what it means to be a teacher, develop within dual contexts of lived experiences as high school students and student teachers?

2. In what ways do UTA students develop “prospective efficacy” beliefs, or the belief in their capabilities to fulfill teaching roles and responsibilities in the future?

In this chapter, I discuss the significance of findings for adding to the theoretical knowledge-base concerning teacher identity and prospective efficacy. I follow with consideration of implications for research on each construct. Concluding discussions address implications for practice pertaining to teacher education, recruitment, and retention.

Implications for Teacher Identity Formation

This study contributes to the literature on teacher identity formation by first
addressing teacher recruitment and retention issues at the precollegiate level. Although Urban Teaching Academies currently provide precollegiate teacher training in states such as Utah, New Jersey, Illinois, and Florida, in contrast to the Urban Teaching Academy in this study, most are affiliated with university teacher education programs in either dual enrollment or intensive summer programs. For example, Salt Lake City School District has operated a Teaching Professions Academy in partnership with Westminster College, and the University of Utah since 1999 (Burbank et al., 2005). Burbank et al. (2005) provides an assessment of the benefits and challenges associated with the programs. However, a search of professional publications rendered no empirical studies of precollegiate teacher training programs. Hence, this study appears to be the first to explore the lived experiences of precollegiate student teachers enrolled in an urban teacher preparatory program. By examining the lived experiences of precollegiate student teachers in terms of two important constructs in teacher development and teacher commitment to the profession; i.e., teacher identity formation and prospective efficacy beliefs, this study broadens the knowledge-base upon which teacher educators, education practitioners, and policymakers can base further scholarship that will inform practice.

I begin this section by looking at parallels between the findings of this study with literature on teacher identity. Two components of literature-based definitions, *Self* and *Care*, emerged as particularly salient for precollegiate student teachers’ teacher identity formation. I next look at contrasts between findings of this study and two components of literature-based definitions that remained relatively inconspicuous, *Emotions* and *Context*. I conclude this section with recommendations for further research.
Parallels between Findings and Literature-based Definitions of Teacher Identity

**Self is crucial to teacher identity formation.** Findings from the study support the preponderance of evidence based on major reviews that the “self” is crucial to teacher identity formation (Beauchamp and Thomas, 2009; Beijaard et al., 2004; Rodgers and Scott, 2008). Major reviews define teacher identity as,

- (a) ongoing, (b) involves both person and context, (c) consists of sub-identities that must be harmonious, and (d) requires a level of agency by teachers (Beijaard et al., 2004)

- (1) dependent upon and formed within multiple contexts which bring social, cultural, political, and historical forces to bear upon that formation, (2) formed in relationship with others and involves emotions, (3) shifting, unstable, and multiple, and (4) involves the construction and reconstruction of meaning through stories over time. (Rodgers and Scott, 2008, p.733), and

- Involving the self, emotion, stories, reflection, agency, and context (Beauchamp and Thomas, 2009)

In each review, researchers postulate that teacher identity formation begins with “self.” The centrality of self is particularly relevant to this study, considering participants’ developmental levels. Precollegiate student teachers who are in their late teen years (ages 12-19) are in the midst of developing social, emotional and academic cognition. Proper schooling involves establishing curricula and instruction that addresses academic, social, and emotional learning, thereby facilitating students’ abilities to be “self-aware, socially cognizant, able to make responsible decisions, and competent in self-management and relationship-management skills so as to foster their academic success (Zins et al. 2004,
For precollegiate student teachers enrolled in programs such as the Urban Teaching Academy, opportunities to learn in educational environs that focus on social, emotional, and academic development can improve chances of developing the dispositions that study participants cite, and which literature confirm as important to teachers’ work (Hollins, 2011).

First, the notion of teacher dispositions is under scrutiny partially because of difficulties with arriving at a definition, as well as controversies regarding the value and legitimacy of viewing dispositions as a construct in teacher education (Diez, 2007; Murray, 2007). Villegas (2007) provides a definition of dispositions that I believe serves well the purposes of the current discussion; i.e., “I propose that dispositions are tendencies for individuals to act in a particular manner under particular circumstances, based on their beliefs (p.373).” Villegas (2007) goes on to discuss the predictive and action-oriented features of the definition. Similarly, study participants stated beliefs regarding teachers and teaching as stationary or fixed; so much so that attributes named by participants function as identity markers for teachers. I have sorted these identity markers into categories based on the features of the attributes. The categories include,

- teacher-as-content-expert referring to teachers demonstrating domain-specific knowledge,
- teacher-as-technocrat referring to teachers following the rules,
- teacher-as-transmitter referring to teacher-centered pedagogical styles, and
- teacher-as-relation referring to relational aspects of teaching.

