Using Case Studies To Explore Teacher Candidates' Intellectual, Cultural, and Moral Dispositions

By Deborah L. Schussler, Lynne A. Bercaw, and Lisa M. Stooksberry

Deborah L. Schussler is an assistant professor in the Department of Education and Human Services at Villanova University, Villanova, Pennsylvania; Lynne A. Bercaw is an associate professor in the Department of Education at California State University-Chico, Chico, California; and Lisa M. Stooksbery is director of professional issues and partnerships with the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.

> I saw the factories where some of my students and many of their parents work…[a few] families fell on bad times economically and were forced out of their homes because they could not pay their rent. These families went to live in one of the area motels. I learned a lot about the background of the students. Knowing this has helped me understand where education is on the list of priorities for these students. It also just helps for me to know where these students are coming from when they enter the classroom each day. It shows me what I need to overcome, in a sense. It also serves as a challenge for me in terms of how to motivate all my students to learn, and how to make it applicable to their lives.

Jackie,[1] a white, upper-middle class student teacher in secondary social studies, wrote these words in her journal at the beginning of her student teaching experience at Whitman High School, a predominantly white, blue-collar, suburban school. In this brief excerpt of her journal, a myriad of assumptions, values, and beliefs about how one effectively teaches intertwine in a throng

of messy layers. Although those evaluating Jackie are most concerned with her outward behaviors, it is these less tangible, internal qualities that determine Jackie's thinking and actions as a teacher. Various bodies of literature address aspects of these internal qualities: teacher beliefs (Nespor, 1987; Pajares, 1992), professional identity (Kelchtermans & Vandenberghe, 1994; Korthagen, 2004), and self of the teacher (Borich, 1999; Bullough & Gitlin, 1995; Nias, 1987). We use the concept of *dispositions*, defined as the internal filter that affects the way a teacher is inclined to think and act on the information and experiences that are part of his/her teaching context (see Schussler, 2006). This filter is shaped by a teacher's prior experience, beliefs, culture, values, and cognitive abilities. We contend that exemplary teaching lies at the intersection of three domains of dispositions—intellectual, cultural, moral—referred to as the "ICM framework" (Stooksberry, Schussler, & Bercaw, in submission). For Jackie, as for all teachers, disentangling the various threads that comprise one's dispositions is essential if teachers are to understand what drives their thinking and actions.

We constructed a case study based on Jackie's journal entry (i.e., the "Jackie case") to examine how candidates in two teacher education courses were inclined to think through a specific teaching situation. Specifically, we examined how candidates drew from three domains of dispositions—intellectual, cultural, and moral—as they analyzed the case twice over the course of one semester. We were particularly interested in whether and how candidates' thinking shifted by the second analysis at the end of the semester. Teacher candidates tend to make particular assumptions, especially when presented with students unlike themselves (Banks et al., 2005; Hollins & Guzman, 2005). Therefore, an integral part of the analysis also included looking within the three disposition domains to examine both candidates' awareness of the assumptions Jackie made as well as candidates' recognition of their own assumptions as they analyzed the case. Although candidates demonstrated an ability to reflect on appropriate instructional strategies, demonstrating awareness within the intellectual domain, they generally lacked awareness within the cultural and moral domains. These results are described in detail following an overview of the ICM framework and the methods for the study.

Theoretical Framework

Dispositions have been defined as "the trend of a teacher's actions in particular contexts" (Katz & Raths, 1985, p. 301), "habits of thinking and action" (Hammerness et al., 2005, p. 387), and "values, commitments, and professional ethics that influence behaviors" (National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, 2002, p. 53). Like Schussler (2006), we consider dispositions more as a process, operating as a point of convergence and inception. In essence, dispositions are a two-way filter affecting how teacher candidates are inclined to receive information and experiences (convergence) and then process this knowledge and make decisions

regarding their actions (inception). Teacher candidates must develop their ability to reflect on their thinking and their actions so that they develop an awareness of their dispositions. Given the complexity of teaching, we posit that teachers should possess awareness of their dispositions across three broad domains—intellectual, cultural, and moral—described briefly below.[2]

The Intellectual Domain

We define intellectual dispositions as teachers' inclination to think and act around issues related to content and pedagogy. A teacher's knowledge base includes content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, and pedagogical content knowledge (Shulman, 1987; Wilson, Floden, & Ferrini-Mundy, 2001). However, this knowledge is inert and useless if teachers can not transfer their knowledge to teaching situations (Bransford, Brown, & Cocking, 2000; Eraut, 1994; Hammerness et al., 2005) overcoming what Kennedy (1999) has termed the "problem of enactment" (p. 70). Intellectual dispositions operate as a point of convergence influencing how teachers learn to teach by shaping how information and experiences concerning content and pedagogy are received. Because teachers have been students of teaching for at least sixteen years (Hammerness et al., 2005; Lortie, 1975), they possess beliefs, values, and cognitive structures defining what effective teaching looks like. Intellectual dispositions then act as a point of inception by guiding teachers' decisions related to content and pedagogy. Through reflection (Zeichner & Liston, 1996), teachers must develop an awareness for which teaching situations require specific knowledge and skills related to content and pedagogy and be inclined to use the knowledge and skills. Therefore, intellectual dispositions move beyond knowledge to represent how knowledge is received and utilized.

