2020-03-27

Faculty Orientations in ESL Professional Development

Jason T. Jay
Brigham Young University

Faculty Orientations in ESL Professional Development

Jason T. Jay

A thesis submitted to the faculty of
Brigham Young University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Science

Stephen C. Yanchar, Chair
Stefinee E. Pinnegar
Peter J. Rich

Department of Instructional Psychology and Technology

Brigham Young University

ABSTRACT

Faculty Orientations in ESL Professional Development

Jason T. Jay
Department of Instructional Psychology and Technology, BYU
Master of Science

The role of teacher educators is vital to education, but when the population of public-school students shifts, or progress and advances in knowledge of the field or knowledge for teaching emerge, teacher education faces challenges. One such challenge involves a continuing increase in the proportion of second language learners entering primary and secondary schools, English learners (ELs) in this case. In such situations, teacher educators often do not have deep knowledge of second language acquisition or how to integrate attention to ELs within their regular courses. One response to this challenge is to provide professional development (PD) for teacher education faculty. This qualitative study explored how faculty responded to a PD focused on developing understandings of second language acquisition with opportunity to consider how it might be taken up in their own teaching of teachers. We interviewed eight teacher education faculty members about their learning and their response to participating in this PD effort. Using data analysis methods specified by Miles, Huberman, and Saldaña (2014), we gained a better understanding of how faculty responded to the PD in general and how it contributed to their positioning as participants within the PD. The importance of this study is that it can help professional development coordinators and facilitators understand the importance of positioning or orientation of participants as they begin a learning experience. Future research could examine ways in which learning opportunities can be designed to take into account the variability in these orientations.

Keywords: faculty development, professional development, staff development, teacher educator education

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

DESCRIPTION OF THESIS STRUCTURE AND CONTENT

This thesis, *Faculty Orientations in ESL Professional Development,* follows a journal ready format. Section one presents a description of the structure of this report. Section 2 presents the journal ready article for this research project. Appendix A is an extended literature review, which describes the challenge of educating English learners (ELs) and explains the need for professional development (PD) for teacher educators as well as some of the challenges in providing that PD. Appendix A also includes literature on what constitutes effective PD. Appendix B contains a copy of the IRB approval letter and Appendix C contains a copy of the Institutional Review Board (IRB) approved consent form.

More specifically, section 2 of this report includes the complete journal ready manuscript, *Faculty Orientations in ESL Professional Development.* This manuscript is formatted for journal submission, including publication requirements for length, citations, and references lists. The journals to which it may be submitted are: Professional Development in Education, which is the official journal of the International Professional Development Association (IPDA) and has an open access option (Impact factor, 1.258); or Frontiers in Education, a new online, open-access journal started in 2018 (ranking information and impact score is not yet available). Both of these journals use peer-review and publish both quantitative and qualitative research. Studies related to improving the education of public-school children through professional development for teacher education faculty are welcome in each of these options

Introduction

The role of teacher educators is a vital aspect of education as a whole, but knowledge within disciplines and methods for teaching those disciplines change over time. Furthermore, the characteristics of student populations in primary and secondary education shift. Both of these realities require teacher education faculty to develop new and deeper understandings of content, students, and pedagogy—since they prepare the next generation of teachers that will educate primary and secondary students. In these cases, professional development (PD) is a potentially helpful resource for helping teacher educators improve their practice since it can have a significant positive effect on teacher effectiveness (e.g., Borko, 2004; Garet, Porter, Desimone, Birman, & Yoon, 2001; Penuel, Fishman, Yamaguchi, & Gallagher, 2007). Well-designed PD could support teacher educators in upgrading their knowledge and their pedagogical practices.

One of the big challenges facing public schools across the U.S. is the escalation of immigrant populations who speak languages other than the language of instruction used in the schools (English, in this case). In most U.S. schools the law requires that English learners (ELs) be provided with instruction targeted at learning English and have opportunities to participate for most of the school day in regular classrooms. This means that all U.S. teachers who work with even one EL need to be prepared to teach in ways that support these learners in both English and content learning.

ELs are the fastest growing student population in U.S. schools. Their numbers have increased by as much as 350% in locations such as North Carolina (National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition & Language Instruction Educational Programs, 2011). With over 5 million EL students nationwide, these students represent about 10% of the total student population and that number is likely to grow (Batalova & McHugh, 2010; National Center for

Education Statistics [NCES], 2018). In fact, by 2025, it is estimated that 25% of all students in the U.S. will be English learners (Goldenberg, 2008; Klinger, Hoover, & Baca, 2008; NCES, 2006), yet currently these students are falling considerably behind their same age native English speaking peers (August & Shanahan, 2006; Carlo et al., 2004; Echevarria, Short, & Powers, 2006; National Assessment of Educational Progress [NAEP], 2013; NCES, 2005; Short & Fitzsimmons, 2007).

In examining the academic performance between ELs and their native English-speaking peers, Kim and Herman (2009) found small to medium gaps in mathematics and medium to large gaps in reading and science. They also found that the achievement gap widens in upper grades as the linguistic complexity of materials, instruction, and assessments increase. By eighth grade, only 5% of ELs are proficient or above in math, and only 3% are proficient or above in reading (NAEP, 2013).

Since EL students are increasingly being educated in regular classrooms, all teachers must be prepared to differentiate instruction to support the learning of ELs (Daniel & Peercy, 2014; National Education Association [NEA], 2011). However, few teachers are prepared to do so. Although about 26% of public-school teachers in the U.S. have participated in some type of ESL PD, only .03% of current public-school teachers actually hold degrees that qualify them to work with ELs in regular classroom settings (NCES, 2013). Furthermore, estimates show a need, across the U.S., for over 46,000 more teachers who are prepared to work with ELs (Office of English language Acquisition [OELA], 2015). For professional teachers, in-service PD lags far behind educators' needs (Leos & Saavedra, 2010), and few higher education institutions offer programs designed to prepare bilingual educators. Furthermore, many of these institutions do not require mainstream teachers to prepare to work with ELs (Ballantyne, Sanderman, & Levy,

2008; Lucas & Villegas, 2013; Menken & Antunez, 2001; U.S. Government Accountability Office, 2009).

In order to prepare future teachers for working with ELs, institutions need to create new programs or improve existing ones so that attention to teaching ELs is a routine part of teacher education, not just an add-on (Ballantyne et al., 2008). Teacher educators are best positioned to embed attention to ELs within regular teacher education coursework. However, many teacher educators, within their academic preparation as higher education faculty, have not learned about second language acquisition and the methods for teaching ELs or how to attend to it in regular teacher education coursework (Daniel & Peercy, 2014). Thus, a challenge facing teacher education programs is that few teacher educators have the knowledge necessary to integrate attention to these issues into their courses and curriculum. As a result, teacher education faculty may benefit from PD that specifically prepares them for working with teachers of EL students.

Often, however, the siloed structure or general organization of higher education into departments and the narrow disciplinary focus of university educators work against such PD efforts (Lattuca & Creamer, 2005; Tagg, 2003; Toulmin, 2001; Woolfolk, 1998). As experts in their fields, higher education faculty typically have academic freedom or latitude to manage their curriculum (e.g., Altback, 2001; Herbert & Tienari, 2013; McPherson & Schapiro, 1999) and as a result, faculty, even within a single program, have limited knowledge about what students learn in other courses and seldom link the content of other courses to what they are teaching (Tagg, 2003). Indeed, “there is a lack of continuity from one course to the next” (e.g., Darling-Hammond, 2006; Levine, 2006) and this limited integration often means teacher educators are not holding students accountable for things they have learned earlier in a program. While most teacher education programs provide some instruction in second language acquisition and

multicultural education, the knowledge future teachers gain in these courses is not applied in practice (Samson & Collins, 2012).

It would be helpful for teacher educators to participate in PD that focuses on the knowledge, skills, and dispositions that pre-service teachers should develop for working with ELs. This PD should also engage teacher educators in considering how to attend to these issues and hold pre-service teachers accountable for that knowledge. Teacher education coursework that increases pre-service teachers' knowledge of how to diversify instruction and attend to the needs of ELs requires that knowledgeable teacher educators attend to these issues in their curriculum (Freeman & Freeman, 2014). Such PD could allow faculty to integrate knowledge of teaching ELs based on their own experience and perspective, thus maintaining academic freedom and control, while adding to their knowledge and skill set.

Literature Review

Various searches within the EBSCO database (Academic Search Premier, Education Full Text, ERIC, and Professional Development Collection) with combinations of the search terms *teacher educators*, *professional development*, *attitudes towards*, and *English language learners/ELL/ESL* did not turn up any studies that addressed how teacher education faculty engage in PD that focuses on preparing pre-service teachers to work with ELs across all teacher preparation courses. However, by searching separately for the key terms *professional development*, *teacher educator development*, *higher education professional development*, and *faculty development* there were many studies that examined various aspects of PD in general, in teacher education, and in higher education. Examining the references that were common across most of these studies led to a collection of readings that were used for an extended literature review of the topic. Only a sample of the most relevant readings is provided in this article.

For more than two decades, studies have examined practices that contribute to effective professional development for teachers. These practices include teachers learning in collaboration (Bolam, McMahon, Stoll, Thomas, & Wallace, 2005; Day, 1999; Jackson & Bruegmann, 2009) and learning within the context of classroom practice (Horn & Little, 2010; Huberman, 1993). Research has also shown that effective PD does not happen in short, one-time seminars or workshops. Instead, it needs to be continuing and thorough, focused on subject matter, include hands-on activities, and be based on the local context of participants (Day & Leitch, 2007; Garet et al., 2001).

It is the combination of all or most of the above-mentioned characteristics that leads to effective learning during PD activities and positive change in the classroom (Birman, Desimone, Porter, & Garet, 2000; Desimone, Porter, Garet, Yoon, & Birman, 2002; Garet et al., 2001). Therefore, PD should be designed with the following characteristics in mind: it should be collaborative, classroom-based, linked to research, ongoing, active (hands-on), coherent (context-based), and content focused (Desimone, 2009; Desimone et al., 2002; Garet et al., 2001; Penuel et al., 2007). While helpful for considering the design of PD activities, this body of research was developed for use in the context of classroom teaching. The question then arises as to whether these principles apply to PD in higher education settings.

Bouwma-Gearhart (2012) found that Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) PD explicitly focused on faculty does improve postsecondary education, yet also stated that there is a small body of research on faculty participation in reform efforts. Sunal et al. (2001) stated that while there is a great need for PD in higher education, there are also many barriers to change at that level, namely, culture that inhibits change, lack of ongoing PD and follow-up, institutional structures that led to ineffective practices, and the ingrained

mindset of the instructors. Understanding institutional and individual barriers to change can help PD designers address these barriers.

In reference to change in higher education, Tagg (2003, 2008) also describes barriers that impede the type of progress expected from PD efforts. For one, the siloed nature of colleges or individual faculty causes a disconnect between departments, faculty, courses, and ultimately students' understanding of material from course to course. This disconnect can cause faculty to be unengaged in PD efforts, which results in little to no learning and little to no change in practice. One way for PD coordinators and developers to bridge the gap between faculty and subject areas is to better understand who the faculty are—their background, interests, current assignment, and teaching area. It may also be important to know how faculty position themselves in relation to the PD being offered.

For the purposes of this study, the term position is used to refer to how the participants responded to the PD: their attitude toward, or impression of, the content and delivery of the PD and their openness to learn, their willingness to cooperate and engage, and their overall disposition towards the PD. This paper also uses the terms orient or orientation to refer to an individual's positioning. Understanding the potential types or patterns that exist across participants' orientations could help program designers and PD coordinators be better prepared for the diversity of experiences and interests that individuals bring as they begin learning activities. Teacher education is one area where such an understanding is not only important, but crucial. Due to the increasing need for effective PD for teacher education faculty and the lack of research on how attitudes, beliefs, and content focuses influence participation in and learning from PD, this study will explore faculty responses to a PD program designed to expand their understanding about preparing future teachers to support ELs. Thus, the purpose of this study

will be to examine the positioning of participating teacher education faculty and describe how that positioning may have influenced learning. The question that guided this study was:

> How do teacher education faculty position themselves as learners within a professional development program for attending to pre-service teachers' understanding of the issues related to learning a second language and about second language learners?

Method

This study examined how higher education faculty in teacher education positioned themselves in response to a PD initiative. The initiative focused on educating the faculty about the content of the required second language acquisition course being offered in their teacher education program as part of the Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) K-12 endorsement. The PD was designed according to research-based best practices in professional development—collaborative, classroom based, linked to research, ongoing, hands-on, context based, and content focused (Desimone, 2009; Penuel et al., 2007). The PD design and implementation also attended to theories of adult learning—specifically principles of andragogy (Knowles, Holton, & Swanson, 2015)—as a way to inform the faculty about what was being taught to teacher education students about educating ELs. The idea was that faculty could then hold preservice teachers accountable for their knowledge of teaching ELs throughout the entire program. This study did not examine what teacher educators learned about teaching ELs but how they positioned themselves within and responded to the PD. This section will explain the methods and methodology used in this study. It will also explain the theoretical framework and the processes used in the PD. Next, the elements of the study (participants, setting, and sampling) will be explained, followed by a description of the data source, the interview procedures, and the data analysis. The final section will discuss attention to trustworthiness of the analysis.