Table 34 displays examples of comments for each identity marker.
Table 34

Identity Markers and Examples of Participant Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity Marker</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-as-Content-Expert</td>
<td>“You have to know your stuff.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“As I said, knowing your subject.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-as-Technocrat</td>
<td>“Once you have your classroom rules down, make sure everybody knows them, make sure everybody follows them…”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I also learned how to create a lesson plan, and how there’s a lot of different ways to do it.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-as-Transmitter</td>
<td>“… the students are doing everything but listening to instruction given them.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“They also should know how to deliver the lesson to the students.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-as-Relation</td>
<td>“Teachers should be able to tell when something is wrong with a student no matter how many they have…”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“They’re like a counselor too.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings of this study suggest that precollegiate student teachers make sense of teacher identity, or of what it means to be a teacher, by thinking of themselves at various points along the continuum as students (student-as-student), precollegiate student teachers (student-as precollegiate-student-teacher), and/or as teachers (student-as-teacher). However, findings show that precollegiate student teachers in this study generally make sense of teacher identity from a student’s perspective wherein teachers must know and be able to teach their content, adhere to professional rules established by their school, district, and society, and always show caring towards students. Anderson and Stillman (2011) found that preservice teachers deemed programs similar to those described by participants wherein practices tended to include implementation of mandated curriculum with fidelity, test-and/or teacher-centered instruction, and emphasis on tested subjects as too restrictive and lacking in educative value. One can infer from precollegiate student teachers’ overall perspectival leanings that although capable of learning the pre-teacher education curriculum and applying concepts to practica experiences in local schools, the bifurcated nature of the UTA experience meant that the
transition to student-as-teacher is unattainable at this stage of development. This is not to say that the UTA experience is inconsequential to teacher development. In fact, if viewed along a continuum of experiences for precollegiate student teachers, the UTA provides early opportunities for precollegiate student teachers to begin to develop the knowledge, skills and dispositions required for urban school teaching (Anderson & Stillman, 2011; McKinney et al., 2008).

Specifically, an additional implication concerns advantages to precollegiate student teachers’ sensemaking of teacher identity from dual perspectives. Opportunities exist within the program to provide precollegiate student teachers with curricula and instruction so that they develop the social, emotional, and academic knowledge, skills, and dispositions that will ensure their success as high schoolers as well as transformation into quality teachers in the future. Precollegiate student teachers can develop the knowledge, skills, and dispositions that will be compatible with the normative structures of urban school settings if UTA coordinators structure learning goals and objectives to that end (Anderson & Stillman, 2011; Bleicher, 2011; Cohen, 2008; Flores & Day, 2006; Goodman, 1988; Villegas, 2007). Because precollegiate student teachers come to the Urban Teaching Academy with preexisting beliefs about teaching and learning, which may function both as “filters to sensemaking” as well as “barriers” to learning new concepts, the UTA must take a proactive approach to addressing misconceptions regarding urban schools and students in urban schools (Bleicher, 2011; Lortie, 1975; Feiman-Nemser, 2001, p.1016). In this way, the duality of lived experiences in the UTA can create opportunities for precollegiate student teachers to begin to compile a repertoire of teaching tools along with teaching habits of mind, thus beginning to develop a teacher
self that will ultimately position them to contribute to a pool of quality teachers for K-12 school settings (Feiman-Nemser, 2001).

**Care is crucial to teacher identity formation.** Major reviews on teacher identity discuss also “Care” or “Caring” as an important dimension to teacher identity. (Beauchamp and Thomas, 2009; Beijaard et al., 2004; Rodgers and Scott, 2008). Noddings (1988) draws attention to the role of teachers in attending to students’ intellectual, social and emotional growth thereby helping to form “acceptable persons” that will contribute to society (p.221). To this end, caring teachers must guide students toward an “ethical ideal—that is relationally constructed (p.222).” The relational aspect to teacher identity formation proved integral to precollegiate student teachers who participated in this study. Participants spoke of ways in which teachers should show that they care about students as well as ways that they anticipate showing students that they care. Participants’ beliefs that teachers should care about students is borne out by the literature.