The Cultural Domain

We define cultural dispositions as teachers' inclination to meet the needs of the diverse learners in the classroom. Whether they are aware of it or not, all teachers possess a cultural identity. This identity shapes how teachers perceive information and experiences, operating as a point of convergence. Cultural dispositions then act as a point of inception by guiding teachers' decisions related to their own beliefs, values, and cultural norms and those of their students. Similar to definitions of culturally relevant pedagogy, our conceptualization of cultural dispositions incorporates three strands: (1) teachers' awareness of their own culture and how their culture affects the teaching and interaction with students, (2) teachers' awareness of students' cultures and how their cultures affect learning, and (3) teachers' ability to utilize the knowledge of self and student (the intersection of teacher culture and student culture) toward modifying instruction to best meet the needs of the diverse learners (Banks et al., 2005; Ladson-Billings, 1994). The negative impact of teachers' lack of cultural experience (Grant & Secada, 1990; Nieto, 2000) on student achievement is well documented (Gay, 2002; Hollins & Guzman, 2005) making teachers' awareness of their cultural dispositions imperative.

The Moral Domain

Moral dispositions encompass awareness of one's own values, the inclination to think through the assumptions and ramifications behind one's values, considering desirable ends and the processes to achieve those ends, and the responsibility one has to others and to helping others meet their needs. Moral dispositions operate as a point of convergence because teacher candidates begin their teacher education programs with an extensive value system in place (Mayes, 2001; Nias, 1987), basing their understanding of the world on personal distinctions between right and wrong (Dill, 1990; Strike & Soltis, 1985). Teachers make countless decisions that are packed with assumptions about the purposes of education; their dispositions operate as a point of inception, acting as a value-laden guide that frames their thinking and actions. Awareness of moral dispositions includes thinking through the assumptions and ramifications behind their values. Teachers must first reflect on desirable ends (Tom, 1984) and then be willing to reflect on the best ways to achieve those ends. Because teaching occurs in a social context, the idea of desirable ends must include the nature of the relationships teachers maintain with others, including teachers' inclination to care for their students (Mayeroff, 1971; Noddings, 1984; VanManen, 2000). If teacher candidates are to develop such relationships, they must first become aware of their own value system (Carroll & Carney, 2005), then they must develop their awareness for how this value system affects their responses to various teaching situations.

The Overlap of Domains

Obviously tremendous overlap exists across the domains. Culture helps to shape values which affects how one considers content and pedagogy. The purpose in separating the three domains is not to suggest they are mutually exclusive. Rather, our purpose is to explore how candidates are inclined to think through teaching situations and whether their awareness exists across domains. In other words, their *inclination* to think within the domains and their *awareness* about their thinking are essential. The intellectual domain, being the most concrete, is the easiest for candidates to access. One of our own assumptions is that effective teachers demonstrate an awareness of how dispositions within the cultural and moral domains affect the intellectual. Therefore, it is important first to understand how candidates' thinking manifests within each of the three domains and whether any shifts occur.

Methods

In order to examine how teacher candidates are inclined to think through a specific teaching situation and whether they develop awareness of assumptions, we asked candidates to analyze a case study twice during a semester. Case studies provide opportunities for candidates to observe and unpack actual events, including teachers' instructional decisions and the consequences of those decisions (Har-

rington, Quinn-Leering, & Hodson, 1996). It is very difficult to change firmly-held beliefs about teaching (Block & Hazelip, 1995; Richardson, 1996), especially when candidates encounter students with backgrounds that are dissimilar from their own (Au, 1998; Delpit, 1995; Ladson-Billings, 1994). Cases such as the Jackie case that narrate the thinking and actions of a real student teacher as described in an actual journal, portray the complexity of events and the thinking surrounding those events, as they occurred. By asking candidates to self reflect in their analyses of a case, we implicitly ask them to examine their dispositions. Knowing that candidates integrate more theoretical concepts during repeated analysis of a case (Lundeberg & Scheurman, 1997), we wanted to know if candidates would draw from more disposition domains and with increased awareness by the second case analysis. It should be noted that this examination is implicit in that neither instructor used the word "dispositions." It is explicit in that the questions candidates answered when they responded to the case revealed how they were inclined to think through and make decisions about a teaching situation, indicating how they drew from the three disposition domains.

Data were collected during one semester in two teacher education programs. University A is a mid-sized, private, religiously-affiliated school in a suburban Northeast city. University B is a mid-sized, public institution in a rural setting located in the Southeast. Course 1 (at University A) is a content area reading methods course with sixteen secondary education teacher candidates (referred to as "TC"). Course 2 (at University B) is an elementary education curriculum course with fourteen candidates. Both courses occur the semester prior to student teaching. Each course included a six week field-placement component where candidates observed and assisted with classes three to five hours per week. Instructors in both courses emphasized aspects of diversity: socioeconomic, racial/ethnic, learning style, and achievement.

