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ABSTRACT

NICOLE H. GALLOWAY: Sources of Information Used by Teachers in Professional Development Book-Club Discussions
(Under the directions of Dr. Jill Fitzgerald and Dr. Julie Justice)

The research questions were: What sources of information do teachers use in their book-club discussions; and is there variability among teachers in which sources of information they use in book club discussions? Sources of information were described in four categories: (a) the Book-Club Text that is read and discussed by the book club participants; (b) Other Experts, such as professors or workshop leaders that the teachers have encountered in the past; (c) Personal Experiences, typically experiences from the teachers’ own classrooms; and (d) Hypothetical Examples, which are generalized, simplified statements created by the teachers in order to help them articulate beliefs that they hold about the topic being discussed. Participants were six first-grade teachers, who comprised the entire first-grade team at a large elementary school in an urban school district. Six book-club sessions were held approximately every other week. The data source was audiotapes of the book-club sessions. The main analysis involved examination of the rank order of the extent to which each of the four sources of information was referenced. Analysis of the variability among teachers involved examination of the rank order of the extent to which each of the four sources of information was referenced for each teacher and comparison of the rank orders across teachers. The potential impact of the Facilitator and one another on teachers’ source use
was also examined. Analysis was also conducted to determine if there were significant progressive increases or decreases in the use of any of the sources over time during the course of the six book-club sessions. Main conclusions were the following: (a) Teachers used Personal Experience more than any other source of information in their discussions. They used Hypothetical Example with the second most frequency, the Book-Club Text with the third most frequency, and Other Experts least frequently; (b) Teachers did not vary from one another in the rank order of their source use; (c) The Facilitator did not speak very often and therefore did not have much impact on the discussions. However, when he did speak, the teachers appeared to follow the Facilitator using the same source of information. Likewise, the teachers appeared to use the same source of information after one another; (d) There were no significant progressive increases or decreases in source use over time.
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Chapter 1

Introduction and Rationale

The research questions guiding the current study were: What sources of information do teachers use in book club discussions; and is there variability among teachers in which sources of information they use in book club discussions?

Rationale

The overarching goal of professional development book club discussions is to positively affect teachers’ practice by encouraging them to critique and potentially adopt the proposed instructional practices or theoretical views presented in the text. In the context of teacher book clubs, goals are thought to be facilitated through reading and discussion of a common text that focuses on specific instructional practices or theoretical views. Examples of instructional practices or theoretical views that have been the focus of teacher book clubs are the following: (a) Multicultural issues (Bean, Valerio, Mallette & Readance, 1999; Chevalier & Houser, 1997; Flood, 1994; Flood & Lapp, 1994; George, 2001; George, 2002); (b) teachers’ own identities in relation to the teaching profession (Florio-Ruane & Raphael, 2001; Kooy, 2006); and/or (c) school improvement and improved teaching practice (Pelletier, 1993; Selway, 2003).

The discussion that takes place during teacher book clubs has potential to help teachers critically assess and adopt the proposed instructional practice or view presented in the text. The potential is borne out of the theoretical view that when engaged in
discussion, teachers continually construct new understandings through dialogic interplay (Kooy, 2006). New understandings are the product of social interactions that combine a variety of sources such as information in the text, the intentions of the speaker, the understandings of the listener, and previous encounters with the topic by those engaged in the discussion (Bakhtin, 1986; Dysthe, 1999; Gee, 2001; Gumperz, 1982; Lemke, 1990; Tedlock & Mannheim, 1995; Wu, 2003). Previous encounters with the topic might have occurred through prior discussions with the same set of speakers and listeners or a different set, or with text-based encounters (Bakhtin, 1986). All prior experiences with the topic of discussion occur in various contextualized situations, so the context of each encounter can yield a slightly different understanding of the topic (Gumperz, 1982). Those involved in a discussion are continually synthesizing the intentions of those participating in the discussion, considering the text read, and considering their previous experiences with the topic being discussed, resulting in new or enhanced understandings about the topic being discussed.

The sources of information that teachers use during professional development book club discussions may be critical to achievement of the desired outcomes. As teachers engage in synthesizing and developing their understandings of the topic during book club discussions, the choices they make regarding which sources of information to draw upon influence the understandings they develop. Sources of information may be described in four categories: (a) The Book-Club Text that is read and discussed by the book club participants; (b) Other Experts, such as professors or workshop leaders that the teachers have encountered in the past; (c) Personal Experiences, typically experiences from the teachers’ own classrooms; and (d) Hypothetical Examples, which are
generalized, simplified statements created by the teachers in order to help them articulate beliefs that they hold about the topic being discussed.

Sources of information represent different authorities, and some sources of information are hypothetically more reliable than others. The Book-Club Text is a source of information and an authority that is hypothetically more reliable than others because texts selected for teacher book clubs typically contain information that is research-based. Research-based findings are desirable because they should represent broad samples of student populations and school settings, making the findings generalizable to a variety of populations and settings. Published texts in the field of education typically describe professional practices or views that are founded in professional research. If professional development book clubs are designed in the hopes that teachers will adopt practices or views presented in the text, then it stands to reason that when teachers rely on the Book-Club Text as a source of information to assist them in developing understandings of the topic, their understandings will be grounded in research.

Like the Book-Club Text, Other Experts such as professors or workshop facilitators are hypothetically more reliable than others. Professional development activities and university courses are held to a certain level of accountability for targeting the desired outcomes of presenting and encouraging teachers to adopt the instructional practices or theoretical views that are the focus of the professional development. As with the Book-Club Text, information presented by experts such as professors and workshop facilitators is typically grounded in a sound research base, making the information drawn from those sources reputable. Therefore, when teachers use Other Experts as a source of information and an authority in their book club discussions, they may be more likely to
develop research-based understandings of the topic that align with the instructional practices or theoretical views presented in the book-club text.

Reliance on Personal Experience during book club discussions may be more or less apt to lead to the desired outcomes of professional development book clubs. On the one hand, Personal Experience can be a useful source of information for teachers as they develop and evaluate their understandings of professional topics. When teachers use Personal Experience as a source of information, they draw upon phronetic knowledge or practical wisdom (Fitzgerald, 2000) associated with the day-to-days of classroom teaching, whereas professional development activities and texts emphasize epistemic or scientific knowledge (Fitzgerald, 2000). Personal Experience may help teachers connect the epistemic knowledge discussed in the book-club text with the phronetic knowledge they possess from their classroom experience. There is some evidence from teacher discussion groups that did not involve text reading that personal experience narratives may have successful outcomes for development of teacher beliefs and identity (Cavazos, 2001; Rust & Orland, 2001; Swidler, 2001). For example, Cavazos (2001) and Rust and Orland (2001) reported that through sharing of and discussion about personal experiences, teachers were able to view their experiences from a broader perspective and enhance their professional knowledge. Swidler (2001) reported that sharing personal experience narratives allowed some members of his teacher discussion group to reposition themselves as “heroes” when faced with demoralizing school environments. Unlike the teacher book club described in the current study, the teacher discussion groups described above utilized the discussion itself, the teachers’ telling of their stories, as the topic of study and the catalyst for professional growth.
On the other hand, Personal Experience sources may be problematic in the context of a book club discussion because of the dichotomy described by Fitzgerald (2000) between the phronetic knowledge associated with day-to-day classroom teaching and the epistemic knowledge associated with research-based findings. If teachers use Personal Experiences more than other sources of information in book club discussions, the result may be an emphasis on the specifics of classroom teaching associated with phronetic knowledge at the expense of epistemic knowledge that is associated with the book club text. This is not to imply that practical wisdom is not valuable but that by using Personal Experience sources teachers may emphasize specifics from their own classroom in ways that contradict the knowledge represented in the book club text. First, the teacher may have limited experience due to teaching only a short time, and may make generalizations based on personal experiences that are atypical for similar classrooms. Second, the teacher may have limited experience due to teaching in one school or schools with similar populations throughout her career and again may make generalizations based on experiences that are specific to one population of students and not applicable to other populations. Finally, the teacher may have a narrow repertoire of teaching strategies that limit the experiences she has with students. For example, if a teacher relies on traditional spelling instruction, having students study a given list of words in isolation then testing the students on those words, she may become frustrated when her students do not translate their spelling knowledge to their own writing. The teacher may then consider the students to be the cause of the problem rather than considering that her own strategies may warrant reevaluation. If the book club text presents an alternative to traditional spelling instruction such as word study, the teacher in the preceding example may be
unlikely to adopt the new practice. Any of the limitations described above, when they inform the personal experience of teachers, may cause teachers to reinforce the “practical wisdom” associated with the particulars of their own teaching practice in their discussions and to not consider the perspectives presented in the book club text.

Hypothetical Examples represent generalized, simplified beliefs or understandings, or “prototypical events” (Gee, 1989) about the topic the teachers are trying to elaborate through the discussions. An illustration of a Hypothetical Example is the following statement: “Once a child begins to read, he will continue to progress despite lack of support from the teacher.” If a group of teachers reads a book-club text that discusses the importance of continued instruction for children reading above grade level, a teacher may use the preceding Hypothetical Example in the book club discussion, presumably to explain why teachers sometimes spend less instruction time with higher level readers than with others. The use of Hypothetical Examples by teachers as they develop their understandings in book club discussions may be helpful or they may be an impediment to achieving the desired outcome of adopting the practices or views presented in the text. Teachers may use Hypothetical Examples in a positive way in an effort to make connections between the phronetic knowledge or practical wisdom that guides their professional practice and the epistemic or scientific knowledge (Fitzgerald, 2000; Kessels & Korthagen, 1996) presented in the book-club text. The scientific knowledge presented in professional texts is typically universal and generic (Fitzgerald, 2000). Therefore, it may be useful for teachers to connect that scientific knowledge with examples that they believe to be grounded in real life teaching. However, the challenge of Hypothetical Examples is that they represent a simplified understanding of the event,
experience, or relationship they seek to describe, and therefore in many instances may be misguided or unfounded.