For example, Kim and Schallert (2011) found that caring is not an innate personality trait that teachers either have or not, but rather that caring was “an enactment of a relationship,’’ which developed through dialogue, consciousness, reciprocity and trust (p.1066). Relationships between teachers and students developed cyclically as teachers set-out to show that they cared and students reciprocated if only by acknowledging teachers’ efforts. However, if students felt no trust in the teachers’ efforts, the relationships deteriorated, as the caring was unanswered. Kim and Schallert (2011) contend that learning about caring requires preservice teachers to move past previous attitudes and beliefs to embark on “a process of constructing or authoring their identity as
the teacher they want to become, building their ethical ideal (p.1066).” Although Kim and Schallert (2011) endorse explicit actions by teachers to become the caring teachers each wishes to be, James (2012) warns that the tendencies of preservice teachers to enter the profession believing that they know how to care for students they do not know, may prove destabilizing for establishing caring relationships between teachers and students.

According to James (2012), teachers’ biographies greatly influenced the caring relationships that teachers established with students. Teachers failed to consult with parents regarding what students needed, but rather injected their personal care narratives into what they knew about the students’ lives. James (2012) concludes, “participants’ preconceptions about their students’ needs and the deficit discourse that affirmed them, hindered teachers’ ability to establish a caring presence with their students.” The deficit discourse in which the teachers and principal engaged, which projected the notion that differences between students’ realities and teachers’ realities equated to inferiority of students’ life scripts, when coupled with “mothering discourse” wherein teachers assume the role of surrogate parents, resulted in ineffective caring relationships (James, 2012).

Precollegiate student teachers placed great emphasis on care as part of teacher identity, the same as recent literature reviews on teacher identity do also. As the brief discussion above suggests, teacher-as-relation is an essential dimension of teacher identity, as it influences the level of intensity as well as quality of engagement by students and teachers in the teaching and learning process (James, 2012; Kim and Schallert, 2011). On one hand, precollegiate student teachers noted the necessity of caring by teachers. On the other hand, precollegiate student teachers generally used deficit terminology when discussing teachers’ roles, including their own future role in
caring for students. The challenge for precollegiate student teachers will be to displace deficit beliefs systems with notions of mutuality (James, 2012). In applying the concept of mutuality to care theory, James (2012) argues, “…caring as relation demands caution—a hesitance in making judgments about the other—and humility—a willingness to believe that our understandings are incomplete and require input from others (p.167).”

Precollegiate student teachers consistently refer to caring by teachers. It will be important for precollegiate student teachers to learn to care in ways that respect their students’ biographies as well as their own, thus achieving the mutuality to which James (2012) refers.

Contrasts between Findings and Literature-based Definitions of Teacher Identity

Just as Self and Care emerged as particularly relevant for precollegiate student teacher participants, the influence of Emotion and Context appears less salient for precollegiate student teachers participants. The literature points to the role of emotions in identity construction (Geijsel & Meijers, 2005), in understanding possible selves (Hamman et al. 2010), as constituted through power relations (Zembylas, 2003), as a coping mechanism (Rots et al., 2012), and in understanding the other (Hargreaves, 2005). For example, Hargreaves (2005) refers to “emotional geographies” as “the spatial and experiential patterns of closeness and/or distance in human interactions and relationships that help create, configure and color the feelings and emotions we experience about ourselves, our world and each other (p. 968).” Hargreaves (2005) found that teacher emotional geographies vary with age and experience. Whereas early career teachers generally show energy, enthusiasm, flexibility and adaptability, later career teachers display opposite emotions of tiredness, emotional distance, relaxation and relief, as well
as resistance and resilience (Hargreaves, 2005). Precollegiate student teachers demonstrate minimal emotional connections to teaching. The emotional distance that is suggested in precollegiate student teachers’ responses are likely due to the duality of experience.

As mentioned previously, precollegiate student teachers in this study, engaged in meaning-making primarily from student-as-student perspectives. Contextual references were limited to classroom curricula and instruction, which served the professional context for precollegiate student teachers, as well as practica experiences in which precollegiate student teachers participated once each semester (Rots et al., 2012). Hence, limited opportunities for contextualized meaning-making of teaching appear to have precluded merging of precollegiate student teachers emotional selves to authentic schooling contexts (Hargreaves, 2001; Zembylas, 2003). Precollegiate student teachers are not yet at the point of engagement with how their teacher selves form (Zembylas, 2003). As Anderson and Stillman (2011) conclude, placement in urban settings does not guarantee preservice teachers plentiful opportunities nor purposed learning. Instead, urban field placements such as the early practica experiences in which precollegiate student teachers in this study participate, must target specialized knowledge, skills, and dispositions suitable for future contexts (Anderson & Stillman, 2011; Bleicher, 2011; Hollins, 2011)

Implications for Prospective Efficacy

Findings suggest inextricable linkage between teacher identity and prospective efficacy. Prospective efficacy refers to precollegiate student teachers’ beliefs regarding capabilities to perform successfully in the future the roles and responsibilities associated with teaching. Questions posed by precollegiate student teachers begin with “Will I be
The future-oriented perspective adds an element of informed speculation to prospective efficacy beliefs. Hence, prospective efficacy involves assessment of the return on investment delivered via early teacher education. In other words, will the knowledge, skills, and dispositions gained through early participation in teacher education render precollegiate student teachers good standing in preparedness to teach effectively?