All study participants were Caucasian. University A included seven males and nine females; all participants at University B were female. In each course there were two non-traditional students (older than 22). At University A, nine participants attended public high school, six private, and one "other;" fourteen of the sixteen participants estimated that at least 50% of their high school classmates attended college. At University B, thirteen attended public and one attended a private high school; ten of the fourteen estimated at least 50% of their high school classmates attended college. Two participants from University A and four from University B said their parents had no higher than a high school education.

At the beginning of the semester instructors asked teacher candidates to identify the major issues in the case and to state how they thought Jackie should proceed. To ensure authentic responses, instructors told candidates there were no "correct" responses and did not assess responses based on specific answers. Candidates responded to the situation individually then posted their responses to a WebCT discussion board. These responses are referred to as "Jackie 1." Each instructor identified topics from the WebCT postings and facilitated small group followed by a whole class discussion at each site. Topics included academic expectations, parental

involvement, and ways to motivate students. Discussions were audio-taped, and two researchers at each site took field notes. Topics identified by candidates from the class discussions were posted on WebCT for further examination. Throughout the semester instructors addressed these topics in various class discussions and activities. At the end of the semester candidates again responded to the case ("Jackie 2") in order for the research team to ascertain whether any shifts occurred over the semester. Candidates at University A were also asked to identify Jackie's assumptions, values, and responsibilities and to identify their own assumptions in their initial analysis of the case.[3]

Data analysis emerged as a four-stage process and employed the constant comparative method (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). During the first stage of analysis, researchers coded responses to Jackie 1 by disposition domain paying particular attention to the major issues that the teacher candidates identified. We also noted statements that did not fit the three domains, but these were few. Some data were placed into multiple domains with most of the overlap existing between cultural and moral or cultural and intellectual. For reliability purposes, data were coded separately by two researchers who exchanged information via email and conference calls. When discrepancies arose, the definitions for each disposition domain were further clarified. *How* candidates thought about an issue, rather than the actual topic, was most salient as we coded for the domains. For example, TC 11 said Jackie was responsible for finding interesting instructional methods. TC 12 said Jackie should provide the "maximum learning environment" for all her students which she achieves by going into the community and understanding their backgrounds. Both candidates refer to instruction, but TC 12 was thinking about instruction from the perspective of cultural understanding. Therefore TC 11's comment was coded "Intellectual" and TC 12's comment was coded "Cultural." During the second stage of analysis, the statements within each disposition domain were grouped together into broader categories or themes. For example, a statement coded in the first stage of analysis as a moral disposition (e.g., "Jackie must be more than just the teacher; she must be the parent. She may be the only constant support these students have.") was defined by its theme within the moral domain, "relating to students." Two to three themes emerged for each disposition domain (see Table 1).

The coding of Jackie 2 comprised the third and fourth stages of data analysis. These stages mirrored stages one and two, yet we purposefully did not refer to the themes that emerged in stages one and two so that we could more easily perceive new data. Similar themes emerged. Sometimes they were addressed with more complexity of thought. For example, candidates sometimes recognized assumptions and value judgments they made. For some themes, the candidates' thinking remained stagnant. The themes are described in more detail below.

Table 1.
Themes Identified in the Domains According to Degree of Change from the First to Last Case Analysis.

Domains	Themes with More Change →		Themes with Less Change
Intellectual	Knowing students and making appropriate instructional decisions.	Student motivation.	
Cultural	Differences between teacher and student. background.	Connecting students to curriculum.	Awareness of worldviews.
Moral	Responsibility for promoting student learning.	Relating to students and setting expectations.	Instilling value education.[a]

[a] Differences existed between teacher candidates at University A and University B.

Findings

Within each domain we delineate themes prevalent in the data, describing aspects of the Jackie case on which teacher candidates were inclined to focus. Data were analyzed collectively from University A and B though we note where substantive differences between schools emerged. Within the themes of each disposition domain, we also note changes from candidates' initial response to the case to the second response at the end of the semester. We were particularly interested in whether candidates became more aware of Jackie's and their own assumptions by the second case analysis. Because some overlap existed between the domains, we indicate where this occurs and hypothesize what it may reveal about candidates' dispositions.

Intellectual

Intellectual dispositions are the inclination to think and act around issues related to content and pedagogy. Because we are exploring the decision-making processes of beginning teachers, the issues they explore in a case study about a student teacher will almost always relate to content and pedagogy in some way. Parceling out intellectual dispositions from all others seems impractical given the tremendous overlap. As we coded for all three domains, we tried to ascertain the impetus for teacher candidates' reasoning. When teacher candidates explored issues regarding content and pedagogy by drawing from sources of knowledge, data were coded under the intellectual domain. Those same issues could be explored but with a focus on the differences in worldviews or a focus on the values involved, in which case they would be coded as cultural or moral. Major themes in the intellectual domain include student motivation and the importance of making instructional decisions based on knowledge of students.