Theoretical Framework for the PD

Complexity theory (Mason, 2009) and andragogy (Knowles, 1980, 1984) provided the theoretical lenses that guided the development of the PD sessions for the faculty. Complexity theory holds that in creating change within a system one must be mindful of as many of the variables impacting the system as possible and act in ways that push toward desired change. Complexity theory, then, suggests that there is a need to simultaneously attend to as many aspects of the system as possible (Mason, 2009). Therefore, the PD coordinators tried to be cognizant of the various aspects of the teacher education system, such as faculty commitment to their own disciplines and content areas, and possible resistance to what they may see as imposed content (Toulmin, 2001). Additionally, they wanted to be mindful of the participants as adult learners. In this regard, they drew on the theory of andragogy, and were thus concerned about participants' readiness to learn, motivation to learn, and orientation to learning, as well as their background and experiences that could have an effect on their motivation to engage and ultimately, their learning (Knowles, 1984; Knowles et al., 2015). While andragogy did not inform the methods used for data analysis or interpretation, it did impact decisions regarding the design, development, and implementation of the PD sessions.

The PD was designed according to research on adult learning as well as quality professional development. To support these efforts, the coordinators attended to research on what makes PD effective: that it should be ongoing, collaborative, provide opportunity for practice, connect to local context, and enact the pedagogy promoted by the PD (Desimone, 2009; Penuel et al., 2007). Six PD sessions were organized according to these principles. Each of the six sessions were designed to educate the faculty about key ideas, concepts, and skills that pre-service teachers were required to learn in the second language acquisition course. At the end of

each session participants were asked to consider how their own course assignments and class activities could hold pre-service teachers accountable for this content. In addition, the PD coordinators were cognizant of the various aspects of the teacher education system, such as faculty commitment to their own disciplines and content areas, and possible resistance to what they may see as imposed content (Toulmin, 2001). Additionally, they wanted to be mindful of the participants as adult learners. In this regard, they drew on andragogy, a learning theory specifically developed to explain theories and methods for working with adult learners (Knowles, 1980, 1984; Knowles et al., 2015). The ideas of andragogy led the coordinators to consider participants' readiness to learn, motivation to learn, and orientation to learning, as well as participants' background and experiences that could have an effect on their motivation to engage and ultimately, their learning.

Process of the Professional Development

The content of the PD for this study focused on the concepts, principles, and skills that were taught to pre-service teachers in the second language acquisition course. The purpose of the PD was to educate faculty about what students were being taught, without expectation that faculty would teach this content to their students or in their classes. Instead, the faculty were asked to discuss and consider how they might update readings, alter class activities, and otherwise hold pre-service teachers accountable for the content and skills they learned in the course, related to the teaching of ELs.

A total of six PD sessions were conducted across two semesters, with each organized to engage faculty in learning about the endorsement course using the sociocultural learning and teaching strategies that were considered best practices for teaching ELs. Further, these strategies were those that preservice teachers experienced while taking the course. During each session,

faculty were taught about the course content and then provided with opportunities to collaborate and consider ways in which they might hold pre-service teachers accountable, within their respective courses, for the concepts, skills, and issues related to learning a second language and about second language learners. The focus was not on educating faculty to teach second language acquisition, but to identify the intersections between the knowledge and skills pre-service teachers were learning in the second language acquisition course and the content of the courses they were teaching.

Participants and Setting

Nineteen full-time faculty, at a private university in the Intermountain West region of the U.S. participated in the PD, which was provided as a series of regular department level meetings. At the time of the PD, the college of education required all teacher education students to complete a TESOL K-12 minor, thus faculty were strongly encouraged to participate in this PD opportunity to better understand some of what their students would be learning. Faculty were also given the incentive that if they attended all six PD sessions, they would be entered in a raffle for a new tablet device. Of the 19 faculty who participated in the various sessions, eight agreed to be interviewed and participate in this research study. No extra incentives were offered for participation in the research. Each of the eight participants were professorial faculty within the department of teacher education at the sponsoring institution and held a PhD in their specialty area. The faculty specializations represent a range of content and responsibility within the teacher education program (see Table 1).

Table 1

Selected Demographic Information for Study Participants

Participant	Gender	Years in Field	Subject Area	Education Program
Barrie	M	37	Math Education	Elementary
Mallory	F	40	Math Education	Elementary
Wendy	F	9	Multicultural Education	Secondary
Cindy	F	20	Multicultural Education	Elementary
William	M	27	Literacy Education	Elementary
Fiona	F	11	Literacy Education	Secondary
Ryan	M	25	Educational Psychology	Elementary
Emily	F	39	Social Studies Education	Secondary

Sampling

Participants for this project were selected through purposive and convenience sampling procedures. More specifically, participants had to be teacher education faculty that participated in the PD provided through a National Professional Development grant (purposive). Participants were also those who agreed to be interviewed about their experience within the PD (convenience). For this study, only interview data from professorial faculty were used.

Data Sources

Data for this study was collected as part of a larger study involving the collection of faculty interviews, PD attendance numbers, syllabi, and a series of exit tickets (surveys collected at the end of workshops). For this study, the faculty interviews were analyzed to gain insight into how faculty positioned themselves as learners within the professional development program. The patterns that exist across faculty responses to interview questions about the program will also be discussed.

Interview Procedure

The interviewer began by explaining the purpose of the interview and reviewing the consent form. Participants were informed that the interview would be audio-recorded, but a pseudonym would be used in place of their actual name and raw data would not be shared outside of the research team. Each participant agreed to a single interview which lasted between 30 and 45 minutes. Participants were asked to answer a series of the semi-structured interview questions. These questions are as follows:

1. Think about the courses you have taught pre-service teachers in the past. How do you think you have attended to second language learners in your past curriculum in terms of content messages, readings, assignments, and class activities?
2. What do you think was the most important thing you learned in the Faculty Professional Development about learning a second language and about second language learners?
3. As you begin to think about preparing your course(s) for next semester, where do you think attention to teaching pre-service teachers to work with second language learners might fit in your course? (e.g., What adjustments will you make to your curriculum? What content messages, readings, assignments, and class activities might you include that you haven't in the past?)
4. What questions, comments, or suggestions do you still have?
5. Would you like someone to work with you as you think about how you might adjust activities or other materials based on the TELL training (PD)?

During the interview, the researcher asked each question and allowed participants to respond for as long as they chose. If clarification was needed, the question was asked again, or

rephrased. Each time a participant stopped speaking s/he was asked if there were any additional comments they would like to add to their answer.

Data Analysis

Before analysis, each interview was transcribed using the following procedure: First each interview was listened to at partial speed and an initial draft of the transcription was created. Second, punctuation and formatting were inserted to improve flow and understanding. Third, each interview was listened to at regular speed and transcriptions were adjusted, adding missing words, deleting extra words, and making corrections to punctuation. Next, each interview was listened to again at half speed and final edits were made as necessary. Finally, transcripts were reviewed both by the researcher and the participants in order to verify that the content, as presented in the transcript, accurately reflected the interview.

This study employed a three-stage thematic analysis with an emergent coding approach based on Miles, Huberman, and Saldaña (2014). The first stage of analysis, or "first cycle coding" (p. 73), employed a holistic coding approach. This approach helped provide preliminary insight into the overall content of each interview and the possible themes that could emerge through later cycles of analysis.

The second stage of analysis, which still falls within the scope of first cycle coding, consisted of emergent, in vivo coding. Through this approach, codes were named closest to the concepts they were describing, using the language of participants wherever possible (in vivo coding). In using this approach, each transcript was read several times, each time with a different focus. The first reading served to better familiarize the researchers with the data. The focus of the second reading was for the researchers to work independently to identify and highlight statements and sections of each interview that were of interest for the research question. Next,

the researchers discussed the codes that emerged and created a code sheet. Codes and definitions were negotiated by the researcher and a research assistant until consensus was reached on each code. This was encompassed the third reading. During the fourth, fifth, and subsequent readings the researchers used the code sheet to code each transcript, negotiating where necessary, and adjusting codes and definitions as needed. Throughout the coding process, researchers ensured that key aspects of participants' interviews were accounted for by the codes being utilized.

The third stage of analysis reached the level of what Miles et al. (2014) call "second cycle coding" or pattern coding (p. 86). It is called pattern coding because it allows the researcher to combine themes into larger holistic patterns across the data. Pattern coding is a way to reorder and group codes into a larger pattern or network of codes, showing the interrelationship amongst the codes. This helps the researchers to condense data into smaller units and develop a more elaborate understanding of the context wherein the data was gathered. It also supports cross-case analysis and pattern recognition. For this final stage, codes were reviewed and clustered to generate themes. Once themes were identified they were collapsed and/or combined with other themes that were similar. Throughout this iterative process, themes were expanded and adjusted to take into account the nuances of each participant's positioning or orientation. This led to the development of patterns or the clustering of codes into patterns (Maxwell & Miller, 2008; Miles & Huberman, 1994; Miles et al., 2014).

The results of this pattern coding are represented below, in Table 2. In this table, each theme is listed, including our working definition of the theme, a percent of the total number of codes represented by that theme, and an exemplar quote for that theme. We present this here since we attended to the advice of Maxwell and Miller (2008) to push beyond simple coding as outlined by Miles et al. (2014) and seek for patterns represented by the coding.

Table 2

Identified Themes-Including Descriptors, Percent of Total, and an Exemplar Quote

Name of Theme	Definition of Theme	Percent of Comments	Exemplary Quote
Adaptations	Expressing a need or desire to adapt curriculum, course material, or teaching practice	2.2	"One change I did make based on the in-service was I have them do a shared or guided reading lesson…. I point students to the textbook where they'll see those EL adaptations."
Already Knowledgeable	Comment that participant already knew the subject matter or didn't need the PD	6.6	"I…knew the content…but it was good to review it."
Attention to ELs	Expressing the importance of paying attention to EL needs or attending more to EL issues	16.5	"The way I've attended to second language learners…has been indirect.… [It has] never been directly addressed."
Authentic Instruction/ Integration	Expressed a need for approaches to be authentic or integrated into curriculum and context	14.8	"Embedding instruction in real life context, which I think is huge for ELLs because real life context supports learning in general."
Awareness	Expressing an individual's increased awareness of EL issues or need to have greater awareness of EL issues	14.8	"Those workshops were helpful, I think, in just increasing my awareness of the issues; an awareness of some of the ways that instruction is more or less effective for English language learners."
Balancing Curriculum	Expressing the importance of balanced curriculum; not over-emphasizing one thing	3.8	"I think before the workshop I was sort of in a more reductionist point for ELL. I felt like I really needed to balance the language piece."
Language Types	Referring to ways of communicating or different types or uses of language	4.4	"The arts...are a language unto themselves."
Need More	Expressing a recognition, need, or openness to learning more about ELs or EL issues	17	"In the future…more conversations among faculty members [would be helpful]."
Personal Comment	Comments related to PD but not to the questions asked	14.3	"Many of the faculty perceived [the presenters] as, 'Oh they're just master's students.'"
Uncertain	Unsure whether they were meeting EL needs and/or how to use information from the PD. Often said, "I don't know," "I'm not sure," or "I think."	5.5	"Maybe, I don't know...but there are some things that are already there that are helpful."

Throughout the analytical process, the researcher and research assistant created "jottings" (Miles et al., 2014, p. 93); a type of journaling where researchers write analytic notes or annotations about sections of the data. These jottings were done through writing notes in the margins on hard copies of the transcripts, typing notes after a coding session, and typing notes after interactions between the researchers. These jottings were reviewed during regular interactions between the researchers. These interactions occurred weekly or bi-weekly as needed.

Trustworthiness

This research project, based within a qualitative paradigm, did not attempt to produce generalizable findings, nor did it deal with validity or reliability, in the traditional quantitative sense. Instead, the value of this project is based on the credibility of the research work that lead to the findings and in the transferability of those findings to similar contexts, i.e., teacher education PD, and possibly other contexts involving PD for adult learners (Miles et al., 2014).

A major goal of this project was to attend to the individual context, or story, of each participant (e.g., Clandinin & Connelly, 2000; Kim, 2016). As part of this, the researchers conducted the interviews and reviewed each transcript for accuracy. They worked closely with each other to develop the coding procedure, create the code book, and code each transcript based on methods suggested in the works of Miles and Huberman (1994) and Maxwell and Miller (2008). Throughout this process, transcripts were read and re-read several times in order to ensure immersion in the data for both the main researcher and the research assistant. Becoming extremely familiar with each participants' story was helpful in understanding not only what was said, but also, how each comment was part of the larger whole.

Throughout the coding process, the researchers compared and deliberated on what was coded and how it was coded. If differences of opinion occurred, the researchers discussed the

analysis until consensus was reached, and when necessary, an expert in qualitative research was consulted to help with this process. The researchers also completed a plot-line analysis and an I-poem analysis as a way of checking our coding against other methods of interpretation (Gilligan, 2015; Gilligan, Spencer, Weinberg, & Bertsch, 2006). The plot-line and I-poem analyses were not included in the findings of this study but helped shape the researchers' understanding of the participants. These methods of triangulation, i.e., inter-coder consensus and checking for alternative interpretations through multiple analyses, strengthened our understanding of each participant's story as well as our understanding of the data as a whole. It also increased the amount and quality of our engagement with each transcript.

A next step in the triangulation process was to consult with participants. Interviewees were invited to review the transcript of their interview and clarify or add to any of their previous comments. The researchers also discussed the findings with two separate individuals who were present during the PD. These participant facilitators were part of the teacher education program and were responsible for the implementation of the PD sessions. They organized the materials, scheduled meeting locations, provided the daily welcome, and sat in on each session. As participants of the PD, they were familiar with the other participants and how they responded to the PD in general. As facilitators for the PD, they were familiar with the content that was delivered. Our discussions with them provided further insight into the actions and involvement of the participants during the PD as well as their actions and involvement, within the department, outside of the PD.