Because Hypothetical Examples created by teachers may be misguided or unfounded they may be less helpful than the other sources of information in achieving the desired outcome of adopting professional practices or theoretical views presented in the text. In the earlier example of a Hypothetical Example suggesting that teachers don’t need to spend much instructional time with higher level readers, the teachers may develop a misguided understanding from the book club discussion that teachers can be resigned to spending little of their instructional time with students already reading at a higher level. When teachers use Hypothetical Examples like the one in the preceding example as a source of information to develop their understanding of a topic, their new understanding may be based on generalized or simplified beliefs which do not align with research-based findings that are presented in the text.

Significance

To my knowledge, to date no one has studied the sources of information that teachers use in book club discussions. The four sources of information described above represent various sources of authority that teachers use to introduce, substantiate and/or validate their points of view relative to the professional development topics set forth in the book-club text. If teachers draw upon more reliable sources of information such as the Book-Club Text, Other Experts, and possibly Personal Experiences as their authority when making their points, then the understandings they develop through the book-club discussions will be more likely to achieve the overarching goal of teachers adopting the research-based practices or theoretical views from the text. However, should teachers
utilize Hypothetical Examples as an authoritative source of information as they develop understandings through book-club discussions, their understandings may be misguided because Hypothetical Examples represent generalized or simplified understandings of the events, experiences or relationships they reference.

An elaborated understanding of what sources of information teachers use in book club discussions is potentially significant for the following reasons:

a) If the results of the current study suggest that teachers use potentially less reliable sources of information such as Hypothetical Examples as their authority in book club discussions, then professional development leaders might recognize the importance of structuring book-club discussions to ensure that more reliable sources, such as the Book-Club Text, Other Experts, and possibly Personal Experience are discussed;

b) If results of the current study suggest that teachers may adopt research-based practices through discussion that is based on more authoritative sources of information, such as the Book-Club Text, Other Experts, and possibly Personal Experience, then professional development leaders can assist in bridging the gap between educational research and the professional practice of teachers by structuring book-club discussions to encourage the use of more reliable sources of information by teachers;

c) If professional development leaders know more about how to structure book-club discussions so that the goal of teachers adopting instructional practices or theoretical views that are research-based is more likely to be met, then the book-club discussions will be more likely to lead to improved classroom practice;
d) If the results of the current study suggest that teachers rely on some sources of information more than others, then researchers may be led to pursue questions related to how particular sources of information influence the understandings created by teachers through professional development discussions.

Definitions

By sources of information I refer to the possible sources from which teachers acquire information about literacy topics that they introduce into their book group discussions and use to evaluate, argue, and/or justify their claims. Exemplative sources of information are the following: (a) The assigned reading from the text; (b) other experts encountered by the teachers in the past, such as professors or workshop facilitators; (c) personal experiences, typically from their own classrooms; and (d) hypothetical examples created by the teachers during the discussions. A Hypothetical Example is a simplification of an event, experience, or relationship that serves as a prototype of that event, experience, or relationship. Hypothetical Examples can be factually unfounded (distinguishing them from Personal Experience), but based on a teacher’s beliefs about events, experiences, or relationships. For example, when a teacher asserts that parents of low-income families do not have time to read with their children, the teacher provides a Hypothetical Example.

Teacher book clubs (Flood & Lapp, 1994; Flood, 1994; Florio-Ruane, 2001; George, 2001; George, 2002; Pelletier, 1993; Selway, 2003) are used for professional development. Typically, people who implement teacher book clubs do so as a means for teachers to develop or enhance understandings about the topics addressed in the book or books they read, with the ultimate goal of positively affecting classroom practice. The
structure of the book club in the present study was: teachers read a common text over twelve weeks; they came together six times to discuss the text; the format of each meeting was a roundtable discussion with each participant and a facilitator posing and responding to questions about the text.

The conceptualization of the term *discussion* that guides the present study aligns with Brookfield and Preskill’s (1999) definition of discussion as an “effort by two or more to share views and engage in mutual and reciprocal critique” (p. 6) of a given topic. Discussion as defined in the current study focuses on knowledge development (Bridges, 1988) toward “a more critically informed understanding about the topic or topics under consideration” (Brookfield & Preskill, 1999, p. 6). Discussion provides opportunities for participants to assert their own informed viewpoints and critically assess the viewpoints of others (Brookfield & Preskill, 1999). The definition of discussion guiding the current study differs from the related term *conversation* in that conversation implies the less formal talk that occurs in groups, where the purpose is a casual exchange among participants (Brookfield & Preskill, 1999). Discussion in the present context does not include casual talk that does not involve critique of the book club topics.
Chapter 2

Review of the Literature

Research about professional development for teachers focuses largely on ways to improve teachers’ practice. Teacher book clubs are thought to be one way to help teachers improve their practice. Research in teacher professional development suggests that when teachers read and discuss texts in a book club format they are likely to change their practice. In their book-club discussions teachers are able to consider and critique the instructional practices they read about, they are able to consider alternative theoretical perspectives, and ultimately they are more likely to work new teaching practices into their classroom. New teaching practices are likely to lead to improved student outcomes. Still, little is known about what sources of information teachers rely on in their discussions as they work to develop understanding of the professional development topics. Knowing more about the sources teachers draw on as their authority in professional development discussions has potential to help designers and facilitators of teacher book clubs optimize the outcomes of the discussions.

In the current chapter I present a review of the literature related to the research questions. I begin by providing background about the goals of professional development and how those goals have been addressed in the literature. Next I suggest that professional text reading may be used as a vehicle to achieving professional development goals. I then propose teacher book clubs as a format to be used toward meeting the goals
of professional development. Finally, I argue the theoretical underpinnings that position discussion as a potentially effective means for teacher professional development.

Recall that the research questions guiding the current study were: What sources of information do teachers use in book club discussions; and is there variability among teachers in which sources of information they use in book club discussions?

I chose the research for the literature review by searching in the ERIC database using five different combinations of keywords: (a) “book club” and “professional development;” (b) “teacher discussion” and “professional development;” (c) “teacher discussion;” (d) “discussion” and “professional development;” and (e) “literature circles.” I set the search options in ERIC to include only research published in peer-reviewed journals. The search for “book club” and “professional development” yielded 24 results, the search for “teacher discussion” and “professional development” yielded eight results, the search for “teacher discussion” yielded 113 results, the search for “discussion” and “professional development” yielded 372 results, and the search for “literature circles” yielded 45 results. By reading the titles and/or the abstracts, I narrowed the search to include only research that dealt with book clubs or discussion groups for the professional development of teachers. I excluded research about implementing book clubs with students, research about electronically mediated professional development activities, and research about professional development activities outside of the field of education, because the research was not directly relevant to the current study. After being narrowed according to the criteria described above, 38 articles or book chapters were left. I then sorted the research into the following categories that emerged as I read the studies: multicultural adolescent literature book clubs, professional literature book clubs,
autobiography book clubs, other book clubs for teachers, case-based discussion groups, and discussion groups with no book. Additionally, I perused the reference lists of the research I identified through the ERIC search to identify other pertinent literature. I analyzed the research by first identifying the format of the professional development activities described and the role of discussion in the professional development. For example, I asked how many times and how often did participants meet, what type of text did they read and discuss, and the degree of structure imposed on the discussions by the researchers or facilitators. I then determined the measures used by the researchers to evaluate the professional development. Finally, I identified specific outcomes named by the researchers as results of the professional development. Appendix C contains a table of reviewed research. The following is a review of the literature.

Goals of Professional Development

A major goal of professional development is to improve teaching (Bean & Morewood, 2007; George, 2001; George, 2002; Guskey, 2000; Richardson & Anders, 2005; Sparks & Hirsch, 1997). Other goals of professional development are to change teachers’ attitudes and dispositions (Malm, 2009), introduce teachers to new pedagogical strategies (Adger, Hoyle & Dickinson, 2004), and cultivate teachers’ critical thinking and decision-making skills related to their teaching (Richardson & Anders, 2005). It is thought that addressing the goals listed above is one way to accomplish the goal of improved teaching (Richardson & Anders, 2005). A way to address the goals of professional development is to actively involve teachers in the professional development process through activities like text reading and discussion.
Text Reading for Professional Development

One way to cultivate teachers’ critical thinking and decision-making skills is through reading texts, which can allow teachers to gain knowledge that can then be applied in the classroom (George, 2001; George, 2002; Pelletier, 1993). When teachers and other educators read texts related to teaching, the potential exists for them to enhance their understandings of the professional topics presented in the texts because text reading familiarizes educators with educational or pedagogical issues that they may not have been familiar with prior to reading (Smit, 2001). For example, school administrators who participated in a professional book club were presented with various educational issues like the importance of character education through reading professional texts (Smit, 2001).