The Jackie case includes information designed to engage teacher candidates in examining, first, Jackie's assumptions about students' motivation and then their own assumptions. The case includes the following information: "It seemed that many students were not highly academically motivated and did not succeed in [history] class." This notion was reinforced in the case by the description of Jackie's drive through the school's neighborhood where she saw the small homes and local businesses that comprise the area. When responding to the question of what major issue Jackie faced, in both Jackie 1 and 2 responses over two-thirds of the teacher candidates from both universities expressed overwhelmingly that student motivation was Jackie's biggest challenge. Candidates then offered strategies for how Jackie might motivate her students. Recommendations included: modeling enthusiasm, connecting to students' prior knowledge, and making lessons interactive with hands-on activities. Several candidates from both universities suggested creating a "fun" environment through activities like games. Others suggested using real-world events like the presidential election to bring history to life (TC 5 & 13, Jackie 1; 1& 14, Jackie 2). There was little evidence of change between responses to Jackie 1 and Jackie 2. The importance of motivation was as important in the beginning of the semester as it was in the end. Candidates' ideas for how to increase motivation also showed little change.

One aspect of student motivation that did not emerge in responses to Jackie 1 or 2 is teacher candidates' awareness that they readily accepted Jackie's assumptions about students' lack of motivation. A compelling aspect of this case is Jackie's series of assumptions as to why her students lack academic motivation. Much of Jackie's analysis is based on a tour of the neighborhood, not from information she gains directly from students. While the case states that "it seems" students were not highly motivated to succeed and the case implies this is because of the low socioeconomic status in the area, we anticipated that teacher candidates might raise questions or consider other potential factors influencing students' motivation. Instead, the candidates unquestioningly accepted Jackie's conclusions.

One shift we noticed between the analysis of Jackie 1 and Jackie 2 was the development of less abstract ideas regarding instructional strategies that could increase student motivation. Although their ideas became less abstract, candidates still failed to outline specific strategies necessary to affect students' level of motivation. In responding to Jackie 1 and 2, candidates recommended that Jackie modify instruction to relate directly to students' lives and interests. To achieve this, candidates in Jackie 1 made broad suggestions about using multiple teaching methods. In response to Jackie 2, candidates offered more specific ideas but did not offer actual strategies to collect the information. For example, several candidates stated the importance of "getting to know students" and their learning styles so one can make an informed decision about how to "proceed in the classroom" (TC 29, Jackie 2). One candidate suggested that Jackie observe the "mechanics of the classroom, methodologies utilized by her cooperating teacher, the personalities of the students and their learning techniques

and abilities" (TC 15, Jackie 2). The lack of specificity is not wholly unexpected given that candidates are in the incipient stages of teaching (Berliner, 1994) and that they are referring to hypothetical rather than actual students.

The teacher candidates possess an obvious inclination to motivate students and employ appropriate instruction. Yet, they are lacking an awareness of some of their own assumptions regarding their students and how they can best ascertain student needs. Candidates are capable of applying appropriate educational jargon (e.g., learning styles, prior knowledge) to a hypothetical case indicating their inclination to consider these concepts. However, it is unclear whether the paucity of specific strategies indicates candidates' inability to transfer their knowledge about pedagogy into actual teaching situations or is indicative of the abstract nature of a case study.

Cultural

Data were coded as part of the cultural domain when teacher candidates focused their comments on meeting the needs of diverse learners. Unlike the intellectual domain, where the crux of a comment focused on strategy use, comments coded in the cultural domain centered on understanding an individual's background or worldview (a teacher's, a student's, and one's own). We were particularly interested in whether candidates addressed how background or worldview affects one's behaviors and achievements in school. Responses from both institutions focused on the chasm of difference between Jackie and her students. Specifically, candidates described teacher/student difference of background, the importance of connecting school curriculum with students' lives, and for a few candidates, an awareness of their own worldview.

Candidates highlighted the differences between teachers and students both in regard to Jackie and her students and in regard to the teacher candidates and their experiences with students in their field placements. The differences in background resonated throughout the responses from both Jackie 1 and Jackie 2. Candidates attributed Jackie's problems with student motivation to this difference. There was an overall sense of Jackie's expectations being quite different from her students. Many candidates extrapolated from information that did not exist in the case. For example, TC 3 writes, "Parental expectations, peer relationships are very different for Jackie's students than for Jackie. This makes it difficult for her to relate to them" (Jackie 1). Others went further to say that the difference in backgrounds actually caused students' negative perceptions toward school. TC 25 said Jackie's inability to relate to students caused a "difference in understandings which caused Jackie's students to react negatively to education" (Jackie 2). Some candidates attributed the disconnect to something problematic with the students. For example, TC 6 states that because the students will most likely go into the family business or factory jobs, they probably have "negative connotations toward school" (Jackie 1). The candidates were acutely aware of the cultural chasm between Jackie and her students. However, this awareness led to

assumptions regarding students' perception of the value of school, assumptions which may not have been accurate.