Throughout this study, the researchers consulted with an expert in the field of qualitative research. This served as a check on the methods used for gathering, organizing, and analyzing the data as well as checking for disconfirming evidence or interpretation and negative cases that

could change our interpretation of the data. It also reminded us to focus on the context surrounding the participants' participation, which supported improved understanding of the results of our analysis.

Findings

There were two kinds of orientations evident in faculty members analysis of and response to the PD. The first was their central focus as they came to the PD. The second was related to the constellation of the participants specific responses.

The first orientation was toward a central focus in their learning and indicated that their background and experience greatly influenced their participation. However, our analysis revealed that their decision about the value of the potential learning within the PD was also an important indicator of their orientation to learning from the PD. In terms of this orientation, analysis indicated that participants' responses were predominantly representative of one of three attitudes. These attitudes can be characterized as *willing to engage*, *experienced*, and *focused elsewhere*. While these attitudes are distinct from each other and participants exhibited a predominance of one attitude and could be categorized accordingly, participants' responses also exhibited some fluidity, meaning that there were elements of other orientations within their individual response. In unpacking the results of our analysis, we discuss the influence of participants' academic focus and their responsibilities within teacher education on their central focus during the professional development. Next, we explore the three orientations or positions faculty had toward learning from the professional development.

Central Focus

Participants engaging in a course of professional development come with prior knowledge and experience. Even though their background knowledge and experience may not

directly relate to, or overlap with, the content being taught in a PD program, they still influence what is learned. Faculty academic focus, their responsibilities within teacher education, and their sense of the quality of the PD, oriented them in terms of their learning. They seemed to enter the PD with an idea of what or whether they wanted to learn. Invariably, their ideas about what they wanted to learn and what was relevant, was based on their focus and influenced their discussion during the interview.

Participants occasionally talked about the pedagogy used in teaching their content. We identified this as a pedagogic focus. In other words, they talked about the techniques, strategies, and activities they used in their teaching. Thus, when participants talked about how they enacted their curriculum, it clearly related to the central focus they brought to the PD. For example, throughout her interview, Mallory commented on her desire to learn more about authentic, constructive, and organic learning/teaching. She said, “I'm always looking for those.” Mallory indicated that she looked to the PD as a source for learning new pedagogic strategies for teaching her own content. She was mindful of ways that the pedagogy used resonated with, and was authentic to, concepts she teaches. In addition, she reported that concepts and ideas relevant to her content need to emerge, as much as possible, in organic ways within learning activities and class discussion. Her concern then, was with whether she felt the PD content was coherent with her content area, the organic and authentic nature of the strategies taught in the PD, and how she might be able to draw attention to the learning of ELs in natural, organic ways into her class activities, discussions, and assignments.

In contrast, other participants were more concerned that the content of the PD was in harmony and supportive of the content they were teaching. Emily was an example of this content orientation. She was preoccupied with issues of equity, democracy, and building community in

the classroom, “the way I teach, it focuses on increasing democratic practices in the classroom and building community . . .”. Note here her concern is that students understand clearly the issues of democracy, equity, and community and their interrelationships. She was oriented to whether the content was in concert with her focus on democratic practice.

Finally, Cindy often mentioned her own qualifications and wanting qualified faculty to do the presentations, “this is my background . . . we do have some expertise within our faculty that we need to draw upon . . . so doing would have fostered more buy in on their part, more buy in on the other professors’ part.” The PD was taught by educators who actually taught the second language acquisition course on campus and who had helped develop the course. Cindy felt that instead of these instructors, people like herself, who had content knowledge but not necessarily curricular and pedagogical knowledge of the specific course, should be the ones who taught the PD. Thus, she was resistant to learning and was critical of the content being presented regardless of its accuracy and appropriateness. In other words, because Cindy felt that her own knowledge of the content was not taken advantage of, she resisted learning.

Complexity theory and andragogy provide a framework for understanding this finding. Mason (2009) argued that we cannot prescribe exactly what will be learned in educational experiences. We can only set up parameters for the information being presented and then try to guide the learning in such a way that it will be meaningful for all participants at whatever place they find themselves. Furthermore, andragogy posits that adult learners are greatly affected by their readiness to learn, motivation to learn, and their orientation to learning. Our interviews provided clear support for these ideas.

The goal of the PD was to teach faculty the content, curriculum, and pedagogy employed in the second language acquisition course as it was currently taught. The PD provided an

overview of what their students were learning about second language acquisition with the intention that faculty would be able to hold preservice teachers accountable for this learning within their own course and make more explicit connections to the learning of ELs. The six PD sessions were designed to attend carefully to the research on effective PD by Desimone (2009) and Penuel et al. (2007) and the understanding that we need to honor faculty expertise in designing curricular responses to the PD. Ideas were presented, concepts were discussed, awareness was developed, but in the end, there were too many variables to predict what the participants would take away from the PD (Entwistle, 2009; Mason, 2009). Through this study, we gained deeper understanding that adult learners will take up those things that are most related to their area of interest, background experience, or those things that will help them problem solve within their own field (Knowles et al., 2015).

Attitudes and Characteristics

This section begins by characterizing and describing each of the three attitudes uncovered in the process of analysis. The section explores the three attitudes in this order: willing to engage, experienced, and focused elsewhere. Next, each attitude is considered in terms of the constellation of themes evident or absent in participant responses. We first provide a brief introduce of each attitude, then follow these with a more in-depth examination of each.

The *Willing to Engage* group consisted of individuals who had a general interest in learning more about second language acquisition and the needs of ELs. These individuals seemed most open to learning about what students were being taught throughout the program. They were willing to change their curriculum to integrate attention to ELs in their courses and embrace strategies for holding preservice teachers accountable for what they learned in the

second language acquisition course. In addition, they wanted to learn more about how their courses could support preparing preservice teachers to work with ELs.

The *Experienced* group were participants who had experience with and knowledge about ELs. They believed they were already doing all that was needful in teaching about linguistic and cultural difference in their courses and saw the PD as review and potentially not relevant to their own courses. Unlike the *willing to learn* group, they did not understand how they might build, more than they already had, on what preservice teachers learned about second language and literacy development. Although for the most part they were polite, implicit in their comments was their position that they did not learn from the PD nor did they need to. However, they agreed that the rest of the faculty really needed help with this content.

The *Focused Elsewhere* group were the professors that referenced the PD in terms of how their content area naturally addressed the needs of ELs. They appreciated the content of the PD and agreed they had learned from it but felt validated concerning the current content and pedagogy of their own courses, since their courses already addressed EL needs. They were uncertain how they might build on what preservice teachers were being taught about second language acquisition or how, within their courses, they might hold students accountable. These individuals seemed willing to learn more but were less open to changing their curriculum.

Willing to engage. This section begins by identifying the themes of our analysis that distinguished participants who could be characterized by this description. Following this explanation, each theme relevant to this attitude is explained and exemplar quotes are given. A short summary of the section follows.

The responses of participants categorized as willing to engage exhibited three prominent themes: *need more*, *authentic instruction*, and *awareness*. Another important feature of this

group was an absence of responses that could be coded *already knowledgeable* or *uncertain of practice*. In addition, this group was the only one with responses for the theme of *adaptations*. These were teachable individuals who expressed a genuine interest in learning in general and in learning more about ELs specifically. They also seemed to be the most open to change and they asked questions, which we interpreted to mean they were interested in learning more. One example came from Ryan who said, "I can see the relevance of ESL for this topic." In this statement, Ryan articulated his understanding that ESL is relevant to the topics he teaches within teacher education. He, like others in this group, saw the importance and relevance of the PD to their own courses.

***Need more*.** This was the largest theme for the willing to engage group. They accounted for more than two thirds of all the need more statements across all groups. This supported the idea that members of this group had a strong interest in further learning; they were eager to change but wanted more information to help move them forward. For example, Ryan said, "I definitely could use more information on it." The "it" in this example referred to information about educating preservice teachers to work with ELs within his content area. As a whole, this group was willing to change and wanted more information to facilitate such change.

Members of this group may have imagined future adjustments to their curriculum, but their ideas were not yet fully developed because they felt that while they had learned a lot from the PD, they lacked sufficient understanding to act. William indicated this speaking of his desire to adjust an assignment, "I need to do something where they get a stronger plan as we do that QRI assignment." Like others in this group, William easily identified specific places where what preservice teachers learned about ELs was applicable to the assignments, readings, and activities within his course. He, like others, also thought this would lead to improvement in his course and

in preservice teacher learning. However, he was still working out how to go about it. Mallory's comment was similar, "I know there are a lot of things I don't have answers to and I'm not sure I've got the answers here." This illustrates that she recognized the value of what was taught but was still seeking answers about the best way to integrate it into her own courses. She had not only been willing to learn in the seminar, but she also wanted more information.

Faculty in this group also asked for and were receptive to help. William, for example, expressed interest in receiving feedback on his course. He commented, "I would like to actually have somebody come into my classroom." Ryan stated that he "would welcome ideas and suggestions." As these quotes indicate, participants not only acknowledged their lack of knowledge, they also expressed a desire to learn more, specifically with making adjustments in pedagogy and curriculum.

***Authentic instruction and integration*.** Integrating attention to ELs within their content in meaningful ways was important to this group. This was demonstrated by the high frequency of authentic instruction and integration codes; willing to engage participants accounted for just over 80% of the codes for this theme. In referencing preservice teachers, Ryan said, "I hope that my course is, that students see it as relevant." He believed the activities for his course were authentic enough to be valuable to future teachers and hoped that they too would see that. Mallory had a strong interest in authentic instruction in her courses and emphasized finding a way to teach preservice teachers to provide authentic opportunities for ELs. She said, "how do we teach more where they own the language?" Mallory wanted to learn how to integrate authentic learning opportunities that support preservice teachers in developing ELs' language and literacy skills. The willing to learn group did not want to just teach the material; they wanted to do it well, by

integrating authentic activities into their current curriculum, thus effectively preparing preservice teachers to work with ELs.

Awareness. Comments from this group accounted for over half of all the awareness codes in our analysis. This group of participants gained, or already had, a strong awareness concerning what they might adjust and why they needed to make adjustments. This awareness seemed to be their motivation for wanting more and for their desire to effectively implement what they learned. They also referenced experiences that helped increase their awareness of the needs of ELs. William shared an experience with an EL student with no English language ability from his own past experience as a teacher, "I would do a little minor translating but I didn't have time to do a lot of translating so I look back and I think, boy I wish I would have done things a little bit differently." In this case, the teacher educator expressed an increased awareness of the needs of ELs and a commitment to act on their awareness.

Already knowledgeable. Besides those themes that were most common, it is interesting to note which themes were absent. One of those themes was already knowledgeable. This group of participants did not assert that they already had foundational knowledge about teaching ELs or teaching preservice teachers to teach ELs. They were less fluent when talking about EL principles, and were often hesitant, as shown by phrases such as "I think," "I could," and "I don't know" in regard to their inclusion of EL strategies. For example, Ryan said the following, "I could see, it potentially could be integrated a lot more than what I've done. I'm not sure exactly how." His hesitation may have stemmed from a lack of confidence or lack of knowledge. William, although his speech was more fluent, still expressed hesitation signaled by his frequent use of the phrase "I think." For example, his comment that, "I think Bill Jackson and I, in our textbook, we have EL stuff highlighted." Again, this hesitation might indicate that they are

unsure of their understanding of this content yet are trying to learn and implement to the best of their ability.

Uncertain of practice. Another theme that was absent for this group was uncertain of practice. It is important to distinguish that while they were hesitant in discussing EL content and not confident in their knowledge, these individuals were very certain of what they did not know and that they needed to learn more. Ryan expressed his position with certainty, "I definitely could use more information on it." He did not say, "I think I could use more," he said, "I definitely could use more." These participants spoke with confidence about their future learning and changes to their curriculum. When discussing a class activity or planning an adaptation to an assignment these individuals were confident about where they might attend more fully to teaching ELs within their courses, yet they were also very aware of their knowledge limitations. William used direct language without hesitation when discussing a change, "I have them go through that lesson. I have them plan." He knew what he was going to do and said it with confidence. Members of this group are certain of where they stand and that they will need more information and more PD to move forward.

Adaptations. This group wanted to teach principles of language acquisition in their courses and could already identify areas of their curriculum where this could be incorporated. This is the only group that had any codes for the theme adaptations. They were either attempting to implement changes already, planning to make changes soon, or were trying to figure out what exactly to change. Ryan, for example, said, "there are many places it would fit" and "it could be relevant actually for each section." These comments demonstrate that he was willing to adapt and that he was already identifying sections of the curriculum where adaptations could be made. He, as well as others, expressed a willingness to change curriculum and assignments. In response

to being asked if he would make such changes he said, “I definitely would.” Participants in this group were likely to have already made changes based on this and previous PD opportunities. For example, William said that there were “three assignments that I’ve either adapted or included now that I wasn’t doing, you know, a semester or two ago.” Not only was he willing to change, he had already begun to make some of those changes.