The model for prospective efficacy follows. Beginning with the self as influenced by personal, social, cultural, historical and political knowledge sources, precollegiate student teachers begin to develop an epistemological stance towards teaching. Over time, precollegiate student teachers build identity capital grounded in the skills, knowledge and dispositions gained through access to varied knowledge sources. These skills, knowledge and dispositions develop as precollegiate student teachers learn theoretical principles of teaching, are able to obtain and learn from performance information, and combine the theory and practice into an epistemological framework that provides impetus for ongoing synergy between theoretical and practical experiences. The broader the base of identity capital from which the precollegiate student teacher draws, the greater the likelihood that she will develop prospective efficacy, or the belief that she will be capable of fulfilling teaching roles and responsibilities in the future. Figure 2 provides a graphic depiction of my theory of prospective efficacy as derived from this study.

Figure 2 illustrates that prospective efficacy results from a discursive relationship in which the Self engages with both an inward and outward flow of knowledge, thus building identity capital, and in turn prospective efficacy. Dimensions to this process that are worth noting include temporal considerations for meaning making and program
structure. Although this study is not a program evaluation in terms of quality control, the structure of the UTA program influences outcomes for precollegiate student teachers in terms of teacher preparation and is therefore open to consideration.

Figure 2. Prospective Efficacy Beliefs for Precollegiate/Preservice Teachers—A Model

**Constraints Associated with Temporal Distance**

Does temporal distance constrain prospective efficacy beliefs among students enrolled in precollegiate teacher preparation programs? When examined within the model of prospective efficacy that I provide here, the answer is “Yes.” Precollegiate student teacher participants in this study conceptualize teaching from a perspective wherein teachers’ work is characterized by identity markers denoting *teacher-as-content-expert* (teachers demonstrating domain-specific knowledge), *teacher-as-technocrat* (teachers following the rules), *teacher-as-transmitter* (teachers employing teacher-centered pedagogical styles), and *teacher-as-relation* (relational aspects of teaching). Preservice teachers have found schooling programs with similar characteristics to be constraining and of limited educative value (Anderson & Stillman, 2011). The fact that participants
primarily make meaning as students regarding teaching suggests that these markers represent the type of teaching that precollegiate student teachers observe currently as students in school, which in turn inform prospective efficacy beliefs (Knoblauch & Woolfolk Hoy, 2008).

Efficacy beliefs are stagnant and resistant to change (Bandura, 1977, 1993; Goddard et al., 2000). Moreover, researchers find that prior to the fulltime internship or practicum, preservice teachers focus primarily on teaching in terms of methodology rather than on developing understandings that will build professional teaching competence (Chamoso, Cáceres, & Azcárate, 2012). Therefore, precollegiate student teachers are unlikely to transition to more acceptable models of teaching, characterized by “some adaptation of mandated curricula, student-centered instruction, and emphasis mostly on tested subjects,” unless and until they encounter contextually significant experiences through which they can make meaning regarding teaching (Anderson & Stillman, 2011, p.454). These contextually significant experiences typically involve “critical incidents, phases, and persons” which help to shape the professional biographies (Kelchtermans, 1993, p.446). Development of professional competence not only impacts prospective efficacy beliefs, but also motivation to teach, and therefore commitment to teaching, particularly regarding teaching diverse student populations (Malinen, Savolainen, & Xu, 2012; Rots et al., 2012).

Constraints Associated with Proximity to Training Opportunities

Does the lack of cogent school-district-university partnerships restrict possibilities for theoretical and experiential growth opportunities among students enrolled in precollegiate teacher preparation programs? This is an important question, particularly as
it pertains to the value of programs such as UTA for recruiting individuals to the profession. Current research suggests that closer proximity of theoretical and experiential training to actual teaching opportunities increase the likelihood that preservice teachers will consider entering the profession (Bleicher, 2011). Additionally, high efficacy preservice teachers tend to hold positive beliefs about their internships and teaching in general and have been found to achieve better student achievement outcomes (Gibson & Dembo, 1984; Torre Cruz & Casanova Arias, 2007). Partnering with institutions of higher learning will increase opportunities for precollegiate student teachers to gain the requisite knowledge, skills, and dispositions for teaching in urban school contexts (Bandura, 1993; McKinney et al., 2008). By aligning UTA curricula and instruction with accreditation standards, organizers can facilitate strengthening of precollegiate student teachers prospective efficacy as these pre-teachers build identity capital. Moreover, school-district-university partnerships allow for co-construction of pre-teacher programs that can prepare precollegiate student teachers as lifelong learners (Hammerness et al., 2005).