Professional texts that are used to meet the goals of professional development can take several different forms. For example, Adger, Hoyle and Dickinson (2004) assigned teachers to read pedagogical texts about the literacy development of preschoolers, including topics like the value of repeated reading for emergent readers. The purpose of using pedagogical texts was to introduce literacy instruction that the teachers and facilitators would then discuss during their professional development sessions and would ultimately incorporate into their classrooms. Other teachers and administrators read books about schools and school-related issues (Kisch, 2009; Pelletier, 1993; Selway, 2003). The purposes of the professional development groups that read books about school-related issues were to bring educators together to discuss and debate issues they faced in their schools like race (Selway, 2003), school administration (Kisch, 2009) and school leadership (Pelletier, 1993). Reading the texts served as a pathway to the teachers
and administrators critically assessing the topics of the texts. Still other teachers read adolescent literature as their texts (Bean, Valerio, Mallette & Readance, 1999; Chevalier & Houser, 1997; Flood, et al., 1994; Flood & Lapp, 1994; George, 2001; George, 2002; Kooy, 2006). Using adolescent literature in the context of professional development familiarized the teachers with literature that they could incorporate into their curriculum with their students as well as providing a context in which they considered their own comprehension processes and how to teach those processes to their students (George, 2001; George, 2002). Additionally, adolescent literature was used to introduce issues of multiculturalism into the teachers’ professional development (Bean, Valerio, Mallette & Readance, 1999; Chevalier & Houser, 1997; Flood, et al., 1994; Flood & Lapp, 1994; George, 2001; George, 2002; Kooy, 2006), which led the teachers to discuss the multicultural issues present in the books. As another form of professional text, some researchers have advocated the use of case studies for teaching as a basis for effective professional development (Cennamo, 1998; Levin, 1999; Redman, 2003). Case studies for teaching are short written scenarios that “represent the problems, dilemmas, and complexity of teaching something to someone in some context” (Levin, 1999, p. 63). When teachers read case studies for teaching, it was thought to bring difficult issues faced by teachers to the forefront and help them develop decision-making skills by considering the various perspectives that a case study for teaching presents (Redman, 2003). Reading any form of professional text has potential to help teachers enhance their understandings of professional development topics and ultimately enhance student outcomes.
Teacher Book Clubs

Next I will discuss teacher book clubs. Teacher book clubs can provide a forum for teachers to read professional texts toward the aim of accomplishing the professional development goals named above (Bean, Valerio, Mallette & Readance, 1999; Chevalier & Houser, 1997; Flood, et. al., 1994; Flood & Lapp, 1994; Florio-Ruane, 2001; Florio-Ruane & Raphael, 2001; George, 2001; George, 2002; Goldberg & Pesko, 2000; Kisch, 2009; Kooy, 2006; McVee, 2004; Pelletier, 1993; Selway, 2003). Teacher book clubs are used as a way to incorporate text reading into professional development, which I stated above is one way to introduce professional development topics to teachers. The format of teacher book clubs involves teachers reading selected texts and gathering periodically to discuss what they read (Flood & Lapp, 1994; Flood, 1994; Florio-Ruane, 2001; George, 2001; George, 2002; McVee, 2004; Pelletier, 1993; Selway, 2003). Teacher book clubs allow teachers the opportunity to read professional texts, with the additional benefit of then coming together to engage in discussion about the texts with other teachers and colleagues (Bean, Valerio, Mallette & Readance, 1999; Chevalier & Houser, 1997; Flood, et. al., 1994; Flood & Lapp, 1994; Florio-Ruane, 2001; Florio-Ruane & Raphael, 2001; George, 2001; George, 2002; Goldberg & Pesko, 2000; Kisch, 2009; Kooy, 2006; McVee, 2004; Pelletier, 1993; Selway, 2003).

Teacher book clubs have been used to address a variety of professional development topics. In some instances teacher book clubs were used by teachers and administrators to enhance their understanding of the difficult pedagogical or social issues faced by teachers in schools (Kisch, 2009; Pelletier, 1993; Reilly, 2008; Selway, 2003; Straits & Nichols, 2007). Another common use of teacher book clubs for professional
development was to enhance teachers’ knowledge of adolescent literature and multicultural issues that arose from the adolescent literature they read (Bean, Valerio, Mallette & Readance, 1999; Chevalier & Houser, 1997; George, 2001; George, 2002; Flood, et. al., 1994; Flood & Lapp, 1994). Still other book clubs focused on autobiographical texts as a means to lead future teachers to deeper understandings of cultural issues (Florio-Ruane, 2001; Florio-Ruane & Raphael, 2001; McVee, 2004; Raphael, Damphousse, Highfield & Florio-Ruane, 2001). In the following sections I review the literature in each of the areas outlined above.

Teacher book clubs aimed at enhancing understanding of pedagogical or social issues faced by teachers in schools. Book clubs have been used to address pedagogical or social issues faced by teachers in schools (Hoerr, 2009; Kisch, 2009; Kooy, 2006; Pelletier, 1993; Reilly, 2008; Selway, 2003; Straits & Nichols, 2007). The use of professional texts that targeted pedagogical or social issues as a springboard to discussion led participants to discuss issues pertinent to their teaching and enhance their understandings of the topics (Kisch, 2009; Pelletier, 1993; Reilly, 2008; Selway, 2003; Straits & Nichols, 2007). The findings suggest that teacher book clubs focused on pedagogical or social issues can help teachers achieve the goal of enhanced understanding of professional development topics. Further, since pedagogical or social issues have direct implications for classroom practice, enhanced understanding of the topics has potential to positively affect teachers’ practice.

Several studies support the findings that book clubs aimed at pedagogical or social issues can lead to teachers’ enhanced understanding of the topics. For example, the teachers in Pelletier’s (1993) group read and discussed titles like Teachers at work:
Achieving success in our schools (Johnson, 1990) and The quality school (Glasser, 1992). In a survey of participants, the teachers reported that among the benefits of participating in the book club were engaging in professional reading and having the opportunity to discuss the text with colleagues. An additional reported result of participating in the book club was that the teachers made connections between the material they read for the book club and their own classroom practice. Similarly, the teachers in Selway’s (2003) group began their book club by reading and discussing Why are all the black kids sitting together in the cafeteria? (Tatum, 1997). Participants said that through the book club they gained insight into issues of race faced by their students that impacted the way they related to their students. The findings above suggest that teacher book clubs are a valuable way for teachers and administrators to enhance their understandings of the pedagogical or social issues discussed in the text and potentially change their practice related to the issues. However, the research did not report specifics of what the participants talked about in their book-club discussions. Instead, they reported participants’ perceptions of the discussions. Analysis of the discussions themselves may have provided a more complete understanding of how the discussions supported the enhanced understandings reported by the participants.

Teacher book clubs aimed at enhancing knowledge of adolescent literature and multicultural issues that arose from the adolescent literature. A number of teacher book clubs have used adolescent literature as their texts. The research suggested that the outcomes of teachers reading adolescent literature as their texts were threefold. First, teachers were introduced to adolescent literature that they could use in their language arts and social studies classrooms with their students (George, 2001; George, 2002). Also,
reading and discussing adolescent literature allowed the teachers to reflect on their own reading and comprehension processes, the same processes that they would teach their students to use when reading the literature they taught in their classrooms (Flood & Lapp, 1994; George, 2001; George, 2002). Finally, adolescent literature presented the teachers with issues of multiculturalism dealt with by characters in the texts and provided a springboard for the teachers to discuss such issues (Bean, Valerio, Mallette & Readance, 1999; Chevalier & Houser, 1997; Flood, et. al., 1994; Flood & Lapp, 1994; George, 2001; George, 2002; Harlin, Murray & Shea, 2007). Each of the outcomes named above has potential to help teachers improve their practice.

When teachers read adolescent literature in book clubs, their practice was positively affected. For example, George (2001) initiated a teacher book club for a group of middle school teachers who prior to the book club were not incorporating adolescent literature into their classes. Through reading and discussing the literature the teachers reported having an opportunity to reflect on their beliefs and practice. Additionally, the teachers began to incorporate the adolescent literature they read into their classes. They also began to use a wider variety of instructional practices like book clubs in their classes. Through reflecting on their beliefs and practice in during book club discussions, the teachers were led to make positive changes in their practice. However, while the outcomes of George’s (2001) research showed positive changes, the research told about some observable behaviors like incorporating new literature in the classroom. What was not reported was information about potential changes in the teachers’ beliefs that may have resulted from the opportunity to reflect that was reported by the teachers.
Information about the content of the teachers’ discussions would provide a more complete understanding of the reflection the teachers reportedly engaged in.

Teacher book clubs that used adolescent literature also provided teachers and pre-service teachers an opportunity to discuss issues of multiculturalism (Bean, Valerio, Mallette & Readance, 1999; Chevalier & Houser, 1997; Flood, et. al., 1994; Flood & Lapp, 1994; George, 2001; George, 2002). Participating in book clubs that focused on multicultural literature helped teachers to identify with characters from cultural backgrounds different from their own and develop greater cultural sensitivity toward the cultural groups they discussed (Chevalier & Houser, 1997; Flood, et. al., 1994). Teachers and pre-service teachers also changed their teaching or made plans to change their future teaching as a result of participation in book clubs focused on adolescent literature (Chevalier & Houser, 1997; Flood, et. al., 1994). For example, Chevalier and Houser (1997) studied a group of pre-service teachers who participated in a book club focused on adolescent literature. The researchers found that through reading and discussing adolescent novels, participants initially engaged in struggle and resistance to some of the novels’ themes that they considered inappropriate based on their own cultural beliefs. Participants eventually developed heightened awareness in the form of deep reflection and revised perspectives of cultural issues discussed. An additional finding was that the pre-service teachers modified their plans for future action, an example being one teacher’s resolution to act differently toward her own future students by looking for positive behaviors in the students instead of focusing on negative behaviors. Again, the findings suggest that teacher book clubs have the potential to positively impact teachers’ beliefs and practice. A question left unanswered by the research described above is how a
similar book club may have impacted more experienced teachers, particularly if more experienced teachers contributed more professional experience to the discussions. Also, it would be valuable to know whether teachers would move through similar phases of struggle, resistance, and heightened awareness described by Chevalier and Houser (1997) if the book-club text were pedagogical in nature and did not deal with emotionally charged issues like cultural experiences.