Summary. By examining the most common themes, as well as absent themes, we can better understand the characteristics of this group. The willing to engage participants had a significantly higher number of comments expressing a need for more information; in fact, 74% of all comments for this theme came from this group, which supports the claim that this group had a high interest in learning more. A high number of codes for authentic instruction illustrates their interest in effectively integrating support for ELs into their curriculum. However, they do not want to just add principles of second language acquisition into their courses, they want these additions to be authentic and useful. These participants often commented about an increased awareness for EL issues and concerns and they desire to address EL needs within their course work, specifically in relationship to preservice teachers being able to attend to the language and literacy needs of this population. As a result, they were already trying to make changes to be more explicit about issues surrounding the teaching of ELs but are eager to learn more about how to do this effectively.

Experienced. This section first describes those participants distinguished by particular themes that illustrate a level of expertise not had by other participants. Second, the themes that relate most to this group are explained, including exemplar quotes from participants. Finally, the section closes with a summary.

The language of a few participants demonstrated that they already had extensive knowledge of second language acquisition. These participants viewed the PD as a review of concepts they already understood and were currently teaching. Although they were polite and did not directly state it, they seemed to indirectly say that they learned very little; yet thought the PD was good for the rest of the faculty who did need some help. Mostly, these were individuals with previous expertise in ESL. Cindy for example informed the interviewer, “This is my background,” and Fiona stated, “my area of research is second language learners.”

The content offered in the PD was not new to these participants. Fiona said, “I pretty much knew the content of what was being taught...I sort of knew the content of it.” Statements such as these demonstrated their experience in the content area as well as a degree of disinterest in the PD itself. The highest frequency of codes for this group were under the themes *personal comment, attention to ELs*, and *already knowledgeable*, respectively. Within their interviews, there were no instances of codes prevalent in the willing to learn group: need more, adaptations, authentic instruction, and uncertain. Furthermore, this was the only group with comments listed under the themes already knowledgeable and balancing curriculum.

Personal comment. The most frequent codes for the experienced group were in the theme personal comment. Members of this group spoke about themselves and their thoughts about the PD. This might suggest that they were less interested than other participants in discussing content. They were likely to critique the PD and comment on the presenters and how the material was delivered. Cindy said, “That doesn’t have anything to do with the content. It’s more with the audience and the deliverers.” This was in reference to her negative critique of the PD, specifically that the audience did not buy into the PD, partly because the presenters were seen as being under qualified. Other personal comments revolved around other colleagues’ lack of

knowledge, while mentioning their own expertise. Fiona said, “I was really surprised at how little my colleagues in the department and especially the clinical faculty knew about second language acquisition,” while Cindy pointed out, “I was a bilingual education scholar.” Comments such as these position the participants as experts, as already knowing or understanding what the PD had to offer.

Attention to ELs. About half the codes for this theme come from participants we categorized as experienced. They expressed that they already give attention to ELs. In the beginning of her interview Cindy stated, “So every course I have ever taught has attended to these issues.” When asked if she planned to make any changes to include content from the PD Fiona commented, “I didn’t because I’d already.” Fiona also said, “cause I have, like I said, two weeks sort of devoted already.” Wendy listed many ways she gave attention to ELs, “We talk about the multiple modalities, which again we talk about with language, but we also talk about it with lots of other things, so it fits in that way to the whole course content.” These quotes illustrate the fact that some individuals enter PD already having considerable background knowledge, which can and will influence not only their view of the PD itself, but also their participation in PD related activities.

It is important to distinguish that, unlike the willing to engage group, these individuals referred to practices already in place in their courses. The focus was not on the effectiveness of their activities and assignments just that they do a, b, and c or x, y and z in teaching preservice teachers to address EL needs.

Already knowledgeable. This theme was very frequent for participants in the experienced group, in fact, they are the only ones with comments that fit into this theme. Due to their backgrounds, they were very adept at explaining their curriculum and at ease with ESL concepts

and ideas. Their speech was fluent and confident, and they did not question themselves. They spoke quickly and used "I" phrases followed by doing verbs. According to them, they were not thinking or wondering, they were doing. Common phrases were, "I have" and "I don't." For example, Fiona said, "I have assigned readings," and Cindy said, "I don't see changing anything, radically." There was little to no hesitation in their comments. This group felt confident that they were already doing what was needed.

Along with strong verbs these individuals also discussed ESL content easily. They listed ESL content embedded within their courses and the information was fluent and on the tip of their tongue. They did not interrupt themselves or struggle to explain. Although the list may be lengthy, they did not ramble or rant. They had a firm enough grasp of the content to summarize it effectively.

All members of this group already addressed ESL issues in their courses. Cindy started strong with the statement, "every course I have ever taught has attended to these issues." Fiona easily discussed her content in the following passages, "two full weeks devoted to teaching English language learners and cultural diversity" and "every class period when we talk about teaching...we would talk about how you would adapt that to English language learners." Not only were these individuals already knowledgeable, they clearly expressed ways in which they were already using that knowledge in their teaching.

Need more. The experienced group did not have any codes for the theme of need more. In fact, expressions regarding learning more were often made in reference to others, which were coded as personal comments. While confident in their own teaching and curriculum, members of this group were concerned about their colleagues. They expressed surprise by how little their colleagues already knew. As stated previously, Fiona said, "I was really surprised at how little

my colleagues in the department and especially the clinical faculty knew about second language acquisition." In addition, a general sense of concern was expressed. Cindy said, "hopefully it's going to be integrated into other people's courses." Later Cindy expressed a greater concern, "I don't think that a lot of the other method courses, and other courses that aren't specific to the EL minor now, realize [that they] ...had better be covering some of these topics." Members of this group saw themselves as fellow experts and equals with those in charge of the PD; they were more concerned with others' need for knowledge about ELs and others' need to act on that, rather than what they themselves might learn. In response to being asked if they wanted to receive help in adapting their curriculum Cindy said, "I have a PhD from [a well-known institution] with a bilingual fellow scholar...my name could be added to that question." Fiona said, "[helping] other teachers in terms of how to help them adjust their methods, or whatever for ELs, that's probably more of a priority."

Adaptations. Since these individuals were already addressing EL concerns, they were less interested in making adjustments. They mentioned few, if any, adjustments and none of their comments fit into the theme of adaptations and any adjustments that were made were not connected to the PD. When explaining these changes, they had fully thought out what would be changed and could easily describe their plans. They could also easily explain their reasoning for the changes. This showed a firm grasp of the content knowledge involved and a level of comfort in including it, or not including it, in their courses. In response to being asked about making changes, Cindy was direct in stating, "Honestly, I hope not," thus expressing that she did not see a need for making changes based on the PD. Another participant, Fiona, explained one of her adjustments by stating, "I've just sort of spread it out and made it a beefier piece of the

curriculum," which shows that she was already attending to the concept, but decided to increase attention to it.

Authentic instruction and uncertain of practice. This group had no codes under the themes of authentic instruction or uncertain of practice. This supports that these individuals were more focused on explaining how they already knew the content and how to teach preservice teachers to work with ELs. There was more of an emphasis on their knowledge base than on how they were deepening that knowledge or bringing forward the learning preservice teachers developed in their second language acquisition courses into their own coursework. They were certain about what they said; they said what they already knew, without hesitation, and left it at that.

Balancing curriculum. Rather than discussing adjusting their curriculum to include increased attention to teaching ELs, these participants argued that they needed to attend less to teaching teachers to work with ELs. They articulated this as balancing curriculum and their attention was on doing less. The balancing curriculum theme only appears for this group. Most individuals in this category reported reducing the amount of time and curriculum spent on EL content. Cindy said, "I've pulled back actually" and "I'm able to address larger issues of second language acquisition…more of what I was supposed to do in a foundations course." A major reason given for pulling back was to have a more balanced curriculum due to a sense of relief that, through the ESL minor (required for all elementary education majors), students would now learn about addressing ELs' needs in other courses. In discussing her relief that others would teach these concepts, Cindy said, "cause beforehand it could have been that my class would have been the only place [they] heard of that." For these faculty, one good thing about the PD was that they could expect EL concerns to be addressed by other faculty, not just themselves.

Summary. The prevalent themes for this group give numeric support to their unique perspective. Members of this group account for all themes coded with already knowledgeable. These individuals see themselves as experts in this field and were the only group to discuss balancing curriculum, which to them actually meant a reduction in attention to teaching ELs. They were less interested in adding ESL curriculum and more interested in creating balance between ESL and their course content. The few statements about needing more from this group were in reference to other faculty needing more, not themselves as they did not see a personal need for more PD in this area. They also had a lot of personal comments where they tended to talk about themselves and their credentials or feelings about how things should be run. Overall the common themes for this group support that they are already experienced, that they do not think they need more PD in this area, are in the process of balancing their curriculum, and were more interested in discussing their position, as knowers of the content, than the content itself.

Focused elsewhere. The first portion of this section describes the basic characteristics of participants deemed part of this group. Second, the themes associated with this group are discussed, including exemplar quotes. The final portion provides a short summary.

Participants associated with this group explained how their course naturally included the content from the PD. They acknowledged that they had learned, but felt their courses already fulfilled what was necessary to support ELs. These individuals seemed less open to change than those in the willing to engage group. A good example is Barrie's statement, "my opinion is that I have been addressing the needs of second language learners to some degree...not necessarily intentionally or explicitly."

Members of this group also had a high frequency of codes for the themes of uncertain, need more, and attention to ELs and they were the only group to have codes for uncertain. In

contrast to the experienced group, there were no codes that fell under the themes of already knowledgeable, adaptations, and balancing curriculum.

Uncertain. This is the only group with comments that fell into the theme of uncertain. As such, the concept of uncertainty defines this group. They act, and sometimes speak, like the experienced group yet hesitate and question their knowledge and understanding of concepts, like the willing to engage group. The highest percentage of comments for this group were in the theme uncertain, and while they were not the only group to have codes for this theme, uncertainty was a frequent, defining factor of the group.

Participants who were focused elsewhere mentioned how they already address ELs but were hesitant to commit to that stance. They listed current curriculum and assignments that addressed EL content but then backtracked by saying they were not sure if it was effective or adequate or even that it met the needs of ELs. Hesitant language such as "maybe," "not sure," and "I think," were used at the end of statements as compared to the experienced group who never expressed unsurety. An example is Barrie's statement, "The entire course is focused on some of these key ideas that I'm sharing with you that have, I think, implications for English Language Learners." Another example is Emily's statement after she explained several assignments in her course, "well I don't know if this is really good for second language learners." In both these examples, the participant claimed to be aware of and to address EL needs, but quickly added that they were not sure if what they were doing was adequate or effective.

Another trend within this theme is questioning. Members of this group would add a question to the end of statements and validations. For example, Barrie said, "if we did that right with ELs wouldn't we actually, not only help them to learn more math, but accelerate their

language acquisition? Wouldn't we?" Here Barrie starts with a strong statement about EL learning and then backtracks by questioning if his statements are in fact correct. This shows that although he is talking the talk, he is not confident in his responses. Emily responded in a similar manner by questioning her knowledge at the end of her interview with the question, "Is there tons of stuff there that I just need to know more about?" This questioning shows the bridge between their uncertainty and need for more.

Need more. Toward the end of the interviews, members of this group referenced their lack of knowledge. In their final statements, they end by clarifying that they really do need to learn more. Emily said, "I need to know more" and "maybe it'll take some practice, maybe some direct instruction." Barrie had similar sentiments, "there's more I need to learn, and it needs to be explicit." This admission of needing more shows a strong contrast to the experienced group; they express limitations in their knowledge and a need to learn more.

Attention to ELs*.* A major feature of this group was their explanations of how their course already taught EL concepts. The difference between this group and the experienced group is that those who were focused elsewhere stated that they did not purposefully teach EL principles. Barrie stated, "So I think I've done some of that but without knowing it." These participants posit that they already address EL needs unintentionally; indirect instruction that could support ELs was already embedded in their course content. In reference to her own course, Emily said, "That content [subject matter] lends itself easily to some content that was taught in the second language classes." Exemplified in this quote is that those in this group linked current assignments to what was taught in the PD.

Already knowledgeable*.* Despite their many comments regarding attention to ELs, this group never commented that they had prior knowledge or understanding of EL needs and

concerns. They did not claim to know about this field, they just happen to address EL principles in their courses; partially because methods in their subject matter lend themselves to the concepts taught in the PD.

Adaptations and balancing curriculum. An important characteristic of this group is that they expressed no desire to make adaptations or change what they were doing. Despite their uncertainty, they did not plan to change their curriculum or assignments. Emily stated, "I don't know that I'm making too many adjustments to my curriculum," and Barrie commented, "I don't change fast." The only change these participants referred to was being more aware of EL concerns while they teach.

Another common characteristic of this group is that they thought the PD was interesting and that it validated their course curriculum. It confirmed, to them, that what they were already doing met EL standards. Individuals in this group reported interest in the PD, but not necessarily that it was needed. Emily said, "I found the professional development opportunities that we had this last year to be interesting." They mention that the information from the PD was new and that they learned, but also that they already indirectly taught it in their courses. Barrie said, "So what I was teaching was validated." Since they felt validated, they indicated no intention to make changes. They seemed to be saying, why change if they are already incorporating EL concepts? The same idea applies to balancing curriculum. There is nothing to balance, they like it just how it is.