**Recommendations for Further Research**

In this study, I investigated teacher identity and prospective efficacy beliefs among students enrolled in a precollegiate Urban Teaching Academy, using a phenomenological case study design. Findings indicate that by the third year of participation in an Urban Teaching Academy precollegiate student teacher participants continued to make sense of what it means to be a teacher primarily from a student perspective. This appears to have impacted prospective efficacy beliefs as precollegiate student teachers experienced few and intermittent opportunities to engage with actual
teaching and learning processes that would have facilitated meaning making. Additional research would entail investigating the impact of more integrated experiential learning opportunities on teacher identity formation.

Similarly, literature-based definitions on teacher identity parallel study findings in terms of *Self* and *Care*, but contrast with findings in terms of *Emotions* and *Context*. Additional research should address areas of similarities and differences to understand better relationships of the construct respective of developmental suitability for precollegiate student teachers. For example, because precollegiate student teachers are far-removed from fulltime internship/practicum and even farther removed from actual teaching, connections that would elicit emotional engagement and interaction with contextual factors remain dormant. Additional research should seek to uncover ways to bridge the temporal divide that appears to hinder development of relational aspects to teacher identity for precollegiate student teachers.

Finally, I present a new model for extending the teacher efficacy construct; i.e., *prospective efficacy*. Additional confirmatory research would help to refine the construct and its meaning for teacher education targeting individuals at the precollegiate and preservice levels. Researchers should investigate implications for prospective efficacy and teacher education sequencing and organization, the goal being to improve teacher recruitment and retention results.

**Implications for Practice: Teacher Education, Recruitment, and Retention**

The UTA is a viable mechanism for early preparation of quality teachers for urban schools. Findings show that participants gained identity markers, which support growth and development of identity capital for becoming teachers. Prospective efficacy
beliefs increased as participants built identity capital, albeit primarily from a student’s perspective. Practica experiences, however, helped to merge the self-as-student to self-as-precollegiate student teacher to self-as-teacher. This displacement of self is crucial for teacher development (Ball & Forzani, 2009). Participants responded favorably to “low-risk” experiential opportunities wherein they were allowed to teach students in elementary feeder schools (Grossman et al., 2009, p.2087). As is shown in the previous chapter, participants used practica experiences to validate knowledge and skills learned from the UTA curriculum. Participants expressed wanting to increase these experiences. Additionally, participants such as Erica and Raul attributed their growing commitment to completing the program and continuing on to a teacher education program to practica experiences. These experiences served as pre-induction for participants, allowing them to activate knowledge learned in the UTA classroom, under direct supervision of practicing teachers (Ball & Forzani, 2009). Evidence suggests that induction can improve the likelihood that new teachers will stay after one year; thus encouraging similar results when precollegiate student teachers are provided with similar experiences (Smith & Ingersoll, 2004)

According to Ball and Forzani (2009), “Teacher is a “role word” (Buchmann, 1993, p.147), and the locus of the role is other people—learners. Acting in learners’ interests is the core imperative of the role. Acting in their interest entails the deliberate suspension of aspects of one’s self (p.499).” Findings show that participants believed that teachers are responsible for students’ learning. All, except Rafael, rigorously accepted responsibility for identifying and meeting students’ academic and socio-emotional needs in whatever ways called for, in accordance with their professional judgment when they
become teachers. Overall, participants considered knowing, understanding, and
demonstrating care for one’s students as an ethical dimension to the teaching profession.
Additionally, care and connection were believed integral to teachers’ effectiveness. In
fact, care and connection trumped academic preparation for all participants except Raul.
In contrast, Raul ascribed importance to passion, stating that teachers cannot be
successful if they enter the profession for the wrong reasons. Raul placed greater
significance to one having passion for the work as opposed to having “passion” for the
students. Relational requirements for teachers include having a level of cultural
competence, therein adopting a “constructivist-sociocultural perspective” in urban
schools where teacher and student backgrounds are mix-matched (Ball & Forzani, 2009;
Hollins, 2011, p.403).