Teacher book clubs aimed at enhancing understandings of cultural issues through autobiographical text reading. Some teacher book clubs focused on autobiographical texts as a springboard to enhanced understanding of cultural issues (Florio-Ruane, 2001; Florio-Ruane & Raphael, 2001; McVee, 2004). The pre-service teachers who participated in the book clubs discussed issues of culture during book-club meetings that enhanced their understandings of cultural issues that they would face in schools. The texts served as a springboard for the teachers’ discussions of issues about which they were previously unfamiliar or uncomfortable. Florio-Ruane and Raphael (2001) found that as teachers read autobiographies of authors from cultures other than their own and met to discuss the autobiographies, they developed the ability to discuss uncomfortable topics of race and culture that they avoided at the onset of the book club. Discussing the topics helped the teachers develop their understandings of cultural issues, which in turn helped them develop their identity as teachers.

All of the examples above demonstrate that teacher book clubs can be used to introduce teachers to pedagogical or social issues (Hoerr, 2009; Kisch, 2009; Kooy, 2006; Pelletier, 1993; Reilly, 2008; Selway, 2003; Straits & Nichols, 2007), multicultural issues and adolescent literature (Bean, Valerio, Mallette & Readance, 1999; Chevalier &
Houser, 1997; Flood, et. al., 1994; Flood & Lapp, 1994; George, 2001; George, 2002; Harlin, Murray & Shea, 2007), or cultural issues presented through autobiography (Florio-Ruane, 2001; Florio-Ruane & Raphael, 2001; McVee, 2004). The book club format provides a unique opportunity to combine book reading and discussion, resulting in the teachers adopting new pedagogical practices (Flood, et. al., 1994; Flood & Lapp, 1994; George, 2001; George, 2002) and/or thinking differently about issues of race or culture (Bean, Valerio, Mallette & Readance, 1999; Chevalier & Houser, 1997; Florio-Ruane, 2001; Florio-Ruane & Raphael, 2001; Hoerr, 2009; Kisch, 2009; Kooy, 2006; McVee, 2004; Pelletier, 1993; Reilly, 2008; Selway, 2003; Straits & Nichols, 2007). When teachers adopt new classroom practices or develop new understandings about social and racial issues faced by their students, the potential exists for improvement in teaching and ultimately in student achievement. In the following section I will further address the significance of discussion among teachers as a part of effective professional development.

A critique of the research on book clubs is that, while the research described above indicated that participation in book clubs might enhance teachers’ understandings of classroom practices or social and racial issues, few of the studies focused on what the teachers talk about when they discuss book-club texts. Because the majority of the research relied on surveys and/or interviews with participants, the research provided little information about the actual content of their discussions. The content of the discussions is relevant. For example, if teachers talked primarily about the text in their discussions, the enhanced understandings they reported are more likely to be aligned with the topic
presented through the text than if the teachers talked primarily about their own classrooms.

The Role of Discussion in Professional Development

Along with text reading, discussion is a critical component of the teacher book club format. When teachers discuss the topics they read about, the potential exists for them to adopt new perspectives that they would not adopt if they only read the text (Levin, 1999). Therefore, professional development activities that include discussion as a component, as teacher book clubs do, are likely to lead to the desired professional development outcomes of improved understanding of the professional development topics.

In the following section I analyze the role of discussion as a part of successful professional development for teachers. First I suggest some contexts in which discussion has been identified as a catalyst for successful professional development. Then I propose theoretical views of how discussion functions as a means to socially constructed understanding of professional development topics. Last, I argue the potential significance of the choices teachers make during professional development discussions about which sources of information to draw on.

Discussion as a catalyst for successful professional development. Discussion as a component of professional development has been shown to have a positive impact on teachers’ critical thinking about various topics and in various contexts (Adger, Hoyle & Dickinson, 2004; Cavazos, 2001; Deglau, Ward, O’Sullivan & Bush, 2006; Florio-Ruane, 2001; Florio-Ruane & Raphael, 2001; Levin, 1999; McVee, 2004; Passman & McKnight, 2002; Rust & Orland, 2001; Shafer, 1995; Swidler, 2001; Wiltz, 2000). Levin
(1999) isolated the impact of discussion as part of professional development by comparing a group of teachers who read and wrote about case studies for teaching to another group who read, wrote about and discussed the same case studies for teaching. She found that the participants who only read and wrote about the case studies were more likely to reiterate their previously held beliefs about the teaching issues presented in the case studies, while the participants who read, wrote about and discussed the case studies with colleagues were more likely to broaden their perspectives and consider new viewpoints related to the topics. The research suggests that discussion was the catalyst for teachers to further their understanding about the topics of the case studies. Levin’s (1999) findings suggest that when discussion is included as a component of professional development, teachers may be more likely to critically assess and/or change their perspectives than they would be if they did not engage in discussion. The teachers met only one time for the study described above. The findings could be enhanced if the teachers met for discussions on an ongoing basis. A study similar to Levin’s (1999) focused on an ongoing discussion group could provide information about whether discussion might serve a similar function in groups like teacher book clubs.

Another context in which discussions have been shown to be an effective component of professional development was in discussion groups that focused on teachers’ own narratives about their teaching (Cavazos, 2001; Rust & Orland, 2001; Swidler, 2001). Teachers’ own narratives have been the topic of professional development discussion groups aimed at helping teachers develop their understanding about a variety of professional topics (Cavazos, 2001; Rust, 1998; Rust & Orland, 2001; Swidler, 2001) ranging from classroom management (Rust & Orland, 2001) to teachers’
identity development in challenging school environments (Swidler, 2001). A common thread was that in the discussion groups, the teachers’ narratives, rather than a text, were central to the discussions. Among the outcomes of the discussion groups were that teachers developed the ability to articulate theories and beliefs about teaching, and develop specific techniques and problem-solving abilities (Clark, 2001). Discussing their narratives with other teachers in the groups was cited as the impetus to the achievement of the outcomes named above. While the studies described above suggest that discussion may be a powerful means to help teachers develop their understandings of professional development topics, the topics of discussion in the studies were the teachers’ own oral narratives based on personal experience. No texts were used. As I suggested in the Introduction, personal experience may be more or less reliable as a topic of professional development because of the reliance on phronetic knowledge (Fitzgerald, 2000; Kessels & Korthigan, 1996) associated with the day-to-days of classroom life. Personal experience may help teachers make connections between the topics of the professional development and their classroom life, but personal experience may also emphasize the teachers’ own classroom contexts at the expense of new understandings that could be a result of professional development focused on topics outside of the teachers’ own classrooms.

*Construction of meaning through social interaction in discussion.* The understandings gained from reading texts can be enhanced through discussion of the topics presented in the text with other professionals (Bean, Valerio, Mallette & Readance, 1999; Chevalier & Houser, 1997; Florio-Ruane, 2001; Florio-Ruane & Raphael, 2001; Kooy, 2006; Levin, 1999; Pelletier, 1993). As I suggested in the Introduction, the
discussion that takes place during teacher book clubs has potential to help teachers critically assess and adopt the proposed instructional practice or view presented in the text. When engaged in discussion, teachers continually construct new understandings through dialogic interplay (Kooy, 2006) that builds on one another’s contributions to the discussion (Adger, Hoyle & Dickinson, 2004). Engaging with other teachers in discussions of the texts they read has potential to help teachers deepen their understandings of the texts through the knowledge construction that occurs during social interactions.

New understandings that develop during discussions are the product of social interactions that combine a variety of sources, for example, information in the text, the intentions of the speaker, the understandings of the listener, and previous encounters with the topic by those engaged in the discussion (Bakhtin, 1986; Dysthe, 1999; Gee, 2001; Gumperz, 1982; Lemke, 1990; Tedlock & Mannheim, 1995; Wu, 2003). Previous encounters with the topic might have occurred through prior discussions with the same set of speakers and listeners or a different set, or with text-based encounters (Bakhtin, 1986). The synthesis of various encounters with the professional development topic may enhance the teachers’ understandings of the topic.

For instance, Adger, Hoyle and Dickinson (2004) studied a group of preschool teachers engaged in a professional development course that included 45-minute Professional Conversations in small groups, traditional lecture by a course facilitator, and whole-group discussions as a regular part of their class meetings. The Professional Conversations focused on a set of questions designed by the course facilitators to encourage teachers to synthesize information from the current session, past sessions, and
other outside assignments. Discussions that occurred during the lecture and whole-group discussions were also closely guided by the facilitators. The researchers argued, using a discourse analytic approach that the group jointly constructed their knowledge of emergent literacy topics by contributing “propositions” from a variety of sources that built on one another during their interactions. Sources included texts they read for the professional development sessions, other expert sources and their personal experiences from the classroom. The researchers argued that discussions in which joint construction of knowledge was evidenced contributed to the teachers’ enhanced understanding of the topic in a more meaningful way than those discussions that more closely resembled the traditional initiation-response-evaluation (IRE) interaction in which the teachers simply reiterated information presented by the group facilitator. The study implies that when teachers engage in joint construction of professional knowledge their understandings are more complete than they would be if the teachers were presented the information through only lecture or more traditional IRE interactions. However, the discussions analyzed by Adger, Hoyle and Dickinson (2004) occurred in the context of highly structured course meetings and were closely guided by the course facilitators. The research leaves unanswered the question of whether the joint construction of professional knowledge would be as complete if the discussions occurred in the context of less structured discussions like the ones that take place during teacher book clubs.