Summary. The number of codes in the major themes for this group are a good example of their distinction from the other two groups. For example, this is the only group to talk about uncertainty, which is illustrated by their hesitation to fully support their statements and claims, yet their comments often seemed to fall into the theme of already knowledgeable, which was a

major theme for the experienced group. It is interesting to note that while the willing to engage group had a significantly high number of comments for the theme of needing more and the experienced group had a high number of comments for the theme of attention to ELs, the focused elsewhere group had one less member but a relatively high count for comments in these same themes. Like the experienced group, they spoke about themselves and expressed their competence yet also expressed their need for more knowledge, like those in the willing to engage group. The focused elsewhere group also had a high number of codes for the theme of attention to ELs; they assert they are teaching EL content indirectly through their curriculum. Another unique characteristic of this group is the lack of comments regarding adaptation to their course or curriculum. They acknowledge the importance of attending to ELs and needing to learn more on the subject and they express uncertainty regarding their practice, yet they do not intend to make changes.

Discussion

Complexity theory and andragogy provide a framework for understanding the findings of this study. Mason (2009) argued that we cannot prescribe exactly what will be learned in educational experiences—we can only set up parameters for the information being presented and then try to guide the learning in such a way that it will be meaningful for all participants at whatever place they find themselves. Furthermore, andragogy posits that adult learners are greatly affected by their readiness to learn, motivation to learn, and their orientation to learning (Knowles, 1980, 1984). Our interviews provided clear support for these ideas.

The goal of the PD was to teach faculty the content, curriculum, and pedagogy employed in the second language acquisition course as it was currently taught. The PD provided an overview of what their students were learning about second language acquisition with the

intention that faculty would be able to hold preservice teachers accountable for this learning within their own course and make more explicit connections to the learning of ELs. The six PD sessions were designed to attend carefully to the research on effective PD by Desimone (2009) and Penuel et al. (2007) and the understanding that we need to honor faculty expertise in designing curricular responses to the PD. Ideas were presented, concepts were discussed, awareness was developed, but in the end, there were too many variables to predict what the participants would take away from the PD (Entwistle, 2009; Mason, 2009). Through this study, we see further evidence that willingness to learn, readiness to learn, and motivation to learn greatly influence the orientation of participants in relation to learning activities. Furthermore, we gained deeper understanding that adult learners will take up those things that are most related to their area of interest, background experience, or those things that will help them problem solve within their own field (Knowles et al., 2015).

This study also sheds light on the types of attitudes that may exist within any given learning opportunity. A study by Pedder and Opfer (2013), showed that participants of professional learning opportunities fell into one of five groupings: engaged learners, moderate learners, infrequent learners, individual explorers, and solitary classroom learners. While this study uses a different number of groups and a different naming convention for the groupings, it supports the idea that participants can be categorized into groups, which may improve understanding of participants' "readiness to engage" (p. 561).

Conclusion

Teacher education faculty today have a different role than those from previous decades. Knowledge within disciplines has advanced, methods for teaching have changed, and student demographics include increased numbers of ELs, who may require a different approach in order

to be successful. Therefore, it is critical that these faculty be given opportunities to update their knowledge, improve their understanding of the task before them, and increase their ability to prepare future teachers for what they will encounter in the teaching profession.

While it is critical that teacher education faculty adjust their understanding of content, students, and pedagogy so they can better prepare future teachers, it is difficult to define and prescribe how this should be accomplished (Mason, 2009). Learning opportunities or PD can help in this regard, but studies have shown that traditional PD is not effective and does not lead to lasting change (e.g., Borko, 2004; Gusky, 2002; Pedder & Opfer, 2013; Parise & Spillane, 2010). In addition, while there are many studies of the effectiveness of PD among teachers, little work has been done on PD for teacher educators. Therefore, we need more studies, such as the current one, that help inform PD designers and facilitators on how to assess learning readiness and motivation to learn within a particular domain.

While professional development can be an important tool in helping teacher educators face current and future challenges, little is known about how faculty orientations toward learning will affect their learning. The findings of this study demonstrate the importance of understanding participants' orientation or positioning in relation to a particular learning opportunity as a way to better design and implement PD that will have meaningful results and lead to lasting change.

The contribution of this thesis is an understanding of the orientations that adults bring into a PD opportunity and how those orientations may affect their learning. Our first major finding was that participants enter PD with a central focus that influences their positioning, attitude, and learning. This focus is a driving force and motivator for their current situation. It influences not only what they hope to get out of the PD, but also what they ultimately learn. In the interviews, participants mostly talked about how the PD did or did not address what they

hoped to learn. For example, one participant hoped to learn more about providing equitable educational opportunities for ELs and how to strengthen community building in the classroom. Although she admitted that the PD was beneficial, she also expressed disappointment that there was not more emphasis on equity and community.

The second major finding was that participants' attitude toward the PD was representative of one of three types of attitudes: willing to engage, experienced, or focused elsewhere. Those participants who expressed a need to know more and a willingness to learn more were clustered together in the willing to engage group. Those who showed little interest in the content of the PD and demonstrated a high level of prior understanding of the material were clustered in the experienced group, and those who were teachable and interested in the PD yet felt validated in their current practice and pedagogy were clustered in the focused elsewhere group.

Of importance is the possibility that participants could move within and between the continuum of the three attitudes described. For example, a participant who enters a PD with a focused elsewhere attitude may find value in what is being taught and may become more willing to engage. On the other hand, a participant may begin a PD with a willing to engage attitude but find he or she already knows the content. Thus, moving along the continuum from willing to engage to experienced. Even though participants may shift in orientation, those designing or facilitating PD should consider who the participants will be and find ways to uncover the central focus those participants already have and the orientation they may have toward learning about the given topic. Doing this may have the potential to reduce resistance to the PD and increase learning.

Importance of this Study

Many areas of higher education face an escalation in knowledge and understanding of the needed practices of particular disciplines. Therefore, faculty at these institutions have a need for PD that supports them in adjusting the content and pedagogy of their courses and teaching. Institutions will need to adjust or create programs to meet this demand. The contribution of this thesis is an understanding of the orientations that adults bring into a PD opportunity and how those orientations may affect their learning.

Studies such as this, are necessary if faculty and programs are to meet the needs of the larger community, as they shed light on how faculty view themselves as learners and how experience, background, and attitude affect their positioning within PD and what aspects they take up. Understanding the interests, backgrounds, and attitudes of participants could also guide coordinators in adjusting approaches to better interest participants and engage them in the overall PD discussion.

Limitations

As with all studies, there are limitations to this study. First, we acknowledge the small sample size and limited generalizability of this study—especially from a quantitative standpoint. However, this study was never designed to be generalizable. The reflections presented here are meant to grant fresh insight into issues that could easily be overlooked in a larger, quantitative study. Second, each participant only participated in one interview session, which limited the scope of the data to a single moment in time, whereas multiple interview sessions, possibly throughout the PD, could have provided a deeper, richer context wherein to examine participants' orientations more fully. Third, the model of using researcher as interviewer could

have affected how a participant responded to the questions, especially since the researcher was involved in the program that provided the PD.

Future Research

Current research demonstrates that PD for higher education faculty could potentially be more effective if it utilizes the research on PD for educators in other arenas. However, what this study helps us understand is the importance of the positioning or orientation of faculty coming into the PD and preparing the PD to take up the variability in these orientations. A one-size fits all model does not work. Future research could employ interviews or surveys to help coordinators assess and better understand the positioning of participants and determine how best to meet their needs. Research could also be designed to examine whether there is a difference in results when orientations are taken into account and when they are not. Finally, this study could be repeated using larger groups, different settings, or different subject matter areas.

References

Altback, P. G. (2001). Academic freedom: International realities and challenges. *Higher Education, 41*(1/2), 205-219. doi:10.1023/A:102679151

August, D., & Shanahan, T. (Eds.). (2006). *Developing literacy in second-language learners: Report of the National Literacy Panel on language minority children and youth.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Ballantyne, K. G., Sanderman, A. A., & Levy, J. (2008). *Education English language learners: Building teacher capacity.* Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition. Retrieved from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED521360.pdf

Batalova, J., & McHugh, M. (2010). *Number and growth of students in us schools in need of English instruction.* Washington, DC: Migration Policy Institute.

Birman, B. F, Desimone, L., Porter, A. C., & Garet, M. S. (2000). Designing professional development that works. *Educational Leadership*, *57*(8), 28-33.

Bolam, R., McMahon, A., Stoll, L., Thomas, S., & Wallace, M. (2005). *Creating and sustaining effective professional learning communities*. Research Report Number 637. London, England: General Teaching Council for England, Department for Education and Skills.

Borko, H. (2004). Professional development and teacher learning: Mapping the terrain. *Educational Researcher*, *33*(8), 3-15. doi:10.3102/0013189X033008003

Bouwma-Gearhart, J. (2012). *Engaging STEM faculty while attending to professional realities: An exploration of successful postsecondary STEM education reform at five SMTI institutions.* APLU/SMTI Paper 5. Washington, DC: Association of Public and Land-grant Universities.

Carlo, M., August, D., McLaughlin, B., Snow, C., Dressler, C., Lippman, D…White, C. (2004). Closing the gap: Addressing the vocabulary needs of English language learners in bilingual and mainstream classrooms. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *39*(2), 188–215.

Clandinin, J., & Connelly, F. M. (2000). *Narrative inquiry: Experience and story in qualitative research*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Daniel, S., & Peercy, M. M. (2014). Expanding roles: Teacher educators' perspectives on education English language learners. *Action in Teacher Education, 36*(2), 100-116. doi: 10.1080/01626620.2013.864575

Darling-Hammond, L. (2006). Constructing 21st-century teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 57*(3), 300-314. doi:10.1177/0022487105285962

Day, C. (1999). Professional development and reflective practice: Purposes, processes, and partnerships. *Pedagogy, Culture, & Society*, *7*(2), 221-233. doi:10.1080/14681366.1999.11090864

Day, C., & Leitch, R. (2007). The continuing professional development of teachers: Issues of coherence, cohesion, and effectiveness. In T. Townsend (Ed.), *International handbook of school effectiveness and improvement* (pp. 707-726). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Desimone, L. (2009). Improving impact studies of teachers' professional development: Toward better conceptualizations and measures. *Educational Researcher, 38*(3), 181-199. doi:10.3102/0013189X08331140

Desimone, L., Porter, A., Garet, M., Yoon, K., & Birman, B. (2002). Effects of professional development on teachers' instruction: Results from a three-year longitudinal study. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 24*(2), 81-112.

Echevarria, J., Short, D., & Powers, K. (2006). School reform and standards-based education: An instructional model for English language learners. *Journal of Educational Research, 99*(4), 195-210.

Entwistle, N. J. (2009). *Teaching for understanding at university: Deep approaches and distinctive ways of thinking.* Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Freeman, Y. S., & Freeman, D. E. (2014). Introduction. In Y. S. Freeman & D. E. Freeman (Eds.), *Research on preparing preservice teachers to work effectively with emergent bilinguals* (pp. xi-xviii). Bingley, UK: Emerald Group Publishing.

Garet, M. S., Porter, A. C., Desimone, L., Birman, B. F., & Yoon, K. S. (2001). What makes professional development effective? Results from a national sample of teachers. *American Educational Research Journal*, *38*(4), 915–945. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/3202507?origin=JSTOR-pdf

Gilligan, C. (2015). The listening guide method of psychological inquiry. *Qualitative Psychology, 2*(1), 69-77. doi:10.1037/qup0000023

Gilligan, C., Spencer, R., Weinberg, M. K., & Bertsch, T. (2006). On the listening guide: A voice-centered relational method. In S. N. Hesse-Biber & P. Leavy (Eds.), *Emergent methods in social research* (pp. 253-271). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Goldenberg, C. (2008). Teaching English language learners: What the research does—and does not—say. *American Educator, 32*(2), 8-23, 42-44.

Gusky, T. (2002). Professional development and teacher change. *Teachers and Teaching, 8*(3), 381-391. doi:10.1080/135406002100000512

Herbert, A., & Tienari, J. (2013). Transplanting tenure and the (re)construction of academic freedoms. *Studies in Higher Education, 38*(2), 157-173. doi:10.1080/03075079.2011.569707

Horn, I. S., & Little, J. W. (2010). Attending to problems of practice: Routines and resources for professional learning in teachers' workplace interactions. *American Educational Research Journal, 47*(1), 181-217. doi:10.3102/0002831209345158

Huberman, M. A. (1993). *The lives of teachers*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Jackson, C. K., & Bruegamann, E. (2009). Teaching students and teaching each other: The importance of peer learning for teachers. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics, 1*(4), 85-108. doi:10.3386/w15202

Kim, J. (2016). *Understanding narrative inquiry: The crafting and analysis of stories as research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publishing.

Kim, J., & Herman, J. L. (2009). *A three-state study of English learner progress* (CRESST Report 764). Los Angeles, CA: University of California, National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing (CRESST).

Klinger, K. J., Hoover, J. J., & Baca. M. L. (2008). *Why do English language learners struggle with reading? Distinguishing language acquisition from learning disabilities.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Knowles, M. S. (1980). *The modern practice of adult education: From pedagogy to andragogy*. Wilton, CT: Association Press.

Knowles, M. S. (1984). *Andragogy in action: Applying modern principles of adult learning*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Knowles, M. S., Holton, E. F., & Swanson, R. A. (2015). *The adult learner: The definitive classic in adult education and human resource development* (8th ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Lattuca, L. R., & Creamer, E. G. (2005). Learning as a professional practice. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 102*(1), 3-11. doi:10.1002/tl.192

Leos, K., & Saavedra, L. (2010). *A new vision to increase the academic achievement for English language learners and immigrant students*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.