Throughout their responses teacher candidates did address ways to lessen the cultural chasm, which included connecting school curriculum with students' lives. Responses in Jackie 1 show a consensus of the importance of Jackie knowing and understanding her students (e.g., background, family, interests, goals). Ideas toward this end include Jackie adjusting her expectations (TC 1), understanding students' points of view (TC 2), understanding students' strengths and weaknesses (TC 13), and getting to know each student individually (TC 6, 10, 21, 26, 29, 31, 32). Similar to candidate responses in the intellectual domain, the major difference in responses to Jackie 1 and Jackie 2 is that at the end of the semester some teacher candidates began to offer more specific suggestions for how to lessen the chasm between teacher and students. For example, TC 27 suggested Jackie have "students write, draw a picture or create a PowerPoint about themselves. This would allow Jackie to learn more about the students' individual experiences. Also connecting subjects back to the community when possible would be useful." Many suggested Jackie spend more time with students out of the classroom and that she avoid or be aware of assumptions she is making from a simple drive-through of the neighborhood. As teacher candidates spent more time in their field placements, they shared ideas they used to lessen the chasm with their own students, such as integrating literature related to students' lives and spending time with individual students. In contrast to data coded in the intellectual domain which focused on the strategy, comments coded as cultural showed candidates considering students' backgrounds first, then determining appropriate strategies.

For a few candidates a shift that occurred from Jackie 1 and Jackie 2 responses involved an emergent awareness that teachers possess a worldview. For example, TC 8 writes, "Jackie must understand her own sociocultural identity (like Villegas and Lucas)" (Jackie 2). Although the six orientations of Villegas and Lucas (2002) were mentioned in the course, the instructor did not connect these ideas to discussion about the Jackie case. The candidates who were developing a worldview awareness primarily focused on how Jackie needed to value students' lives and goals, while introducing them to many new learning opportunities. TC 31 writes, "There is nothing wrong with following the family business but each child needs choice to decide what they [sic] really want to do with their lives" (Jackie 2). Responses to Jackie 1 were threaded with assumptions that each student needed to see the importance of education, to move beyond complacency to work in the family business or in a factory. However, a few students in Jackie 2 wrote about it being "okay" to stay where they are as long as other opportunities were presented to them. In regard to the role of education in students' lives, one candidate writes:

> Jackie doesn't know… exactly how they feel. She needs to understand that they may be happy with their lives and want to take over family businesses instead of going to college. She needs to understand that if that is ok for them then it's ok. (TC 23)

The candidates who were critical of Jackie's assumption that her students did not value education as much as they should, identified themselves as having a background different from Jackie's (i.e., upper-middle class, white collar, educated). One candidate who stated she wanted to teach in the small town where she grew up expressed consternation at Jackie's assumption that "students who want to stay in that town are less successful" (TC 31, Jackie 2). These candidates were few in number and demonstrated the greatest awareness within the cultural domain by expressing cognizance of their own worldview.

Moral

Data were coded in the moral domain when candidates encompassed a value-laden consciousness concerning the assumptions and consequences of one's decisions as well as the responsibility to care for others by helping them meet their needs. In discussing the issues of the Jackie case, the teacher candidates at University A and University B focused on the value of education, their responsibility in promoting learning, and determining the appropriate ways to relate to students to achieve particular ends.

As referenced previously, across responses from both Jackie 1 and Jackie 2 teacher candidates at both universities valued education and felt responsible to instill this value in students if they perceived it was lacking. Based on the tour of the neighborhood, most candidates assumed Jackie's students did not value education. One teacher candidate said it was Jackie's responsibility to "stress the utmost importance of education no matter what path students were choosing to take in the future" (TC 18, Jackie 2). The candidates' remarks regarding the value of education encompassed both a present and a future orientation. They were interested in students' desiring success in high school as well as valuing the importance of college so that students would lead meaningful lives. One candidate said, "If these students want a fighting chance at a good life, motivating them to learn must become top priority on her list of responsibilities" (TC 2, Jackie 2). The candidates appeared to believe that helping their students value education and understand how it could benefit their lives represented a rudimentary expression of care for students' well-being. For many candidates, the "good life" equated to a college degree.

The teacher candidates did not appear to want purposefully to indoctrinate students with their values in the case responses. In fact, most seemed unaware of their values. By Jackie 2, after some class discussions about sociocultural consciousness, we assumed candidates would question how they knew what students valued (what was stated in the case versus what they assumed) and would recognize how their own value system affected their analysis. At University A, where most candidates fit Jackie's demographics, candidates were unable to identify the assumptions related to their values, even when specifically asked in the second case analysis. In contrast, a few candidates at University B explicitly stated that it is not the teacher's responsibility to change student values, especially given that any

decision concerning a desirable life is very subjective. TC 23's comment from the previous section, suggesting it is acceptable for students to choose the family business, demonstrates this awareness of different worldviews and values. A handful of candidates acknowledged the subjectivity of their values, but implied that valuing higher education held more import than a vocation not requiring a college education. They explicitly stated the highly personal nature of one's values, but implicitly indicated a hierarchy. TC 33 stated that although Jackie needed to "take into consideration that what's important to her may not be important to her students," it was still her responsibility to "establish a relationship with her students if she thinks she's going to change their minds about college" (Jackie 2). The purpose of these examples is not to propose that one should not value higher education, rather to illuminate the difficulty candidates experienced in recognizing the role their value system plays in their own thinking and how it affects the way they view their students.