The context of professional development discussions may make a difference in the understandings the teachers develop. All of the teachers’ prior experiences with the topic of discussion occur in various contextualized situations, so the context of each encounter can yield a slightly different understanding of the topic (Gumperz, 1982).
When engaged in professional discussions, teachers continually build on one another’s contributions (Adger, Hoyle & Dickinson, 2004) and draw on what they have learned about the topic from a variety of sources (Ball & Cohen, 1999; Bransford, Brown & Cocking, 2000; Lieberman & Miller, 2001). They continually synthesize the intentions of those participating in the discussion, consider the text read, and consider their previous experiences with the topic being discussed as they choose sources of information that fit in with the discussion. The work of synthesizing all of the influences on a discussion can result in new or enhanced understandings about the topic being discussed.

Significance of identifying which sources of information teachers use in discussions. Because of the interactive and constructive nature of discussions (Adger, Hoyle & Dickinson, 2004), the choices teachers make about which sources of information to draw on in their discussions influence the understandings they develop. The discussion that occurs in teacher book clubs can be more or less effective depending on the sources of information the teachers draw on during the discussion. In the following sections I outline the four sources of information presented in the Introduction, and explain why each source may be more or less likely to lead teachers to the desired outcomes of critically assessing and potentially adopting topics addressed in their book-club sessions.

Personal Experience. During book-club discussions, teachers’ Personal Experience may be used as a source of information. Personal Experience includes anecdotes from one’s own classroom or school or other events or circumstances that the teachers describe from firsthand experience. An example of Personal Experience would be the following statement: “I had a child in my class who struggled to learn the
alphabet.” When teachers use Personal Experience as a source of information in their discussions, the discussions can lead to successful professional development outcomes (Cavazos, 2001; Clark, 2001; Crockett, 2002; Kooy, 2006; Rust & Orland, 2001; Swidler, 2001). Some professional development discussion groups have focused on teachers’ own narratives of their professional experiences as the topics of their discussions (Cavazos, 2001; Rust, 1998; Rust & Orland, 2001; Swidler, 2001). The outcomes of professional development discussions that emphasized personal experience narratives included developing the ability to articulate theories and beliefs about teaching, and developing specific techniques and problem-solving abilities (Clark, 2001).

Additionally, novice teachers who participated in a professional development group emphasizing personal experience narratives resisted being “socialized into the anti-progressive norms of the school cultures in which they were working” (Rust, 1998, p. 379) and became more confident professional decision-makers through the process of discussing their experiences. In other book-club discussions that focused on social or cultural issues, teachers developed new, more empathetic ways of thinking about cultures other than their own through discussions that forced them to acknowledge experiences from their own cultures and the differences or similarities between themselves and others (Chevalier & Houser, 1997; Harlin, Murray & Shea, 2007).

*The Book-Club Text and Other Experts.* Similarly, when teachers talk about the professional development topic by referencing the Book-Club Text or Other Experts, the discussions can lead to successful outcomes (Adger, Hoyle & Dickinson, 2004; Kooy, 2006; Levin, 1999). When teachers use the Book-Club Text as a source of information they make direct reference to the text or the topic presented in the text. For example, the
following statement references the Book-Club Text: “In Chapter 4 it said that Reading Recovery has proven results.” Teachers use the Other Expert source when they make reference to a professor or workshop facilitator they encountered in previous professional development. The statement, “My literacy professor said that repeated readings of the same text is good for beginning readers,” is an example of the Other Expert source.

Adger, Hoyle and Dickinson (2004) illustrated through content analysis of their participants’ discussions the ways that teachers co-constructed their understanding of early literacy teaching by drawing on the text they read and other experts. For example, as the teachers discussed text rereading with one another and the group facilitator, they used the text and the facilitator as sources of information that allowed them to mutually develop their understanding of why text rereading is beneficial to emergent readers. The outcome of drawing on the text and other experts was that the teachers were able to articulate new understandings of the literacy issues discussed.

_Hypothetical Examples._ Hypothetical Examples represent generalized, simplified beliefs or understandings, or “prototypical events” (Gee, 1989) about the topic the teachers are trying to elaborate through the discussions. An illustration of a Hypothetical Example is the following statement: “If parents don’t read with their children at home, those parents don’t value education.” If a group of teachers reads a book-club text that discusses the importance of parents reading with their children at home, a teacher may use the preceding Hypothetical Example in the book-club discussion, presumably to explain the challenges teachers sometimes face in getting parental support. While the use of Hypothetical Examples is not discussed in the research literature, it has potential to derail teachers’ discussions by contradicting the material presented in the professional
development text. While Hypothetical Examples may be useful to teachers as they attempt to make connections between the epistemic knowledge presented in the text and the phronetic knowledge of their classroom experience (Fitzgerald, 2000; Kessels & Korthagen, 1996), they present challenges in that they are likely to be accepted without critique. When teachers rely on Hypothetical Examples that are accepted without critique, they may co-construct understandings of the book-club topics that are unchallenged.

Little is known about the extent to which teachers draw on each of the four sources named above. A greater understanding of the extent to which teachers draw on the sources of information has the potential to help professional development facilitators and developers recognize ways that teacher book clubs might be more or less effective. The current study seeks to enhance our understanding of what sources of information teachers use during their book club discussions.

Summary

An overarching goal of professional development is to improve teaching practice and by extension to improve student outcomes. Other goals of professional development are to change teachers’ attitudes and dispositions (Malm, 2009), introduce teachers to new pedagogical strategies (Adger, Hoyle & Dickinson, 2004), and cultivate teachers’ critical thinking and decision-making skills related to their teaching (Richardson & Anders, 2005). Much research attention has focused on ways to improve professional development to meet its goals.

Research suggests that one way to meet the goals of professional development is through reading professional texts, which can allow teachers to gain knowledge that may then be applied in the classroom (George, 2001; George, 2002; Pelletier, 1993). Text
reading is a means to introduce teachers to novel topics. Research suggests that a various
types of texts such as pedagogical texts (Adger, Hoyle and Dickinson, 2004), texts
addressing social issues in schools (Hoerr, 2009; Kisch, 2009; Kooy, 2006; Pelletier,
1993; Reilly, 2008; Selway, 2003; Straits & Nichols, 2007), adolescent literature (Bean,
Valerio, Mallette & Readance, 1999; Chevalier & Houser, 1997; Flood, et. al., 1994;
Flood & Lapp, 1994; George, 2001; George, 2002; Kooy, 2006), autobiographies (Florio-
Ruane, 2001; Florio-Ruane & Raphael, 2001), and case studies for teaching (Cennamo,
1998; Levin, 1999) may be useful in introducing education topics to teachers.

The knowledge gained from reading professional texts can be enhanced through
discussing the topics presented in the text with other professionals. Teacher book clubs
are a type of professional development that allows for text reading combined with
discussion of the text (Bean, Valerio, Mallette & Readance, 1999; Chevalier & Houser,
1997; Flood, et. al., 1994; Flood & Lapp, 1994; Florio-Ruane, 2001; Florio-Ruane &
Raphael, 2001; George, 2001; George, 2002; Goldberg & Pesko, 2000; Kisch, 2009;
Kooy, 2006; Pelletier, 1993; Selway, 2003). The research suggests that combining text
reading and discussion may be a powerful mode of professional development.

I have argued that discussion can be useful for helping teachers improve their
understanding of the professional development topics. During professional discussions,
teachers continually build on one another’s contributions (Adger, Hoyle & Dickinson,
2004) and draw on what they have learned about the topic from a variety of sources (Ball
& Cohen, 1999; Bransford, Brown & Cocking, 2000; Lieberman & Miller, 2001). The
synthesis of ideas about the professional development topic has potential to help teachers
construct more complete understandings of the topic.
The discussion that occurs in teacher book clubs can be more or less effective depending on the sources of information the teachers draw on and assert as authority during the discussion. Research suggests that when teachers talk about the topic by referencing the text, other experts or personal experience, the discussions can lead to successful outcomes. I suggest that teachers may also create hypothetical examples based on incomplete or simplified understandings of the topic of discussion and assert those examples as authority. Little is known about the extent to which teachers draw on each of those sources during the course of their discussions. The current study seeks to enhance our understanding of what sources of information teachers use during their book-club discussions.
Chapter 3

Methods

Design

The current study was a single-case study of a group of six first-grade teachers in a single school, participating in a teacher book club, producing professional discussion distinctly related to the particular setting (Bogdan & Bicklen, 1998; Johnson & Christensen, 2000). Six book-club sessions were held approximately every other week. The data source was audiotapes of the book-club sessions. Four sources of information were identified: (a) The assigned reading from the Book-Club Text; (b) Other Experts encountered by the teachers in the past, such as professors or workshop facilitators; (c) Personal Experiences, typically from the teachers’ own classrooms; and (d) Hypothetical Examples created by the teachers during the discussions. Four variables were created to identify the percentage of turns in the discussion that referenced each of the four sources of information. The four variables were created for each session, each teacher within each session, and the Facilitator within each session. A fifth variable was the Percentage of All Turns in Each Session Spoken by the Facilitator. A sixth variable was the Percentage of Coded Turns in Each Session Spoken by the Facilitator. For the Facilitator and for three randomly selected teachers, four additional variables were the Percentage of Occasions a Teacher Used a Source of Information After Another Speaker Used the Same Source. The main analysis involved examination of the rank order of the extent to which each of the four sources of information was referenced. Analysis of the variability
among teachers involved examination of the rank order of the extent to which each of the four sources of information was referenced for each teacher and comparison of the rank orders across teachers.

Setting and Participants

The school was a large elementary school in an urban school district. During the period when the data were collected, the school enrollment was 745 students in kindergarten through fifth grade, as compared with average elementary school enrollments of 518 students in the district and 494 students in the state. The enrollment for the school was approximately 33% higher than the average enrollment of all other elementary schools in the district and state. The average class size for first grade was 20 students per class. The class size was only slightly larger than first grade classes in the district and state, which were 18 and 19, respectively. Fifty-eight percent of the school’s student population was minority, about 24% African-American and about 24% Hispanic populations. Forty percent of students qualified for free or reduced lunch.