Although most offered broad, non-specific strategies for meeting the needs of
diverse learners, their responses show that they were cognizant of teachers’
responsibilities for student learning. Participants generally expressed beliefs that they
could teach subjects that they were good in as students such as mathematics or English.
However, Ball and Forzani (2009) contend that being able to do mathematics well or
being able to read and write well is no guarantee that one will be able to teach others in
these disciplines. Researchers in each of the respective fields, as well as in remaining
core curricula of K-12 schooling, have identified specific ways of knowing in each
discipline, that are particular to teachers’ work, and that are not extrapolated naturally by
lay persons (Ball & Forzani, 2009). Therefore, participants in the UTA appear to require
more domain-specific instruction in teaching methods and strategies geared towards
teaching students in urban schools.
Hollins (2011) prescribes a “holistic practice-based approach” to teaching that would address the learning needs of specific learners such as students attending urban schools and that would include, first, “essential knowledge, skills and understandings,” and, secondly, “epistemic practices and program qualities that support learning to teach” (p.397). This approach addresses elements that emerged in various stages from the findings. Included within the paradigm for training teachers in essential knowledge, skills, and understandings are:

- knowledge of learners (e.g., who they are, where they come from, and where they are in their development),
- knowledge of learning (e.g., knowledge of the learning process and associated theoretical underpinnings),
- knowledge of subject matter (e.g., domain-specific knowledge according to contemporary learning sciences research and practice),
- knowledge of pedagogy (e.g., ability to design learning processes geared toward achieving appropriately established learning outcomes by all learners),
- knowledge of accountability and assessment (e.g., choosing meaningful assessments for appropriately established learning outcomes that will inform instruction on a day-to-day basis), and
- ability to participate in a professional learning community (e.g., ability to engage in professional discourse with colleagues as part of professional development.

(Intermediate Fall 2011 p. 398-403)

Two aspects to the teacher training paradigm offered by Hollins (2011); i.e., knowledge of pedagogy and the ability to participate in professional learning
communities (PLC), are particularly salient for this study. Specifically, findings from this study exposed deficit thinking among participants regarding the learning potential of students in urban schools as well as beliefs regarding immoderate mandates on teacher knowledge and skills for working successfully in urban school contexts. Although all participants, except Rafael, stated their beliefs that all students can learn, participants consistently pointed to shortcomings within students attending urban schools, the schools’ infrastructure, and the communities where urban schools are located. Hollins (2011) stresses that attention to pedagogy and professional development through cohorts or PLCs have shown effectiveness in breaking the cycle of socialization into an “ideology of power and privilege” that often perpetuates deficit thinking, which leads to inequitable and inappropriate practices among preservice teachers (Hollins, 2011, p.400). Although participants were considered as “insiders” and privy to situational idiosyncrasies that should have enhanced their understandings of contextual elements inherent to urban schools, this did not occur; perhaps because if the UTA program’s status as a magnet program bringing students from other areas within the district (Kim & Schallert, 2011).

Moreover, the fact that only two of nine participants addressed demographic diversity directly in their responses to a direct question on the matter highlights participants’ propensity to ignore implications of race, socioeconomic status (SES), ability, and first language for teaching and learning. This is problematic, as “race-neutral perspectives,” and I would offer SES, ability, and first language to dimensions of neutrality, “see deficiency as an individual phenomenon. Thus, instruction is conceived as a generic set of teaching skills that should work for all students. When these strategies or skills fail to achieve desired results, the students, not the techniques, are found lacking
(Ladson-Billings, 1998, p.19).” One can expect participants to experience this sort of dissonance if the trend of ignoring students’ demographic diversity and lumping of all students attending urban schools into one category continues throughout their years of teacher training. The current scenario in which most traditional teacher education program curricular offerings target generic student characteristics pertaining to age, grade level, subject-area, and disability category propagates the notion of students attending urban schools as special and therefore requiring special training for teachers to believe them teachable (Conaway et al., 2007; Goddard et al. 2000; Tucker et al. 2005). Hence, the early experiences provided by the UTA are a first step in preparing participants ideologically and to acquire the knowledge and skills need to reinforce prospective efficacy beliefs among the participants in order to teach in urban school contexts (Goddard & Skrla, 2006; McKinney et al., 2008; Siwatu, 2007; Tournaki & Podell, 2005). However, findings suggest that the UTA curriculum does not go far enough to alleviate the cultural passivity typically demonstrated by teachers graduating traditional teacher education programs (Cross, 2003).