In addition to instilling the value of education in their students, teacher candidates also indicated they felt responsible for ensuring student learning, with eighteen of thirty candidates referencing their responsibility for learning in Jackie 1. They did not just describe what they felt Jackie should do with instruction, but why she should proceed in that manner, considering the scope of their responsibilities, at least to some extent. The focus on student learning and not merely instructional strategies demonstrates some sophistication for a beginning teacher (Berliner, 1994; Feiman-Nemser & Buchmann, 1987). However, many candidates made assumptions about students' motivation to learn. Pervasive in the data was the candidates' inclination to generalize about all students based on limited knowledge of some. Specifically, many candidates perceived that Jackie's students were somehow deficient given that only "35% attended a four-year college" (as stated in the Jackie case). What seemed like a very low number meant many candidates assumed that *all* of Jackie's students were not college-bound. Although viewing students as a group and less as individuals was still apparent when candidates analyzed the case the second time, some explicitly noted that they could not make assumptions concerning all students' attitudes toward school; they began to understand that each student must be viewed as an individual. TC 15 stated that it was important to recognize the "uniqueness of each student that comprises the entirety of students." Also, by the second analysis of the Jackie case, some candidates realized that blaming students for lack of motivation and therefore lack of learning was a simplistic response to a complex situation. These candidates still accepted responsibility for helping students learn, but noted that multiple factors affect student attitudes toward school.

Throughout the data almost all candidates emphasized the importance of the relationship forged between teacher and student; however, some contradictions existed concerning Jackie's expectations and how she should care for her students as learners. Candidates equally noted personal and academic aspects of the relationship: "Jackie should make herself available for tutoring, guidance, or simply to talk" (TC 26, Jackie 2). Candidates mentioning personal aspects described establishing

trust and demonstrating care for students as individuals. In contrast, candidates mentioning academic aspects disagreed as to how Jackie should meet students' needs as learners. For example, in Jackie 1 a number of candidates believed that it was important to recognize that students had jobs thereby limiting their ability to complete school work. TC 1 said Jackie would need to "adjust her expectations and maybe the goals of the course" because her students have other responsibilities and lifestyles foreign to Jackie. In contrast, by Jackie 2 some students explained it was even more imperative to raise expectations to instill the value of education. In fact, TC 13 claimed that because many students had two parents working in factories, Jackie had to act as the "quasi-parent" who encourages students to "reach high." In this sense, getting to know students was used as a means to an end, namely, to fill the voids in students' educational experiences. Although they may not have gained an increased awareness of the impact of their values on their thinking, by Jackie 2 the candidates did more explicitly acknowledge the need for awareness of students' backgrounds.

Implications for Teacher Education

We used the Jackie case to examine how teacher candidates are inclined to think through a specific teaching situation and to determine if candidates become more aware of their assumptions. Specifically, we wanted to understand how candidates' thinking within three domains—intellectual, cultural, moral—would change after analyzing the same case twice, demonstrating greater awareness of the core of their thinking and thus, their dispositions. We anticipated that by the second case analysis candidates would recognize assumptions Jackie made about her students and that candidates would identify assumptions they made in their first case analysis. In some limited ways, the second case analysis facilitated teacher candidates' thinking about Jackie's assumptions. We found it challenging, however, to facilitate candidates' recognition of their own assumptions, especially within the moral and cultural domains. Even with prompting, they failed to consider the inadvertent imposition of their own values on Jackie's students, and many adopted a deficit perspective. Candidates had a desire to get to know students, to find instructional strategies to meet their needs, and to help them be successful in ways that candidates understood success; yet, they lacked awareness of the assumptions undergirding their thinking and the expertise to enact strategies to accomplish their goals. The case highlights that when candidates are confronted with students of backgrounds dissimilar to their own, their inadvertent inclination is to impose a set of values based on their own worldview.

Traditionally, teacher education has focused on aspects of teaching accessible externally, namely, the development and evaluation of candidates' knowledge and skills related to content and pedagogy (Korthagen, 2004; Wilson et al., 2001). With the work of Schön (1983; 1987), Zeichner & Liston (1996), and others, teacher education has moved towards facilitating inward aspects of teaching, specifically

self reflection about issues of content and pedagogy, issues that fall within the realm of the intellectual domain. In a study exploring how cases foster teacher candidates' critical reflection, Harrington and colleagues (1996) concluded that although candidates assumed moral responsibility for fostering student learning, "they think about that responsibility in a variety of ways" with some "encapsulating [students] as learners" and failing to acknowledge how their cultural identity affects learning (p. 35). In this study, candidates' responses to the Jackie case reinforce how teachers' worldview and values affect their instructional decisions, though they may be unaware of this influence. Therefore, candidates need guidance developing awareness of their dispositions in the cultural and moral domains.