Levine, A. (2006). *Educating school teachers.* Washington, DC: The Education Schools Project. Retrieved from http://edschools.org/pdf/Educating_Teachers_Report.pdf

Lucas, T., & Villegas, A. M. (2013). Preparing linguistically responsive teachers: Laying the foundation in preservice teacher education. *Theory into Practice, 52*(2), 98-109.

Mason, M. (Ed.). (2009). *Complexity theory and the philosophy of education.* Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Maxwell, J. A., & Miller, B. A. (2008). Categorizing and connecting strategies in qualitative data analysis. In P. Leavy, & S. Hesse-Biber (Eds.), *Handbook of emergent methods* (pp. 461-477). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

McPherson, M. S., & Schapiro, M. O. (1999). Tenure issues in higher education. *Journal of Economic Perspectives, 13*(1), 85-98. Retrieved from https://pubs.aeaweb.org/doi/pdfplus/10.1257/jep.13.1.85

Menken, K., & Antunez, B. (2001). *An overview of the preparation and certification of teachers working with limited English proficient students*. Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse of Bilingual Education.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

National Assessment of Educational Progress. (2013). *Nation's report card*. Retrieved from http://nationsreportcard.gov/reading%5Fmath%5F2013/#/student-groups

National Center for Education Statistics. (2005). *The condition of education 2005* (NCES 2005–094). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2006). *The condition of education 2006* (NCES 2006–071). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2013). *Schools and staffing survey (SASS); "Public school teacher data file," 1987-88 through 2011-12; "Private school teacher data file," 1987-88 through 2011-12; and "Charter school teacher data file," 1999-2000*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

National Center for Education Statistics (2018). *Common core of data (CCD), local education agency universe survey, 2016–17*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition & Language Instruction Educational Programs. (2011). *NCELA state title III information system*. Retrieved from http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/t3sis

National Education Association, Quality School Programs and Resources Department. (2011). *Professional development for general education teachers of English language learners: An NEA policy brief.* Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from http://www.nea.org/assets/docs/PB32_ELL11.pdf

Office of English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement for Limited English Proficient Students. (2015). *The biennial report to congress on the implementation of the title III state formula grant program*, school years 2010 – 12. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

Parise, L. M., & Spillane, J. P. (2010). Teacher learning and instructional change: How formal and on-the-job learning opportunities predict change in elementary school teachers' practice. *Elementary School Journal, 110*(3), 323-346. doi:10.1086/648981

Pedder, D., & Opfer, V. D. (2013). Professional learning orientations: Patterns of dissonance and alignment between teachers' values and practices. *Research Papers in Education, 28*(5), 539-570. doi:10.1080/02671522.2012.706632

Penuel, W. R., Fishman, B. J., Yamaguchi, R., & Gallagher, L. P. (2007). What makes professional development effective? Strategies that foster curriculum implementation. *American Educational Research Journal, 44*(4)*,* 921-958. doi:10.3102/0002831207308221

Samson, J. F., & Collins, B. A. (2012). *Preparing all teachers to meet the needs of English language learners: Applying research to policy and practice for teacher effectiveness*. Washington, DC: Center for American Progress.

Short, D., & Fitzsimmons, S. (2007). *Double the work: Challenges and solutions to acquiring language and academic literacy for adolescent English language learners: A report to Carnegie Corporation of New York.* New York, NY: Alliance for Excellent Education.

Sunal, D. W., Hodges, J., Sunal, C. S., Whittaker, K. W., Freeman, L. M., Edwards, L., . . . Odell, M. (2001). Teaching science in higher education: Faculty professional development and barriers to change. *School Science and Mathematics, 101*(5), 246–256. doi:10.1111/j.1949-8594.2001.tb18027.x

Tagg, J. (2003). *The learning paradigm college*. Bolton, MA: Anker.

Tagg, J. (2008). Changing minds in higher education: Students change, so why can't colleges? *Planning for Higher Education, 37*(1), 15–22.

Toulmin, S. (2001). *Return to reason.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

U.S. Government Accountability Office. (2009). *Teacher preparation: Multiple federal education offices support teacher preparation for instructing student with disabilities and English language learners, but systematic department wide coordination could enhance this assistance* (GAO 09-573). Retrieved from http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d09573.pdf

Woolfolk, A. (1998). *Educational psychology* (7th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

APPENDIX A

Extended Review of Literature

Addressing the complex professional development (PD) needs of teacher education faculty is no simple task, and there is not an established, research-based approach that guarantees learning and change across disciplines. However, there are theories and principles, that should be considered when designing learning opportunities for adult learners. The first section of this review discusses the primary theories that should be considered in designing PD for adults, i.e., andragogy, self-directed learning, and transformative learning. The second section of this review examines the research literature that describes the features of effective PD in teacher education and in higher education. The third section discusses the importance of going beyond well-designed PD opportunities by recognizing the complexity surrounding change and learning and the role that an individual's orientation, or positioning, plays in influencing what is learned, how learning occurs, and if that learning will lead to change.

Adult Learning Theories

Andragogy. Andragogy comes from the Greek words "andr" meaning man, and "agogy" meaning leading. Thus, this theory focuses on the science behind what it takes to teach adults. According to Knowles (1980, 1984), who developed the concept of andragogy, it is a self-directed and autonomous approach to adult learning. Within this theory, there are four principles to consider for designing effective learning opportunities.

First, learning should be cooperative. Participants in a well-designed learning activity should have the opportunity, i.e., be given time, to work together to solve problems. These problems should be related to the learner's local contexts so that they are explicitly linked to the participants, thus adding purpose to the learning. Second, learners' needs and interests should be

assessed and learning activities should be based on that assessment. This includes the learners' beliefs, orientations, position, and attitudes. Such assessments are in complete contrast to the traditional approach of one-size-fits-all learning activities where a set of predetermined outcomes dictate what is to be learned and how it is to be learned. Third, learning should be sequential. Activities should be organized such that later learning builds upon and expands understanding of prior learning. Fourth, adults should be active participants in planning and evaluating their learning. Instead of tell adults what they have to learn, how they are going to learn it, and how their learning will be measured, adult learners should be consulted on what they want to learn, how they would like to learn, and how they will measure or evaluate the learning that has taken place. Later, a fifth principle was added, stating that the quality and effectiveness of learning should be evaluated and consequently adjusted as needed to support further learning (Knowles, Holton, & Swanson, 2015).

Tenets of andragogy further posit that while education emphasizes the educator, learning emphasizes the person in whom change is to occur, thus the focus of educational pursuits should be on what it is that learners need to know, what prior experiences they have already had, what is their orientation to learning, what is their motivation to learn, and what is their readiness to learn (Knowles et al., 2015). It is the differences or uniqueness in individual learners that affects which principles of andragogy will best fit any given situation—andragogy does not, and cannot fit every situation, there are too many variables and factors that influence learning. Therefore, effective PD must be responsive to individual learners' needs and flexible enough to adjust to nuances of various contexts.

Self-directed learning. Self-directed learning is the idea that individuals, especially adults, should take initiative in planning, implementing, and evaluating their own learning

(Knowles, 1975; Merriam, Caffarella, & Baumgartner, 2006). This approach is typically learner initiated, but in the sense of formal PD, organizers can be instrumental in the learning process. In self-directed learning activities the role of an organizer or facilitator, is to provide support, whether it be technical, emotional, or academic. They also encourage participants to first engage in the learning process and then remain engaged throughout the selected activities. One specific manor in which facilitators accomplish this is by setting start and end points. They often take the lead in introducing the purpose and topic of the PD and initiate some form of learning contract that will help participants set goals and determine their own evaluation procedures (Gibbons, 2002; Knowles, 1986).

Another way facilitators can help is by explaining various techniques that improve learning and describe strategies that learners can employ for the purpose of self-evaluation. This may include providing specific self-assessment tools that identify the learning objectives and/or encouraging the use of reflective methods to help learners recognize their own growth and learning. Throughout the entire self-directed learning process, a facilitator should help create and maintain a positive attitude towards the learning objectives, and wherever possible, suggest or provide appropriate resources that match the learning objectives.

A key tenant of self-directed learning is a focus on the learner. An individual must want to learn, or at the least be inspired to want to learn and must be responsible for their own learning. The focus is not on a teacher, who maintains a set of information that must be learned in a specified time frame and in a specific way.

Transformational learning. Transformational learning is characterized as learning that changes how an individual thinks about him or herself and their surround world. This change in thinking is not only a shift in one's view of how the world works, but also in how one fits into

that world. Mezirow (1991, 2000) argued that transformational learning occurs when individuals engage in the act of discussing their current views with other people and then reflecting on the perspectives of those other individuals. Designing transformative learning experiences, therefore, requires the creation of learning activities that provide participants with exposure to varying points of view. If done within an environment of trust and openness, one's world view can change. It is through these types of social interactions that individuals can explore their own perspective while also considering and evaluating the perspectives of others. This should lead to reflection on differences of opinion, which is the type of critical thinking that helps challenge assumptions and ideas and ultimately results in changes to their world view. This change, or transformation as it is called, is the result of the learning that is said to have occurred through the social interaction.

While there are other adult learning theories, e.g., critical learning, situated cognition/contextual learning, neuroscience, and experiential learning, andragogy, self-directed learning, and transformative learning are considered the major or foundational theories of the field (Merriam, 2017). It is therefore necessary to consider these theories in preparing learning opportunities for educators.

Attention should also be given to the body of research devoted to examining and describing the practices or principles that are most effective for professional growth and development. Such research, in many ways, builds upon and adds to the theories of adult learning while applying principles of those theories in a systematic way to the field of professional development. The goal of the following two sections will be to explore and describe the core principles discussed in the research literature for two areas of professional development: PD in teacher education, PD in higher education. The final section will discuss the need to go

beyond just having well-designed PD; it is important to get to know the participants and understand how they orient or position themselves as learners within the PD.

Effective Professional Development

Various searches within the EBSCO database (Academic Search Premier, Education Full Text, ERIC, and Professional Development Collection) with combinations of the search terms teacher educators, professional development, attitudes towards, and English language learners/ELL/ESL did not turn up any studies that address how teacher education faculty position themselves in relation to PD that focuses on preparing pre-service teachers to work with ELs across all teacher preparation courses. However, by searching specific key terms one-by-one in the same EBSCO database, I was able to locate studies that examined various aspects of PD in teacher education and in higher education. These terms were professional development, teacher educator development, higher education professional development, and faculty development. By reviewing the sources from these searches, I was able to note references that were common across the majority of studies. A focused study of those common references led to the collection of readings used for this review. While not completely exhaustive of the wide range of literature on professional development, the collection for this review pulls together key studies from across multiple literatures that are focused on the features and approaches that have been shown to be effective in helping educators, of various levels, gain knowledge and improve their practice.

Professional development in teacher education. Over several decades, researchers have examined practices that contribute to effective professional development for teachers. These practices can be found within both informal and formal learning opportunities. Informal teacher learning is a form of PD. It includes such things as interacting with colleagues in conversations about curriculum and instructional approaches, participating in peer observation and feedback,

seeking advice, and simply teaching day to day (e.g., Bryk, Camburn, & Louis, 1999; Louis, Marks, & Kruse, 1996; McLaughlin & Talbert, 2001; Scribner, Cockrell, Cockrell, & Valentine, 1999; Wilson & Berne, 1999). While the daily activities and interactions of teachers can be seen as a form of PD, this review is concerned more with the systematic and purposeful attempt to change attitudes, behaviors, and practices that are the focus of formal learning efforts.

Formal learning opportunities or formal PD is essential for the improvement of schools (Borko, 2004; Gusky, 2002). It can have a positive effect on teachers' classroom practices by increasing knowledge in the content area as well as understanding of research-based methods and strategies for effective teaching (e.g., Borko, 2004; Garet, Porter, Desimone, Birman, & Yoon, 2001; Pedder & Opfer, 2013). However, research in the area of teacher development has shown that most traditional approaches to PD do not meet teachers' needs (Opfer, Pedder, & Lavicza, 2011; Pedder & Opfer, 2013), are ineffective (Gusky, 2002), are "woefully inadequate" (Borko, 2004, p. 3), and "not likely to facilitate change in teacher practice" (Parise & Spillane, 2010, p. 325). Furthermore, the majority of all evaluations done on teacher PD in past decades used only teacher satisfaction surveys, which limited understanding of the effectiveness of the PD to only what the teachers thought about and their enjoyment, or lack thereof, of the specific learning activities (Penuel et al., 2007). Keeping in mind the crucial nature of teacher PD to education as a whole, it is important to understand what it takes to develop PD opportunities that are effective and will have a lasting change in teachers' knowledge, attitudes, beliefs, and practices.

Darling-Hammond and McLaughlin (1995) argued that a key feature of effective professional development for teachers is involving them as both learners and teachers. They stated that effective PD should include concrete tasks that are grounded in inquiry and provide

ample opportunities for reflection and experimentation. Activities within effective PD should be collaborative in nature and aligned with the teachers' context, or in other words, connected to the work of their students; thus, addressing specific problems within their own classrooms or the school as a whole. A final element of effective PD is that it cannot be viewed as a one-and-done type opportunity. Effective PD should be sustained, ongoing, and intensive; meaning that it should persist over a period of time and should take considerable effort. It is important to note that these researchers called for increased partnerships between schools and universities in developing and enacting teacher education programs and learning opportunities that went beyond the traditional seminar-style PD opportunities that were, and still are, common in educational settings.