Participants were six first-grade teachers, who comprised the entire first-grade team. Participation in the study was voluntary. The teachers were invited to participate in the study by their principal, who told them that a professional development book club would be held at their school focusing on a literacy topic that would be chosen by the participants. The teachers earned one Continuing Education Unit (CEU) for participating. Continuing Education Units are professional development credits that teachers are required to earn toward the renewal of their teaching license, and at least three units must relate directly to teaching strategies in their subject area. No additional background information on the teachers was collected at the time the book club meetings were held.
However, upon approval of the current study, I submitted a request for permission to conduct the study from the Institutional Review Board. In the IRB proposal, I requested permission to contact the participants to gather demographic information through an email questionnaire. In the questionnaire I asked the teachers to respond to the following retroactive to the time that the book club was conducted: (a) Their level of education; (b) their licensure area(s); and (c) their years of experience. None of the teachers responded to the questionnaire.

*The Teacher Book Club*

*Purpose.* The main purpose of the teacher book club was to provide the first-grade teachers at the school with a professional development opportunity reflecting current research and best practices in literacy. The Facilitator and I expected that the teachers would consider new ways of assisting struggling readers in their classrooms through reading and discussing the literacy text.

*The Facilitator.* A doctoral student colleague was the teacher book club Facilitator. His responsibilities included the following: (a) Assisting teachers in determining the topic and text that would be the focus of the book club; (b) setting the schedule for the book club meetings and assigning readings for each meeting; (c) providing guidelines for participation in the book club meetings; and (d) participating in the book-club discussions along with the teachers, allowing the teachers to control the discussion while offering expert knowledge of current research and best practices in literacy instruction. His contributions during the discussions included answering questions directed to him and posing guiding questions when he sought for the teachers to elaborate a point of discussion. The Facilitator’s background included work as an
elementary school teacher for four years and as a trainer for a publisher of literacy education materials for five years. He held a master’s degree in literacy education and was enrolled in a doctoral program in literacy education during the time the book club was conducted.

The text and how it was selected. Before the first book club meeting, the Facilitator assisted the group in topic selection by discussing possible topics with them. He asked teachers to share the following: (a) Their greatest challenges in providing literacy instruction, and (b) specific topics they were interested in learning more about. The teachers responded that they were interested in learning more about how to help struggling readers. Based on the teachers’ response, the Facilitator compiled a list summarizing several books that he was familiar with that addressed the topic of how to help struggling readers. The teachers selected the book *Getting Reading Right from the Start: Effective Early Literacy Interventions* (1994) by Elfrieda Hiebert and Barbara Taylor because the book describes a variety of interventions designed to help struggling readers. Chapters from the text dealt with the following topics: (a) Early literacy interventions; (b) compensatory and special education; (c) at-risk university students tutoring at-risk elementary school children; (d) implementation of Reading Recovery; (e) a small-group literacy intervention with Chapter 1 students; (f) early intervention in reading through supplemental instruction provided by first-grade teachers; (g) Success for All; (h) interactive writing; (i) promotion of early literacy development among Spanish-speaking children; and (j) interventions and the restructuring of American literacy instruction. The book chapters all reported results of research studies, and most of the chapters were formatted in the same way as a typical research report, with an
introduction, theoretical framework, methods, results, and discussion. Additionally, some of the chapters reported results of research on school-level intervention programs such as Success for All and Reading Recovery.

*The book club meetings.* There were six book club meetings held approximately every other week across three months during the school year. The meetings were held after school hours. The meetings ranged in duration from one hour and five minutes to one hour and thirty minutes.

Before the meetings, the Facilitator distributed a schedule of assigned reading via email. Participants read one or two chapters from the book for each book club meeting, in the order that the chapters appear in the book. They read all chapters in the book during the course of the book club sessions.

Each book club meeting consisted of the teachers assembling around a large table and discussing the chapter(s) they had read for that particular meeting. At the first meeting, the Facilitator established the following guidelines: (a) The group would meet on a regular schedule to discuss the reading and their classroom experiences related to the reading; (b) participants would take written notes while reading and use those notes to help generate discussion during the book club meetings; (c) participants would generate discussion topics related to the text, rather than the facilitator introducing the topics; and (d) discussions would aim to be open, natural conversations.

The original intent of the Facilitator was that the book club meetings would be structured using Harvey Daniels’ (2002) literature circles approach, with each participant assigned a role to follow during the discussions. However, the Daniels’ approach was quickly abandoned during the first book club meeting, after which the discussions were
Data Sources, Coding, and Variables

In the present section, I describe the data source, coding, and variable creation.

Data source. The six teacher book club sessions were audio taped. The audiotapes were then transcribed. The transcription conventions were based on a modification of Jefferson’s transcript notation (Atkinson & Heritage, 2001) and are detailed in Appendix A.

Coding

Identification of codes. The four major codes were identified through a combination of review of the literature and preliminary readings of the transcripts (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998; Coffey & Atkinson, 1996; Miles & Huberman, 1994). Through reading the relevant literature on discussion in general and teacher discussion groups specifically, and from preliminary readings of the transcripts, I first identified the Book-Club Text, Personal Experience, and Other Experts as sources of information that teachers potentially drew upon during their discussions. The Book-Club Text was shown to help teachers develop pedagogical understandings when used as a topic of professional development discussions that focused on the textual material read prior to the discussions (Adger, Hoyle & Dickinson, 2004; Bean, Valerio, Mallette & Readance, 1999; Chevalier & Houser, 1997; Flood, et al., 1994; Levin, 1995; Pelletier, 1993). Personal Experience was identified in a number of studies on teacher discussion groups as a source of information used by teachers in discussions that helped teachers develop professional dispositions, pedagogical understandings and their identity as a teacher (Adger, Hoyle &
Dickinson, 2004; Bean, Valerio, Mallette & Readance, 1999; Cavazos, 2001; Chevalier & Houser, 1997; Clark, 2001; Flood & Lapp, 1994; Florio-Ruane, 2001; Florio-Ruane & Raphael, 2001; Pelletier, 1993; Rust & Orland, 2001; Swidler, 2001). Other studies (Cavazos, 2001; Dysthe, 1999; Flood, et al., 1994) and theoretical writings about how people create meaning in discussions by drawing upon previous encounters with the topic (Bakhtin, 1986; Dysthe, 1999; Gee, 2001; Gumperz, 1982; Lemke, 1990; Tedlock & Mannheim, 1995; Wu, 2003) led me to speculate that teachers may reference Other Experts, such as professors and workshop facilitators that the participants encountered previously, in professional development discussions. Preliminary readings of the data for the current study strengthened by hypothesis that the Book-Club Text, Personal Experience and Other Experts may be used by the teachers as sources of information in their discussions.

Next, I identified Hypothetical Example as a coding category through my own preliminary readings of the data (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998; Coffey & Atkinson, 1994; Miles & Huberman, 1994) and from theoretical readings describing how speakers use generalized, simplified understandings of situations or events during discussions to aid them in articulating their beliefs or understandings about the situations or events (Gee, 1989). From my preliminary readings of the data for the current study, as well as my prior experiences working with teachers in discussion groups, I began to recognize that at times teachers make statements that are not based on the Book-Club Text, Other Experts or their Personal Experiences. Such generalized, simplified statements interested me because of my theoretical positioning that when engaged in teacher discussion groups, teachers synthesize all of the statements made by themselves and their colleagues to
develop new understandings about the topics discussed (Bakhtin, 1986; Dysthe, 1999; Gee, 2001; Gumperz, 1982; Lemke, 1990; Tedlock & Mannheim, 1995; Wu, 2003).

A fifth code called “other source referenced” was created. The code was created to account for the possibility that the teachers might reference a relevant source of information related to the discussion topic other than the four sources previously identified.

Coding turns. First, I coded the sessions. I began by identifying turns. A turn is everything that a participant says from the time she takes the floor until the time that another participant takes the floor (Jaworski & Coupland, 2001). A turn typically includes a complete thought of a speaker, although more than one complete thought might be represented in a single turn. A turn may be overlapped by short utterances or continuers spoken by other speakers (for example, “yeah” or “um, hm”), but will not typically be interrupted by the other speaker.

A reliability estimate for identification of the unit of analysis was obtained by enlisting a doctoral student colleague. To train my colleague, I purposively selected two of the six transcripts to use for training purposes. I explained how I define a turn. I then showed her anchor examples, which were shown on one-page segments on which I placed brackets to delineate the turns. Then I modeled for my colleague, using approximately one page of one of the training transcripts, how I divided the transcripts into turns. My colleague and I then simultaneously divided another page of the training transcript into turns. I compared the two coded pages by placing them side-by-side and tallying the number of turns that she marked the same way I marked them. I then counted the total number of turns I identified on the training page. I divided the number of turns
she marked the same way I did by the total number of turns I identified on the page to obtain the estimate. I sought that my colleague’s division of the transcript into turns agreed with mine on 80% or more (Miles & Huberman, 1994) of the turns. We continued the training process until her divided transcripts agreed with mine on 80% or more of the turns. Once the training process was complete, I randomly selected the first 50% of turns of two of the remaining transcripts and the last 50% of turns of the other two remaining transcripts for my colleague to independently read and mark units of analysis. I determined the percentage of times that my colleague’s turns matched mine using the procedure used in training that is detailed above. The inter-coder reliability estimate for identification of turns was .99.