Cases are one option to develop candidate awareness. The Jackie case highlights aspects of student difference and fosters responses based on candidates' values. However, when used alone in one teacher education course, the case falls short of facilitating percipient, rather than superficial, awareness of candidates' worldview and values. Results from this study indicate that teacher candidates require multiple opportunities to build awareness of dispositions in the moral and cultural domains, more than what one case in one course provides. The usefulness of a case could likely be enhanced if used in conjunction with other assignments and activities that require candidates to look inward to understand themselves as possessing a culture (Banks et al., 2005; Carroll & Carney, 2005; Delpit, 1995) as well as a value system (Carroll, 2005). For example, Cook-Sather and Reisinger (2001) describe a writing project between teacher candidates and high school students that helps candidates cut through stereotypes. Carroll and Carney (2005) describe a scaffolded multimedia project that requires students to critically examine and represent their cultural identities early in their teacher education programs. Similar to Harrington et al. (1996), who claim "awareness of taken-for-granted assumptions is a key to transformative learning" (p. 35), we contend that candidates will develop more sophisticated self awareness when they examine their assumptions and reflect on their cultural identities and value systems throughout their programs. These opportunities can consist of case analyses as well as guided reflections during field experiences. Multiple, scaffolded opportunities are necessary given the challenges of developing this kind of thinking: "Becoming a teacher who is aware of his or her own values and beliefs, able to analyze one's own practice and consider its…social and political context, involves considerable ability and experience…" (Calderhead, 1993, p. 97).

Although researchers have been studying the use of cases in teacher education programs for two decades (Grossman, 2005), the exploration of how cases can be used to build awareness of candidates' dispositions is uncharted. Clearly, more research is needed. The qualitative design we used in this study provided the opportunity to analyze 30 candidates' assumptions in depth, yet some limitations should be noted. This study was limited to candidates in two courses at two institutions. Jackie's background closely paralleled the backgrounds of teacher candidates at Institution A. We noted some difference between Institution A and B related to

the theme of instilling the value of education. More research should analyze how the match, or mismatch, between the background of the teacher in the case and the background of the candidates affects candidates' ability to critically examine their own assumptions, especially in relation to their value systems. Additionally, this study took place over the course of just one semester toward the end of candidates' programs. Authentic growth in such a short period is unlikely (Tremmel, 1993). Research should explore how candidates develop awareness when they are exposed to case studies and other activities both earlier and throughout their programs, providing much needed longitudinal data to teacher education research (Cochran-Smith & Zeichner, 2005).

The recognition that effective teaching extends even deeper than knowledge and skills is steadily creeping into the teacher education policy arena as organizations like INTASC and NCATE incorporate dispositions into program evaluation standards and benchmarks for teacher candidates. Although recent political rhetoric has focused on the "what" surrounding teacher dispositions (i.e., What dispositions are teacher education programs requiring of candidates?), we maintain it is the "how" that lies at the crux of high-quality teaching. Specifically, we contend that it is most valuable to understand how teacher candidates become aware of their dispositions across all three domains, how candidates reflect on the assumptions that influence their thinking, and how they evaluate the positive and negative impact dispositions have on their teaching. If teacher education is to affect the practice of beginning teachers, it must provide opportunities for beginning teachers to move beyond the outer layers of their knowledge and skills and foster their ability to delve into the core of what drives their decisions.

Notes

[1] All proper names have been changed to protect the anonymity of the study participants.

[2] For a complete description of the framework, see Authors. (in submission a). Conceptualizing a dispositions framework: Intellectual, cultural, and moral domains of teaching.

[3] Course parameters prohibited the additional three questions at University B.

References

Au, L. J. (1998). Social constructivism and the school literacy learning of students with diverse backgrounds. *Journal of Literacy Research, 30*, 297-319.

Banks, J., Cochran-Smith, M., Moll, L., Richert, A., Zeichner, K., LePage, P., et al. (2005). Teaching diverse learners. In L. Darling-Hammond & J. Bransford (Eds.), *Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should learn and be able to do* (pp. 232-274). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Berliner, D. C. (1994). Expertise: The wonder of exemplary performances. In J. Mangieri & C. C. Block (Eds.), *Creating powerful thinking in teachers and students: Diverse perspectives* (pp. 161-186). Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace.

Block, J. H., & Hazelip, K. (1995). Teachers' beliefs and belief systems. In L. W. Anderson

(Ed.), *International encyclopedia of teaching and teacher education* (Vol. 2nd, pp. 25-28). Kidlington, Oxford, UK: Elsevier Science Ltd.

Borich, G. D. (1999). Dimensions of self that influence effective teaching. In R. P. Lipka & T. M. Brinthaupt (Eds.), *The role of self in teacher development* (pp. 92-117). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Bransford, J. D., Brown, A. L., & Cocking, R. R. (Eds.). (2000). *How people learn: Brain, mind, experience, and school*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Bullough, R. V., & Gitlin, A. (1995). *Becoming a student of teaching: Methodologies for exploring self and school context*. New York: Garland.

Calderhead, J. (1993). Dilemmas in developing reflective teaching. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 20*, 93-100.

Carroll, D. (2005). Developing dispositions for teaching: Teacher education programs as moral communities of practice. *The New Educator, 1*(2), 81-100.

Carroll, D., & Carney, J. (2005). Personal perspectives: Using multimedia to express cultural identity. *Contemporary Issues in Technology and Teacher Education, 4*(4), 465-488.