Other researchers have similarly argued that effective PD involves learning in collaboration (Bolam, McMahon, Stoll, Thomas, & Wallace, 2005; Day, 1999; Jackson & Bruegmann, 2009), learning within the context of classroom practice (Horn & Little, 2010; Huberman, 1993), and participating in activities that are continuing and thorough, focused on subject matter, and include hands-on activities—as opposed to short, one-time seminars or workshops that are unlikely to facilitate change (Cohen & Hill, 2002; Day & Leitch, 2007; Desimone, Porter, Garet, Yoon, Birman, 2002; Garet et al., 2001; Hill, 2007; National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), 2005).

It is the combination of all or most of the above-mentioned characteristics that leads to effective learning during PD activities and positive change in the classroom (Birman, Desimone, Porter, & Garet, 2000; Desimone et al., 2002; Garet et al., 2001). Therefore, PD for teachers should be designed with the following characteristics in mind:

- Collaborative- participation should be organized to have teachers work with those from their same grade level, department, school, or district. They should interact by sharing ideas, perspectives, and best practices (Desimone et al., 2002; Desimone, 2009, 2011; Garet et al., 2001; Lawless & Pellegrino, 2007; Pedder & Opfer, 2013; Penuel et al., 2007).
- Classroom based- activities should help teachers address the challenges, struggles, questions, and concerns that relate to their own students, classrooms, and schools. PD should be aligned with real work experience, curriculum, and assessments (Holland, 2005; Desimone et al., 2002; Desimone, 2009, 2011; Garet et al., 2001; Lawless & Pellegrino, 2007; Pedder & Opfer, 2013; Penuel et al., 2007).
- Linked to research- participants should be made aware of research that supports the methods, strategies, and practices they are learning (Pedder & Opfer, 2013; Yoon, Duncan, Lee, Scarloss, & Shapley, 2007).
- Ongoing- PD activities should be sustained or spread out over a period of time and should include opportunities for follow-up and feedback. (Holland, 2005; Desimone et al., 2002; Desimone, 2009, 2011; Garet et al., 2001; Lawless & Pellegrino, 2007; Pedder & Opfer, 2013; Penuel et al., 2007). Follow-up should support the main purpose of the PD (Yoon et al., 2007).
- Active- effective PD includes hands-on, inquiry-oriented learning activities that engage teachers in ways that are meaningful to their context (Desimone et al., 2002; Desimone, 2009, 2011; Garet et al., 2001; Lawless & Pellegrino, 2007; Pedder & Opfer, 2013; Penuel et al., 2007).

- Coherent- activities should be linked to the local context including knowledge and beliefs, i.e., aligned to the policies, reforms, standards, priorities, goals, assessments, and learning activities of the teacher, school, and district (Desimone et al., 2002; Desimone, 2009, 2011; Garet et al., 2001; Lawless & Pellegrino, 2007; Pedder & Opfer, 2013; Penuel et al., 2007).
- Content focused- connected to context, how to teach it (Holland, 2005; Desimone et al., 2002; Desimone, 2009, 2011; Garet et al., 2001; Neuman & Cunningham, 2009; Pedder & Opfer, 2013; Penuel et al., 2007).
- Reform-like- instead of short, traditional, one-stop seminars, PD should incorporate workshops, summer institutes, study groups, PLCs, and mentor/coaching (Desimone et al., 2002; Lawless & Pellegrino, 2007; Neuman & Cunningham, 2009; Penuel et al., 2007; Yoon et al., 2007).

While this body of research is helpful for considering the design of PD activities, it was developed for use in the context of classroom teaching. The question then arises as to whether these principles apply to PD in higher education settings—specifically to teacher education faculty.

Professional development in higher education. Higher education consists of a unique field of professionals. Faculty in these settings may have a background in industry, research, government, non-profits, academics, or any combination of these and their knowledge and experience is quite diverse so it can be particularly difficult to create learning experiences for a mixed group of faculty—it can be quite a challenge to teach the teachers. Furthermore, once employed, most faculty receive little to no PD on improving their teaching (Bouwma-Gearhart, 2012). While it can be extremely helpful to have an understanding of both the best practices for

PD and the theories of adult learning, these do not take into consideration the context within which higher education faculty are set nor the barriers to change that are rather unique to this community of learners.

Sunal et al. (2001) argue the importance of change in higher education but point out that change at this level is extremely difficult due to a variety of barriers specific to higher education. They cite the organizational structure of higher education institutions as not only limiting change, but actually discouraging and impeding it. Risk taking, ambiguity, and inquiry, while acceptable in research, are not looked upon favorably in regard to changing institutional practices. The traditional approach of "teaching is telling" (p. 247) is far too ingrained while efforts to improve teaching tend to be limited to a monthly email or flier on some method or practice that could be tried, if one so has the desire. Sunal et al. also contend that further barriers include funding or compensation issues, lack of rewards for good teaching, class size, culture that inhibits change, lack of ongoing PD and follow-up, institutional structures that lead to ineffective practices, and ingrained mindset of the instructors.

Tagg (2003, 2008) also describes barriers that impedes the type of progress expected from PD efforts. These barriers fall into one or more of the following categories: structural, informational, incentive, financial, and cultural. In general, the result of these barriers is the siloed nature of higher education institutions and, in fact, individual faculty themselves. He stated that faculty are not a "collective body taking shared responsibility for educational decisions," instead, they have a distributed responsibility and are first and foremost members of their departments. Furthermore, many academic departments are indifferent or sometimes even hostile to the idea of interdisciplinary work (Lattuca & Creamer, 2005). This siloed structure limits interaction between departments and colleges and causes a disconnect between faculty,

courses, and ultimately students' understanding of material from course to course. Faculty rarely, if ever, know what students are learning in other courses, which impedes transfer of knowledge and skills between courses and limits student accountability. Lack of collaboration due to policies regarding indirect costs, resources, workload, etc. lend themselves to a system that promotes individual efforts and disconnect from peers (Lattuca & Creamer, 2005). This disconnect can cause faculty to be unengaged in PD efforts, which results in little to no learning and little to no change in practice.

Professional development in teacher educator education. Regardless of any perceived or actual barriers to change in higher education, PD for college and university faculty is important, especially in teacher education. PD in teacher education not only influences the faculty member and his or her immediate students but education as a whole. It is within the courses taught by teacher educators that teachers are exposed to the ideas, strategies, practices, and approaches that will be built upon throughout their careers. It is within these courses and with these teacher educators that future teachers will examine beliefs, attitudes, experiences, and motivations and either solidify what they already know and believe or expand their thinking and understandings in ways that will foster a lifetime of learning and improving. This is why there is a great need for further research and documentation of the approaches, practices, and techniques that support teacher educators in professional growth and development (Bouwma-Gearhart, 2012; Hadar & Brody, 2017; Smith, 2003).

Over the period of about a decade, Brody and Hadar (2011) and Hadar and Brody (2010, 2016, 2017) documented various principles that have proven effective in PD for teacher educators. They note that there are two types of teacher educator PD, self-guided and structured (Hadar & Brody, 2017). Self-guided PD, which includes research, reading, and seeking out

experts to get answers to questions, puts the responsibility on faculty for their own education. They have autonomy and choice in what they study and learn, but also in who they work with, if anybody. There are opportunities for collaboration, learning, and growth, but it is difficult to prescribe learning objectives or measure outcomes as there is no formal curriculum or other kind of guiding structure. Structured PD are those learning opportunities that are designed and implemented, often by an association or academic institution, specifically for teacher educators. Typically, this type of PD has an established curriculum with predetermined objectives or learning outcomes. Learners are invited to participate in a series of activities, often lectures, seminars, or workshops, that cover material related to the well-defined objectives. These activities can either be hosted in a central location where participants will travel in order to participate or held locally within specific institutions, colleges, or departments.

An important principle in PD for teacher educators is the advantage that structured PD has in providing the opportunity for collaboration and interaction between participants. Hadar and Brody (2010) point out that PD for teacher educators should lead to change and change typically comes about as a group of individuals work together to become a community. It is in the building of community, within a safe, interdisciplinary environment that barriers are broken down, isolation is mitigated, and learning that leads to lasting change takes place (Hadar & Brody, 2010). It has been shown that structured activities can be more impactful if there are various types of PD activities held close together, if not concurrently (Bouwma-Gearhart, 2012; Sunal et al., 2001).

Another important principle for effective PD for teacher educators is that change for teacher educators only comes when they experience some form of dissatisfaction with their current teaching (Sunal et al., 2001). That is why collaboration with other faculty is so

important—like transformational learning theory states, collaboration provides opportunities for beliefs and practices to come into question as the needs of current students are discussed. Sunal et al. (2001) also point out that PD activities should be connected to each other so that learning from one activity carries over and relates to other activities. If done well, learning and change can occur, and participants will be more willing to participate in future activities—if done poorly, change will most likely not occur, and participants will be less willing to participate in the future (Bouwma-Gearhart, 2008, 2012).

Complexity Theory and Positioning

In order to developed effective learning opportunities for teacher educators, it is important to understand adult learning theories. These theories describe the basic principles and strategies that have been shown to be effective in supporting adult learners in gaining knowledge and improving practice. It can also be beneficial to understand what researchers have said about what does and does not work in relation to PD—for teachers in general and specifically for teacher educators. However, despite the research on adult learning and effective PD, it is impossible to design and implement learning activities that are guaranteed to successfully change an individual's knowledge or practices. Learning is considerably more complex than that, and there are just too many variables that can affect what an individual learns as well as how, when, and why learning may or may not take place (Mason, 2008). Therefore, in addressing the complexity of adult behavior and learning, there are two points to consider besides the influence of adult learning theory and the research on effective PD for educators. The first is Complexity Theory as it relates to education, which takes into account the complex nature of learning and change. The second is the orientation or positioning of participants in regard to learning, which

takes into account the personal beliefs, attitudes, backgrounds, experiences, and motivations behind a learner's engagement, or lack thereof, in a learning situation.

Complexity theory in education. Researchers have argued that learning for teacher educators is a complex endeavor—that this unique group has highly specialized needs, which vary depending on the subject matter, specialization, or focus of an educator's specific area of teaching (Hadar & Brody, 2017). It is therefore unwise and unfruitful to examine PD for educators without at least acknowledging the complexity surrounding change and learning in higher education settings.

People are complex, learning is complex, change is complex. Mason (2008, 2009) argues that we cannot prescribe what will be learned in educational experiences. There are just too many variables to predict what participants will take away from any given PD opportunity; no matter how well designed and presented (Entwistle, 2009; Mason, 2008, 2009). Therefore, although facilitators and developers of PD may assert specific learning objectives, there is no guarantee as to what individuals will attend to or what they will learn; all that can be done is to invite or guide learners toward a desired change and hope that, over time, change will occur, and that the change will be in ways that are related to the learning objectives. Mason (2008, 2009) also argues the need to acknowledge, and if possible, attend to as many aspects of a system or context as possible. These aspects of a system may include but are not limited to content areas, specialties, time commitments or constraints, backgrounds and experiences, attitudes and motivations, personal barriers to learning, institutional barriers to change, and in some cases, resistance to imposed content (Toulmin, 2001). Again, PD cannot effectively prescribe what will be learned, it can only set up parameters for the information being presented and then try to guide the learning

in such a way that it will be meaningful for all participants at whatever place they find themselves.

Orientation within learning activities. The second point to consider is that an individual's orientation to learning, or their positioning, within learning opportunities influences what is learned, how learning takes place, and when, how, and if change occurs (Brody & Hadar, 2011; Entwistle, 2009; Wayne, Yoon, Zhu, Cronen, & Garet, 2008). In regard to change in teacher education, one way to improve the likelihood that change will occur is for PD developers, coordinators, and facilitators to better understand who the faculty are; their background, interests, current assignment, and teaching area. Knowing more about participants will help those facilitating the PD to be more aware of the attitudes and beliefs that motivate the learner and influence that individual's positioning within the learning opportunity being provided.

Opfer et al. (2011) point out that educator learning is a very complex process-much more complex than traditional PD suggests. Their learning is influenced by myriad variables unique to educators, including previous and current teaching assignments, content specialties, research interests, current make-up of student population, and out of classroom assignments. Considering these factors, it is evident that each educator is different from the next; each has a unique set of concerns, interests, skills, and needs. Yet traditional PD follows a one-size fits all model, wherein material is presented, typically in lecture or seminar fashion, to a large group without consideration of the uniqueness of the individual. With this in mind, it is unreasonable and short-sighted to ignore the orientations that educators bring into a setting, orientations which may contribute to or hinder a learning activity. Orientation, according to Opfer et al. is the "integrated attitudes, beliefs, practices and alignment of oneself and one's ideas to circumstances and

context" (p. 444). These beliefs, attitudes, and practices play a large role in learning and engagement and are not easily altered. Orientation has an effect on what is given priority, and priority leads to sustained practices. Therefore, if orientation has such an important impact on what and how an educator learns, we should not separate learning activities from participants' orientations, but should instead consider how these orientations mediate change (Opfer et al., 2011).

An integral aspect of an individual's orientation or positioning is their motivation for learning within a particular PD opportunity. This can be a significant factor in the successfulness of that PD for that individual. Studies have shown that the results of PD vary between individual participants and that results, or change, comes slowly and includes periods of regression (Brody & Hadar, 2011). Therefore, participant orientation or positioning within a learning opportunity can provide insight into a participant's potential for learning.