*Coding for sources of information used.* Second, each turn was examined to determine whether a source of information was represented in the turn, and if so, the turn was coded for that source of information. Some turns were assigned more than one code if a teacher used more than one source of information in the turn. When in a turn a teacher referenced a source of information other than the four sources already identified (the Book-Club Text, Other Experts, Personal Experience, and Hypothetical Examples), the turn was coded “other source referenced.” Turns that did not include any source of information were not assigned a code. Appendix B details the guidelines that I followed in determining which, if any code(s) were applied to each turn.

Reliability estimates for coding sources of information were established (Erlandson, Harris, Skipper & Allen, 1993; Glesne, 1999). I began by training the coder. To train the coder, I first met with her and described the context of the book club discussions, the topics of the book chapters, the four sources of information identified as
codes, the unit of analysis, the transcription conventions detailed in Appendix A, and the coding guidelines detailed in Appendix B. For training purposes I used the two transcripts that I used in training for establishing reliability on turns, but with my turns already identified in the transcripts. I used approximately one purposively selected page of one of the previously-selected training transcripts to model for the coder my thought processes as I applied codes to the data. I then used another purposively selected page of the previously-selected training transcript and asked the coder to independently apply the codes to the page as I did the same. I compared the pages that we coded independently during the training by placing the pages that I coded and the pages my colleague coded side-by-side and tallying the number of times she coded individual turns the same way I coded them. I counted the number of times that the other coder identified the same code I did. Then I divided that number by the number of codes I identified to obtain the percentage of my codes that the other coder also identified. I sought 80% or better agreement with my codes (Miles & Huberman, 1994). We continued independently coding randomly selected one-page segments of the training transcripts with the goal of reaching 80% or better agreement with my codes. Once 80% agreement was reached on the pages coded during the training transcript, I asked the coder to apply the coding process established in the training transcript to 50% of turns in the remaining four transcripts. I randomly selected the first 50% of turns in two of the transcripts and the second 50% of turns in the other two transcripts to be coded by my colleague. I calculated the percentage of occasions the other person agreed with me using the procedure detailed above. The inter-coder reliability was .85.
Creating variables. I created the following variables: (a) For each of the six sessions, then again for each teacher within each sessions, and then again for the Facilitator in each of the sessions, four variables were created for the Percentage of Coded Turns that Referenced the Book-Club Text, the Percentage of Coded Turns that Referenced Other Experts, the Percentage of Coded Turns that Referenced Personal Experience, and the Percentage of Coded Turns that Referenced a Hypothetical Example; (b) for each of the six sessions, the Percentage of All Turns Spoken by the Facilitator; (c) for each of the six sessions, the Percentage of Coded Turns Spoken by the Facilitator; (d) four variables for each of the six sessions for the Percentage of Occasions a Teacher Used a Source of Information After Another Speaker Used the Same Source.

To create the first four variables, for each of the six sessions, then for each of the teachers in each of the six sessions, and then for the Facilitator in each of the sessions for each source of information, I counted the number of turns in which the source of information was coded at least once. I then counted the total number of coded turns in the session. I divided the number of turns coded for each source by the total number of coded turns.

To create the variable representing the Percentage of All Turns the Facilitator Spoke, for each session I counted all of the turns in which the Facilitator spoke. I also counted the total number of turns in each session. I then divided the number of turns spoken by the Facilitator by the total number of turns. To create the variable for the Percentage of Coded Turns Spoken by the Facilitator, for each session I counted the Facilitator’s total number of coded turns. I divided the Facilitator’s number of coded turns by the total number of coded turns in the session.
To create the variables for the Percentage of Occasions a Teacher Used a Source of Information After Another Speaker Used the Same Source, first I identified how often, within three coded turns after the Facilitator’s or selected teacher’s coded turn, a teacher spoke using the same source of information that the selected speaker used. I also counted the total number of coded turns spoken by the selected speaker using each source of information. For each source of information, I divided the number of coded turns in which the selected speaker’s use of the source was followed by another teacher’s use of the same source by the total number of turns in which the selected speaker used the source.
Chapter 4

Results

The research questions guiding the current study were: What sources of information do teachers use in book-club discussions; and is there variability among teachers in which sources of information they use in book-club discussions?

In the present chapter I describe the analyses conducted to address the research questions and report the results of the analyses. As a preliminary step, I first determined whether the analyses could be done by collapsing across sessions. Next, I report the results of the analysis for the two research questions. Then, I describe the potential impact of the Facilitator on teachers’ source use. Finally, I describe an examination of a possible source use increase or decrease progression over time.

Collapsing Across Sessions

To determine whether the pattern of source use was similar enough to collapse across sessions, I examined the pattern in two ways. First, I compared the rank order of source use across sessions. For the first four variables, Percentage of Coded Turns that Referenced the Book-Club Text, the Percentage of Coded Turns that Referenced Other Experts, the Percentage of Coded Turns that Referenced Personal Experience, and the Percentage of Coded Turns that Referenced a Hypothetical Example, I created Table 1. I rank ordered the percentage of source use within each session. I then looked at the rank orderings across sessions to see if the sources were ranked similarly across sessions.
Table 1. Total Number of Coded Turns, Rank Order, and Percentages of Coded Turns that Used Each Source for Each Session and Number of Coded Turns and Sources Collapsed Across Sessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Number of coded turns</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Second</th>
<th>Third</th>
<th>Fourth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>Personal experience (80.5%)</td>
<td>Hypothetical example (21.16%)</td>
<td>Book-club text (6.48%)</td>
<td>Other expert (5.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>Personal experience (82.6%)</td>
<td>Hypothetical example (19.89%)</td>
<td>Book-club text (8.98%)</td>
<td>Other expert (4.59%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>Personal experience (86.76%)</td>
<td>Hypothetical example (12.5%)</td>
<td>Book-club text (3.92%)</td>
<td>Other expert (3.19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>Personal experience (82.52%)</td>
<td>Book-club text (11.79%)</td>
<td>Hypothetical example (9.76%)</td>
<td>Other expert (3.25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>Personal experience (89.19%)</td>
<td>Hypothetical example (8.95%)</td>
<td>Book-club text (6.48%)</td>
<td>Other expert (3.09%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>Personal experience (57.04%)</td>
<td>Hypothetical example (31.34%)</td>
<td>Book-club text (16.9%)</td>
<td>Other expert (2.11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total coded turns and percentages for collapsed variables</td>
<td>2078</td>
<td>Personal experience (80.65%)</td>
<td>Hypothetical example (17.28%)</td>
<td>Book-club text (8.66%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The question I asked was, “Is the rank order for source use the same across the sessions?” As Table 1 shows, on the whole, the rank order was the same for all sessions. Personal Example was used most frequently, Hypothetical Example was used with the second most frequency, the Book-Club Text was used with the third most frequency, and Other Experts was used least frequently. The one minor exception to the pattern was in Session 4 where Hypothetical Example, ranked second in all the other sessions, and the Book-Club Text, ranked third in all the other sessions, were transposed.

Next I examined the range of percentage source use across sessions. As Table 1 shows, on the whole, the range of use within each source was small. The range of source use across sessions for Personal Experience was 57.04% to 89.19%. For Hypothetical Example the range was 8.95% to 31.34%. For the Book-Club Text the range was 3.92% to 16.9%, and for Other Experts the range was 2.11% to 5.8%. The range of source use for the Book-Club Text and Other Experts was very small. Because the range of use was small, I determined that the use of Book-Club Text and Other Experts in Session 4 was similar to the use of the two sources in the other sessions, despite the fact that the rank order was transposed for Session 4. Additionally, I noted that the range of use for Personal Experience and Hypothetical Example was wider than the range for the other two sources. I determined that in Session 6, Personal Experience was used less frequently and Hypothetical Examples were used more frequently than was common in the other five sessions, accounting for the wider percentage range. The difference in the extent to which Personal Experience and Hypothetical Example were used in Session 6 was not great enough to prevent me from collapsing the variables across sessions.
After examining the rank order and the range of source use across sessions, I determined that source use was similar enough to collapse across sessions.

*What Sources of Information Do Teachers Use in Book-Club Discussions?*

In the present section, I present the results of the analysis conducted to address the first research question, “What sources of information do teachers use in book-club discussions?” First, I describe the creation of the variables for collapsing across sessions. Next, I describe the analyses and results for the research question. After that, I present an extended excerpt from one session of the book club that illustrates prototypical use of the four sources of information. Then, I discuss two kinds of turns coded as Personal Experience. Finally, I discuss turns coded as “other source referenced.”

*Preface.* The analyses revealed something about teachers’ perspectives about the chosen text that is helpful context as results are presented. Further discussion of the teachers’ perspectives about the text is presented in the Discussion chapter.

There was evidence from the book-club discussions that the teachers perceived the book-club text as too research-focused and somewhat irrelevant to their teaching practice. In the following excerpt from Session 5 of the book-club discussions, the teachers set up a division between the kind of practitioner-focused text that they felt would be most beneficial to them and the kind of information they actually found in the book-club text.

LINDA (all names are pseudonyms): Well, and we told you that this (the book) isn’t, this isn’t what we thought we signed on the dotted line for either.
Facilitator: What, what did you think you were signing on the dotted line for?
Because I…
LINDA: Well, when it says “Early Effective Literacy Interventions”…
Facilitator: Oh, oh, oh, so the book isn’t what you thought it was going to be.
LINDA: Right, right.
ALLISON: Yeah.
LINDA: We thought, you know, it would say…
BRENDA: We thought you were going to give us some ideas!
LINDA: No, no, not you, the book. I thought the book…
JUNE: No, I really wanted to come away with some ideas, yeah, some new ideas.
LINDA: Yeah, not all of the percentages and research data.