Cochran-Smith, M., & Zeichner, K. M. (Eds.). (2005). *Studying teacher education: The report of the AERA panel on research and teacher education.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Cook-Sather, A., & Reisinger, O. (2001). Seeing the students behind the stereotypes: The perspectives of three preservice teachers. *The Teacher Educator, 37*(1), 16-26.

Delpit, L. (1995). *Other people's children: Cultural conflict in the classroom*. New York: The New Press.

Dill, D. D. (1990). The moral dimension of teaching. In D. D. D. a. Associates (Ed.), *What teachers need to know: The knowledge, skills, and values essential to good teaching* (pp. 151-156). San Franciso: Jossey Bass.

Eraut, M. (1994). *Developing professional knowledge and competence*. London, UK: The Falmer Press.

Feiman-Nemser, S., & Buchmann, M. (1987). When is student teaching teacher education? *Teaching and Teacher Education, 3*(4), 255-273.

Gay, G. (2002). Preparing for culturally responsive teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education, 53*(2), 106-116.

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Chicago: Aldine.

Grant, C. A., & Secada, W. G. (1990). Preparing teachers for diversity. In W. R. Houston (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 403-422). New York: Macmillan.

Grossman, P. (2005). Research on pedagogical approaches in teacher education. In M. Cochran-Smith & K. M. Zeichner (Eds.), *Studying Teacher Education: The Report of the AERA Panel on Research and Teacher Education* (pp. 425-476). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Hammerness, K., Darling-Hammond, L., Bransford, J., Berliner, D., Cochran-Smith, M., McDonald, M., et al. (2005). How teachers learn and develop. In L. Darling-Hammond & J. Bransford (Eds.), *Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should learn and be able to do* (pp. 358-389). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Harrington, H. L., Quinn-Leering, K., & Hodson, L. (1996). Written case analyses and critical reflection. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 12*(1), 25-37.

Hollins, E., & Guzman, M. T. (2005). Research on preparing teachers for diverse populations. In M. Cochran-Smith & K. M. Zeichner (Eds.), *Studying teacher education: The*

report of the AERA panel on research and teacher education (pp. 477-548). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Katz, L. G., & Raths, J. D. (1985). Dispositions as goals for teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 1*(4), 301-307.

Kelchtermans, G., & Vandenberghe, R. (1994). Teachers' professional development: A biographical perspective. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 26*(1), 45-62.

Kennedy, M. (1999). The role of preservice teacher education. In L. Darling-Hammond & G. Sykes (Eds.), *Teaching as the learning profession: Handbook of policy and practice* (pp. 54-85). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Korthagen, F. A. J. (2004). In search of the essence of a good teacher: Towards a more holistic approach in teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 20*(1), 77-97.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). *The dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African American children*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lortie, D. C. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Lundeberg, M. A., & Scheurman, G. (1997). Looking twice means seeing more: Developing pedagogical knowledge through case analysis. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 13*(8), 783-797.

Mayeroff, M. (1971). *On caring* (Vol. 43). New York: Harper & Row.

Mayes, C. (2001). A transpersonal model for teacher reflectivity. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 33*(4), 477-493.

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. (2002). *Professional standards for the accreditation of schools, colleges, and departments of education*. Washington, DC: National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education.

Nespor, J. (1987). The role of beliefs in the practice of teaching. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 19*(4), 317-328.

Nias, J. (1987). Teaching and the self. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 17*, 178-184.

Nieto, S. (2000). *Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education* (3rd ed.). New York: Longman.

Noddings, N. (1984). *Caring, a feminine approach to ethics and moral education*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Pajares, F. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and educational research: Clearning up a messy construct. *Review of Educational Research, 62*(3), 307-332.

Richardson, V. (1996). The role of attitudes and beliefs in learning to teach. In J. Sikula, T. J. Buttery & E. Guyton (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (Vol. 2nd, pp. 102-119). New York: Simon & Schuster Macmillan.

Schön, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. New York: Basic Books.

Schön, D. A. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner: Toward a new design for teaching and learning in the professions*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schussler, D. L. (2006). Defining dispositions: Wading through murky waters. *The Teacher Educator, 41*(4), 251-268.

Shulman, L. S. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review, 57*(1), 1-22.

Stooksberry, L. M., Schussler, D. L., & Bercaw, L. A. (in submission). Conceptualizing a dispositions framework: Intellectual, cultural, and moral domains of teaching.

Strike, K. A., & Soltis, J. A. (1985). *The ethics of teaching*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Tom, A. R. (1984). *Teaching as a moral craft*. New York: Longman.

Tremmel, R. (1993). Zen and the art of reflective practice in teacher education. *Harvard Educational Review, 63*(4), 434-458.

VanManen, M. (2000). Moral language and pedagogical experience. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 32*(2), 315-327.

Villegas, A. M., & Lucas, T. (2002). *Educating culturally responsive teachers: A coherent approach*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Wilson, S. M., Floden, R. E., & Ferrini-Mundy, J. (2001). *Teacher preparation research: Current knowledge, gaps, and recommendations.* Seattle, WA: University of Washington.

Zeichner, K. M., & Liston, D. P. (1996). *Reflective teaching: An introduction*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.