Wayne et al. (2008) state that the position of a participant greatly influences an individual's view of PD and their take-aways or learning from the activities. They state that position is the combination of beliefs, background, attitudes, and prior knowledge that will influence a participant's learning. Understanding the position of a participant can help improve development and learning, therefore, it is not just important to get to know participants and take into account their personal and work-related issues, it is crucial (Brody & Hadar, 2011). However, studies in the field of educator PD have not yet provided guidance that can help steer investments in PD (Wayne et al., 2008). For many years, evaluations of PD for educators used only teacher satisfaction surveys as a guide for developing future learning activities (Penuel et al., 2007). Those evaluations that did not focus solely on teacher satisfaction attempted to use quantitative analysis of interview or survey data in order to measure change and learning, but as

mentioned previously, educator change and learning are far too complex to examine without considering other variables such as beliefs, attitudes, backgrounds, experiences and so on. Previous experiences, whether at home, in school, with family, or with friends are important influences on learning, therefore, it would be important to use qualitative methods to gain insight into how these factors have affected or may affect current and future learning—as these methods allow participants to reflect on their own beliefs, attitudes, and practices and explore the nuances of individual experiences (Entwistle, 2009).

Conclusion

As mentioned previously in this review, generally speaking, teacher PD appears not to meet teacher's needs, which may signify that teacher educators are not receiving adequate PD either. Given the increased focus and the increasing tax money spent on PD for educators, it is important that research be conducted to address the questions of PD designers on what is and is not effective (Desimone et al., 2002; Hadar & Brody, 2017; Wayne et al., 2008). However, much of the research on PD points to how ineffective most PD programs actually are (e.g., Borko, 2004; Guskey, 2002; Opfer et al., 2011; Parise & Spillane, 2010; Pedder & Opfer, 2013).

One reason for this ineffectiveness may be that beliefs, practices, experiences, and current context have a strong influence on an individual's desire to participate and their readiness to learn, yet at the same time, the same beliefs, values, and attitudes are not easily altered (Opfer et al., 2011; Wayne et al., 2008). Furthermore, the orientation (Opfer et al., 2011) or positioning (Wayne et al., 2008) of an individual has a great impact on what an educator learns as well as how s/he learns. In essence, teacher educator development is far more complex than traditional PD suggests, and attention needs to be given to variables outside of the facilitators control to better understand how individuals learn and how they change. Designers, developers,

coordinators, and facilitators may decide what they believe should be learned, but what participants will actually learn greatly depends on their aspirations, interests, self-confidence, and effort (Entwistle, 2009) hence the importance of examining and coming to understand the participants' beliefs, attitudes, backgrounds, and experiences, or in other words, their orientation to learning and their positioning within a learning opportunity.

Extended Literature Review References

Birman, B. F, Desimone, L., Porter, A. C., & Garet, M. S. (2000). Designing professional development that works. *Educational Leadership*, *57*(8), 28-33.

Bolam, R., McMahon, A., Stoll, L., Thomas, S., & Wallace, M. (2005). *Creating and sustaining effective professional learning communities*. Research Report Number 637. London, England: General Teaching Council for England, Department for Education and Skills.

Borko, H. (2004). Professional development and teacher learning: Mapping the terrain. *Educational Researcher*, *33*(8), 3-15. doi:10.3102/0013189X033008003

Bouwma-Gearhart, J. L. (2008). *Teaching professional development of science and engineering professors at a research-extensive university: Motivations, meaningfulness, obstacles, and effects* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest LLC. (UMI Number: 3327743)

Bouwma-Gearhart, J. (2012). *Engaging STEM faculty while attending to professional realities: An exploration of successful postsecondary STEM education reform at five SMTI institutions.* APLU/SMTI Paper 5. Washington, DC: Association of Public and Land-grant Universities.

Brody, D., & Hadar, L. (2011). "I speak prose and I now know it." Personal development trajectories among teacher educators in a professional development community. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 27*(2011), 1223-1234. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2011.07.002

Bryk, A., Camburn, E., Louis, K. S. (1999). Professional community in Chicago elementary schools: Facilitating factors and organizational consequences. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 35*(5), 751-781. doi:10.1177/0013161X99355004

Cohen, D. K., & Hill, H. C. (2002). *Learning policy: When state education reform works.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Darling-Hammond, L., & McLaughlin, M. W. (1995). Policies that support professional development in an era of reform. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *76*(8), 597–604. Retrieved from https://schoolsanddata.wikispaces.com/file/view/Policies+that+Support+Professional+Development.pdf

Day, C. (1999) Professional development and reflective practice: Purposes, processes and partnerships. *Pedagogy, Culture, & Society*, *7*(2), 221-233. doi:10.1080/14681366.1999.11090864

Day, C. & Leitch, R. (2007). The continuing professional development of teachers: Issues of coherence, cohesion, and effectiveness. In T. Townsend (Ed.), *International handbook of school effectiveness and improvement* (pp. 707–726). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Desimone, L. (2009). Improving impact studies of teachers' professional development: Toward better conceptualizations and measures. *Educational Researcher, 38*(3), 181-199. doi:10.3102/0013189X08331140

Desimone, L. (2011). A primer on effective professional development. *Phi Delta Kappan, 92*(6), 68-71. doi:10.2307/25822820

Desimone, L., Porter, A., Garet, M., Yoon, K., & Birman, B. (2002). Effects of professional development on teachers' instruction: Results from a three-year longitudinal study. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 24*(2), 81-112.

Entwistle, N. J. (2009). *Teaching for understanding at university: Deep approaches and distinctive ways of thinking.* Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Garet, M. S., Porter, A. C., Desimone, L., Birman, B. F., & Yoon, K. S. (2001). What makes

professional development effective? Results from a national sample of teachers. *American Educational Research Journal*, *38*(4), 915–945. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/3202507?origin=JSTOR-pdf

Gibbons, M. (2002). *The self-directed handbook: Challenging adolescent students to excel*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Gusky, T. (2002). Professional development and teacher change. *Teachers and Teaching, 8*(3), 381-391. doi:10.1080/135406002100000512

Hadar, L. & Brody, D. (2010). From isolation to symphonic harmony: Building a professional development community among teacher educators. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *26*(8), 1641-1651. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2010.06.015

Hadar, L. & Brody, D. (2017). Professional learning and development of teacher educators. In D. J. Clandinin & J. Husu, *The sage handbook of research on teacher education* (Vol. 2; pp. 1049-1064). London, UK: Sage Publications, Ltd. doi:10.4135/9781526402042.n60

Hill, H. C. (2007). Learning in the teaching workforce. *The Future of Children, 17*(1), 111-127. doi:10.1353/foc.2007.0004

Holland, H. (2005). Teaching teachers: Professional development to improve student achievement. *AERA Research Points, 3*(1), 1-4. Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED491587.pdf

Horn, I. S., & Little, J. W. (2010). Attending to problems of practice: Routines and resources for professional learning in teachers' workplace interactions. *American Educational Research Journal, 47*(1), 181-217. doi:10.3102/0002831209345158

Huberman, M. A. (1993). *The lives of teachers*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Jackson, C. K., & Bruegamann, E. (2009). Teaching students and teaching each other: The

importance of peer learning for teachers. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics, 1*(4), 85-108. doi:10.3386/w15202

Knowles, M. S. (1975). *Self-directed learning*. Chicago, IL: Follet.

Knowles, M. S. (1980). *The modern practice of adult education: From pedagogy to andragogy*. Wilton, CT: Association Press.

Knowles, M. S. (1984). *Andragogy in action: Applying modern principles of adult learning*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Knowles, M. S. (1986). *Using learning contracts: Practical approaches to individualizing and structuring learning*. London, UK: Jossey-Bass.

Knowles, M. S., Holton, E. F., & Swanson, R. A. (2015). *The adult learner: The definitive classic in adult education and human resource development* (8th ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Lattuca, L. R., & Creamer, E. G. (2005). Learning as a professional practice. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 102*(1), 3-11. doi:10.1002/tl.192

Lawless, K. A., & Pellegrino, J. W. (2007). Professional development in integrating technology into teaching and learning: Knowns, unknowns, and ways to pursue better questions and answers. *Review of Educational Research, 77*(4), 575-614. doi:10.3102/0034654307309921

Louis, K. S., Marks, H. M., & Kruse, S. (1996). Teachers' professional community in restructuring schools. *American Educational Research Journal*, *33*(4), 757–798.

Mason, M. (2008). What is complexity theory and what are its implications for educational change? *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, *40*(1), 35-49. doi:10.1111/j.1469-5812.2007.00413.x

Mason, M. (2009). Complexity theory and the philosophy of education. In M. Mason (Ed.), *Complexity theory and the philosophy of education* (pp. 1-15). Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

McLaughlin, M. W., & Talbert, J. E. (2001). *Professional communities and the work of high school teaching.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Merriam, S. B. (2017). Adult learning theory: Evolution and future directions. *PAACE Journal of Lifelong Learning, 26*(1), 21-37. doi:10.4324/9781315147277-6

Merriam, S. B., Caffarella, R. S., & Baumgartner, L. M. (2006). *Learning in adulthood: A comprehensive guide* (3rd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Mezirow, J. (1991). *Transformative dimensions of adult learning.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Mezirow, J. (2000). Learning to think like an adult. Core concepts of transformation theory. In J. Mezirow, & Associates (Eds.), *Learning as transformation. Critical perspectives on a theory in progress* (pp. 3-33). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2005). *The condition of education 2005* (NCES 2005–094). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Neuman, S. B., & Cunningham, L. (2009). The impact of professional development and coaching on early language and literacy instructional practices. *American Educational Research Journal, 46*(2), 532-566. doi:10.3102/0002831208328088

Opfer, V. D., Pedder, D. G., & Lavicza, Z. (2011). The role of teachers' orientation to learning in professional development and change: A national study of teachers in England. *Teacher and Teacher Education, 27*(2001), 443-453. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2010.09.014

Parise, L. M., & Spillane, J. P. (2010). Teacher learning and instructional change: How formal and on-the-job learning opportunities predict change in elementary school teachers' practice. *Elementary School Journal, 110*(3), 323-346. doi:10.1086/648981

Pedder, D., & Opfer, V. D. (2013). Professional learning orientations: Patterns of dissonance and alignment between teachers' values and practices. *Research Papers in Education, 28*(5), 539-570. doi:10.1080/02671522.2012.706632

Penuel, W. R., Fishman, B. J., Yamaguchi, R., & Gallagher, L. P. (2007). What makes professional development effective? Strategies that foster curriculum implementation. *American Educational Research Journal, 44*(4)*,* 921-958. doi:10.3102/0002831207308221

Scribner, J. P., Cockrell, K. S., Cockrell, D. H., & Valentine, J. W. (1999). Creating professional communities in schools through organizational learning: An evaluation of a school improvement process. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 35*(1), 130–160.

Smith, K (2003). So, what about the professional development of teacher educators? *European Journal of Teacher Education*, *26*(2), 201-215. doi:10.1080/0261976032000088738

Sunal, D. W., Hodges, J., Sunal, C. S., Whittaker, K. W., Freeman, L. M., Edwards, L., . . . Odell, M. (2001). Teaching science in higher education: Faculty professional development and barriers to change. *School Science and Mathematics, 101*(5), 246–256. doi:10.1111/j.1949-8594.2001.tb18027.x

Tagg, J. (2003). *The learning paradigm college*. Bolton, MA: Anker.

Tagg, J. (2008). Changing minds in higher education: Students change, so why can't colleges? *Planning for Higher Education, 37*(1), 15–22.

Toulmin, S. (2001). *Return to reason.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wayne, A. J., Yoon, K. S., Zhu, P., Cronen, S., & Garet, M. S. (2008). Experimenting with teacher professional development: Motives and methods. *Educational Researcher, 37*(8), 469-479. doi:10.3102/0013189X08327154

Wilson, S. M., & Berne, J. (1999). Teacher learning and the acquisition of professional knowledge: An examination of research on contemporary professional development. *Review of Research in Education, 24*(1), 173–209.

Yoon, K. S., Duncan, T., Lee, S. W.-Y., Scarloss, B., & Shapley, K. (2007). *Reviewing the evidence on how teacher professional development affects student achievement* (Issues & Answers Report, REL 2007–No. 033). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Southwest. Retrieved from http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs

APPENDIX B

IRB Approval Letter

Institutional Review Board
for Human Subjects

Brigham Young University
A-285 ASB Provo, Utah 84602
(801) 422-3841 / Fax: (801) 422-0620

August 27, 2013

Professor Stefinee Pinnegar
201 W MCKB
Campus Mail

Re: Simultaneous RENEWAL for the Education of English Learners through Professional Development

Dear Professor Stefinee Pinnegar

This is to inform you that Brigham Young University's IRB has approved the above research study.

The approval period is from 8-27-2013 to 5-01-2014. Your study number is F130291. Please be sure to reference this number in any correspondence with the IRB.

Continued approval is conditional upon your compliance with the following requirements.

1. A copy of the 'Informed Consent Document' approved as of 8-27-2013 is enclosed. No other consent form should be used. It must be signed by each subject prior to initiation of any protocol procedures. In addition, each subject must be given a copy of the signed consent form.

2. All protocol amendments and changes to approved research must be submitted to the IRB and not be implemented until approved by the IRB.

3. A few months before this date we will send out a continuing review form. There will only be two reminders. Please fill this form out in a timely manner to ensure that there is not a lapse in your approval.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call me.

Sincerely,

Allen Parcell, PhD., Chair
Sandee M.P. Munoz, Administrator
Institutional Review Board for Human Subjects