This study sheds light on participants’ meaning making regarding teacher identity and prospective efficacy. An underlying issue was whether discernible effects upon participants’ commitment would be realized through their participation in the program. The good news is that each of the participants, except Raul, stated their intent to enter the profession. However, as is discussed in the next section, the guarantee of scholarships was no longer there. Whether or not the participants continue on to enroll in teacher education programs remains in question.
Recommendations for Practice

Findings from this study indicate that projects such as the Urban Teaching Academy (UTA) can help to curb teacher recruitment and retention issues for urban schools in a positive direction. The following recommendations for further research are suggested as next steps to finding solutions:

1. Establish closer partnerships between universities and local school districts when planning and implementing precollegiate teacher training programs. The leadership structure for the UTA investigated in this study was comprised of a district coordinator, a university faculty liaison, and the classroom teacher. According to reports by the UTA teacher and participants, the faculty liaison only visited the program 3-4 times each year. The nature of the visits was observational at best. Closer partnerships between entities, preferably a cadre of multiple personnel from each unit, would allow a more cohesive program that could be organized so that students transition seamlessly from high school into teacher education programs at representational institutions of higher learning.

2. Consider making the program an early admission to college initiative so that participants can meet requirements to complete the first two years of the teacher education course requirements in high school while dually enrolled and enter the major portion of the degree courses immediately upon graduation from high school. One program that offers an intensive two-week summer immersion program has experience a 60% rate for recruiting high school juniors to teacher education programs (Urban Teaching Academy Fact Sheet, 2011).
3. Keep promises made to students and their families. In the case of the UTA, students and their families were promised four-year scholarships upon graduation. However, according to published reports, the district reneged on this promise, citing fund-raising shortfalls. As a result, the program now only offers to help students seek funding, which is what they should be able to expect from school counselors under normal circumstance. This takes away a major incentive to attract students to the profession.
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Appendix A

Pilot Focus Group Interview Protocol

1. What is a typical day like as a UTA student?

2. Do you plan to become a teacher?

3. If you want to become a teacher, was teaching your first career choice?

4. If teaching was not your first career choice, what was your first career choice? Why or why not?

5. Which choice was teaching; i.e., 1st, 2nd, 3rd, etc?

6. What do you need to enter the career that you have chosen?

7. What types of resources will you need to be successful in obtaining your first career choice?

8. Please share any additional information that you would like to share regarding your participation in UTA.
Appendix B

Demographic Questionnaire

Directions: Please allow me to get to know you a little by completing the information below. Leave areas blank that you do not wish to share. Thank you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>FIRST Name</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCHOOL</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRADE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RACE/ETHNICITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRADUATION YEAR</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UTA (YEAR 1 or 2)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SIGNED PERMISSION? YES or NO</strong></td>
<td>Attach signed consent form.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C

Pilot Individual Interview Protocol

1. Why did you enroll in UTA?
2. What activities do you enjoy most as a student in UTA? Why?
3. What do you see as the purpose of education?
4. Are teachers important for achieving the purpose of education? Why or why not?
5. What are the roles and responsibilities of a teacher? Think about a teacher that you have had that you considered to be a good/effective teacher. Without naming names, talk about what qualities the teacher had that made the teacher a good/effective teacher.
6. How do teachers become good/effective teachers?
7. What or Who influenced your decision to become a teacher?
8. What is the purpose of UTA?
9. How are you benefitting from UTA?
10. Is there anything that you would change about UTA if you could? Please explain.
11. What impact is UTA having on your career choice? Has your career choice changed since becoming a student in UTA? Please explain.
12. What is the most important knowledge or skills that you have learned as a student in UTA so far?
13. What does a UTA student need to be successful in the program?
14. Talk to me about your commitment to UTA.
15. What type of school would you like to teach in when you become a teacher?
16. Do you have anything else to add about being in UTA?
Appendix D

Graphic Representation of Teacher Education Needs
February 18, 2010

Marsha Simon,
Special Education

RE: Expedited Approval for Application Type: Initial Review
IRB#: Pro00000341
Title: African American Students in an Urban Teacher Academy: A Case Study

Dear Marsha Simon:

On 2/17/2010 the Institutional Review Board (IRB) reviewed and APPROVED the above referenced protocol. Please note that your approval for this study will expire on February 17, 2011.

Approved Items:
Protocol Document(s):

African American Students in an Urban Teacher Academy: A Case Study
1/31/2010 7:32 PM 0.01
Research Protocol for IRB
2/15/2010 5:05 PM 0.01

Consent/Assent Document(s):

Parental Permission Consent.pdf 2/18/2010 8:24 AM 0.01
Student Assent.pdf 2/18/2010 8:24 AM 0.01

It was the determination of the IRB that your study qualified for expedited review which include activities that (1) present no more than minimal risk to human subjects, and (2) involve only procedures listed in one or more of the categories outlined below. The IRB may review research through the expedited review procedure authorized by
45CFR46.110 and 21 CFR 56.110. The research proposed in this study is categorized under the following expedited review category:

(6) Collection of data from voice, video, digital, or image recordings made for research purposes.

(7) Research on individual or group characteristics or behavior (including, but not limited to, research on perception, cognition, motivation, identity, language, communication, cultural beliefs or practices, and social behavior) or research employing survey, interview, oral history, focus group, program evaluation, human factors evaluation, or quality assurance methodologies.

Please note, the informed consent/assent documents are valid during the period indicated by the official, IRB-Approval stamp located on the form. Valid consent must be documented on a copy of the most recently IRB-approved consent form.

Your study qualifies for a waiver of the requirements for the documentation of informed consent as outlined in the federal regulations at 45CFR46.116 (d) which states that an IRB may approve a consent procedure which does not include, or which alters, some or all of the elements of informed consent, or waive the requirements to obtain informed consent provided the IRB finds and documents that (1) the research involves no more than minimal risk to the subjects; (2) the waiver or alteration will not adversely affect the rights and welfare of the subjects; (3) the research could not practicably be carried out without the waiver or alteration; and (4) whenever appropriate, the subjects will be provided with additional pertinent information after participation.

As the principal investigator of this study, it is your responsibility to conduct this study in accordance with IRB policies and procedures and as approved by the IRB. Any changes to the approved research must be submitted to the IRB for review and approval by an amendment.

We appreciate your dedication to the ethical conduct of human subject research at the University of South Florida and your continued commitment to human research protections. If you have any questions regarding this matter, please call 813-974-9343.

Sincerely,

Krista Kutash, PhD, Chairperson
USF Institutional Review Board
Cc: Various Menzel, CCRP
       USF IRB Professional Staff
May 4, 2011

Martha Simon
Special Education
18002 Richmond Place Dr., Apt. 1126
Tampa, FL 33647

RE: Approved Amendment Request
IRB#: MS4 Pro00100341
Title: Students in an Urban Teacher Academy: A Case Study

Dear Ms. Simon,

On 4/21/2011 the Institutional Review Board (IRB) reviewed and approved your Amendment by expedited review procedures.

The submitted request has been approved from date: 4/21/2011 to date: 2/17/2012 for the following:

- The research is now being conducted for purposes of the PI's dissertation.

We appreciate your dedication to the ethical conduct of human subject research at the University of South Florida and your continued commitment to human research protections. If you have any questions regarding this matter, please call 813-974-5638.

Sincerely,

John A. Schinka, Ph.D.
Chairperson
USF Institutional Review Board

CC: Anna Davis, USF IRB Professional Staff
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Reflective Journal Prompts

Prompt 1 Think about your philosophy of teaching. Talk about your teaching philosophy in terms of who or what influenced your desire to want to become a teacher, what you will do to make sure that you will be the best teacher that you can be, how you will use the experiences of UTA to become a great teacher, etc.

Prompt 2 Think about the teaching profession. What should every teacher know and be able to do? Name, describe (explain what each thing is) and discuss (talk about why the thing is important) 3 things that every teacher should know. Name, describe (explain what each thing is) and discuss (talk about why the thing is important) 3 things that every teacher should be able to do.

Prompt 3 Think about what you are looking forward to most about becoming a teacher. Talk about at least 3 things that you look forward to when you become a teacher and discuss why you are looking forward to these things.

Prompt 4 Think about the knowledge and skills that you will need when you become a teacher. Name and discuss the 3 areas where you will be most effective.

- What are the three areas?
- Why do you believe that you will be effective in these areas?
- What helped you to become effective in these areas?
- What strategies will you use to continue to develop in each area?

Name and discuss the 3 areas where you will be least effective.
• What are the three areas?
• Why do you believe that you will be least effective in these areas?
• What will help you to become effective in these areas?
• What strategies will you use to develop in these areas?

Prompt 5  Think about the many things that you have learned about the teaching profession through reading, instruction, and experiences since enrolling in UTA. What are the most valuable things that you have learned as a UTA student? Talk about the most valuable understandings about the teaching profession that you have gained as a UTA student, why these understandings are valuable to you, and how you will use these understandings when you become a teacher

Prompt 6  You will return to teach in an “urban” school after completing your teaching degree. What makes a school “urban”? In what ways are urban schools similar to other schools? In what ways are urban schools different from other schools? What will you need to know and be able to do to be an effective teacher in an urban school?

Prompt 7  Do you believe that all students can learn? What will be your role as a teacher in making sure that all students learn? Talk about the specific ways that you will make sure that each student in your class learns regardless of race/ethnicity, gender, ability, first language, etc.?