*Creation of collapsed variables.* Because the pattern of source use was similar across sessions, I collapsed the variables across sessions. To do so, I first added the number of coded turns across all sessions for each source. Doing so resulted in a total number of coded turns for each of the four sources. Then, I added the total number of coded turns for all sources across sessions. I then divided the totals across sessions for each source of information by the total number of coded turns for all sessions, resulting in a total percentage of coded turns that were each source of information across all sessions.

*What sources of information did teachers use in their book-club discussions?* To address the first research question, “What sources of information do teachers use in their book-club discussions,” I compared the percentages of source use. I rank ordered the first four variables, the Percentage of Coded Turns that Referenced the Book-Club Text, the Percentage of Coded Turns that Referenced Other Experts, the Percentage of Coded Turns that Referenced Personal Experience, and the Percentage of Coded Turns that Referenced a Hypothetical Example, from highest to lowest.

The relevant percentages can be found in the last row of Table 1. Personal Experience was by far the most frequently used source of information. Teachers relied upon Personal Experience in the discussions in 80.65% of the turns. The next most frequently used source was Hypothetical Example, which teachers used in 17.28% of the turns. The third most frequently used source of information was the Book-Club Text. Teachers relied upon information from the Book-Club Text in 8.66% of the turns,
indicating relatively low use of the Book-Club Text by the teachers as a source of information. Finally, the Other Expert source was the source used least across all sessions. Teachers only referred to Other Experts in 3.75% of the turns, indicating that the participating teachers rarely drew upon information from other experts such as professors or workshop facilitators during their book-club discussions.

Excerpt from a session illustrating prototypical source use. In the following section I present an extended excerpt from a session illustrating prototypical source use. The excerpt includes turns that reference the Book-Club Text (BCT), Other Experts (OE), Personal Experience (PE) and Hypothetical Examples (HE), with coding indicated at the onset of each coded turn. All four sources of information are used. The excerpt illustrates the heavy reliance on Personal Experience as a source of information, and how the other three sources are used to a lesser extent. The extended discussion between Allison and Linda about the value of text re-reading illustrates how the teachers drew upon the sources of information to critically evaluate the topic being discussed. Recall the coding convention that talk that is overlapped by another speaker but continues without pause is signified by double backslashes at the end of one segment of talk and the beginning of the next, and represents one turn.

(BCT, OE) ALLISON: Here’s something, though, that, you know, this talked about fluency, um, one workshop I went to, um, hearing this man say, and it, for some reason I had heard it before, but this, it just impressed upon me differently that time, that, at a literacy center, say the listening center, or the reading center, that a way to keep them accountable and get them more fluent is to tell them that they need to reread that same story until they can read it flawlessly//
(um, hm)
ALLISON: //and I forget what center it was at, maybe it’s the reading center or something, but they hold on to that book until they can read it to you, you know, completely/
LINDA: Well, that’s…
ALLISON: //and rereading stories I think…
(BCT, PE) LINDA: But that’s, that’s a reading recovery tactic, because that’s how, but the, the other thing to that is, you know, the fact that Johnny can sit there and go, The dog is brown, The dog is running across the park, is not, that’s not reading.

(OE) ALLISON: It was, it was the listening center. It was the listening center, because they are hearing it and reading it at the same time. You know, other areas they are really having to decode//

LINDA: I see…

ALLISON: //whereas you know

(PE) LINDA: I would not necessarily agree

(PE) ALLISON: Because that’s what happens, you know, in the listening center, they’re not really reading, they’re listening

JUNE: Right.

LINDA: But

(PE) ALLISON: There’s no accountability. But this keeps them accountable. If they can read it back to you without the tape, [then they are accountable for reading.]

(PE, HE) LINDA: [But there’s no way that’s going to happen], not with your ESL students who can hardly read, or you know

(PE) ALLISON: But you have different levels in the reading

(PE) LINDA: No, but what you’re, what you’re, one of the things you are doing is you are teaching a new skill, and as we know, this is not a group who knows how to listen.//

(laughter, agreement)

LINDA: //So that is a skill. Listening to the words, following them in the book, that’s the skill you are working more on.//

ALLISON: Right.

LINDA: //Not, not the fact that they are going to be able to read this, so what are you going to do, for two weeks, have this child sit at the listening table//

ALLISON: Yeah, I can see what you are saying.

LINDA: //yeah, until you can do it fluently? No. You’re teaching them the skill of listening. You’re, of really listening for details.//

ALLISON: Yeah. That’s true.

LINDA: //And their beginning paper would say, name of the book and the author, which they’re copying right, you know, I usually put them on a sentence strip, so they can take the sentence strip with them and leave all the other materials there. And then, it’ll say, I liked, and then they have to say, when the such and such.//

ALLISON: Yeah, I…

LINDA: //And then they draw a picture. And that is all that is on the first part.

(PE) ALLISON: And they enjoy that. They are motivated by that.

LINDA: Right.

Two kinds of Personal Experience. Next, I will discuss two kinds of turns that reference the Personal Experience source, which was the source that the teachers used
with appreciably greater frequency than they used any of the other sources of information. Personal Experience may be associated with professional knowledge that the teachers already possess through their prior professional training combined with classroom experience, or it may reference students or events the teachers have encountered in their classrooms or schools. The turns that alluded to teachers’ professional knowledge were clearly borne out of personal experience, but they had a different quality than the turns that used examples from the teachers’ classrooms or schools. In the first example below, Allison describes her personal experience with the Student Assistance Program (SAP) process in a way that clearly illustrates her professional knowledge. She uses professional vocabulary such as “strategies” and “interventions” that indicate training and experience, as well as describing how she integrates the SAP process into her daily work with students. Allison’s turn also includes some analysis of the challenges associated with the teaching profession and how the SAP process may ameliorate some of those issues. Alternately, June’s turn in the second example below shows how teachers use experiences with students or events from their classroom as a means to connect with the topic of discussion. June’s turn comes in the context of a discussion about a point from the book-club text, specifically the importance of demonstrating to students that you have faith in their ability to succeed. June builds upon the point of discussion from the book-club text by drawing upon an example of a particular student who she did not expect to succeed, connecting the point from the text to her own classroom experience. The following are two examples that illustrate two kinds of Personal Experience turns, the first being an example of a Personal Experience turn
that demonstrates professional knowledge, followed by a turn that emphasizes experience with a student or classroom event:

ALLISON: Well, I mean, I think, I actually think that the SAP process can be very beneficial to teachers in that it does help you look carefully at what problems you are seeing and really generate specific strategies to try on a regular basis, because we are so burdened with so many responsibilities that we are, we need something really concrete like that, and I think whenever I put a child in SAP, you know, those intervention sheets are taped by me, and you know I have two or three kids who are in SAP, and I have to take their sheets out every other day and ask myself, am I really trying to meet their needs? Am I really trying to meet their needs? I overburden myself with too many interventions sometimes, but you know, I think it can be helpful. I think it gives us specific goals to work on and specific means, you know, for reaching a certain goal.

JUNE: I had a little girl, Sally, who would wear her coat, gosh the first, nine weeks of school, and it didn’t matter, you know, what the weather was like. That was just her comfort level. And you know, if you had asked me if she was going to make it, I would have said “no.” That kid is, man, she is soaring, but she just needed more time.

There were times during the book-club discussions when the use of Personal Experience led the discussions away from the topic presented in the book-club text. For instance, during Session 2, the teachers began to discuss the impact of nutrition on students’ school performance. They talked about the kinds of foods their students ate, the kinds of foods that were served in the lunchroom, and their belief that poor nutrition led to many children’s difficulties in school. The extended discussion about students’ nutrition led the discussion away from the topic for Session 2, which was Reading Recovery.

Use of the “other source referenced” code. Finally, I will describe the use of the “other source referenced” code. Turns coded as “other source referenced” occurred very infrequently in the discussions. The percentages were as follows: Session 1—2.05%, 6/293; Session 2—2.29%, 12/523; Session 3—1.47%, 6/408; Session 4—1.62%, 4/246;
Session 5 — 1.85%, 6/324; and Session 6 — 1.06 %, 3/284. Extremely few coded turns were coded as “other source referenced.” There were insufficient numbers of turns coded as “other source referenced” to analyze them.

Is There Variability Among Teachers in Which Sources of Information They Use in Book-Club Discussions?

In the following section I first describe the analyses and results for the second research question, “Is there variability among teachers in which sources of information they use in their book-club discussions?” To address the question, I did the following four analyses: (a) Within teacher, I considered whether I could collapse across sessions; (b) Within source, I compared each teacher’s relative source use to the overall relative source use for all teachers, as revealed in the results for the first research question; (c) Teacher-to-teacher, I compared the relative source use; and (d) Teacher-to-teacher, I compared the extent of use of each source.

Collapsing across sessions within teacher. To address the second research question, “Is there variability among teachers in which sources of information they use in their book-club discussions,” I began by determining whether I could collapse source use across sessions for each teacher. Tables 2 through 7 show the rank ordering for each teacher, by session, for the relative use of the four sources, the Percentage of Each Teacher’s Coded Turns that Referenced the Book-Club Text, the Percentage of Each Teacher’s Coded Turns that Referenced Other Experts, the Percentage of Each Teacher’s Coded Turns that Referenced Personal Experience, and the Percentage of Each Teacher’s Coded Turns that Referenced a Hypothetical Example. Within teacher, I looked at both the rank order and the percentage range of use for each source.
As the tables show, the rank order of source use across sessions for each teacher was similar, with only some minor variations. For example, columns 3 through 6 of Table 3 show that Linda’s source use was ranked the same across all sessions, with Personal Experience used most frequently, Hypothetical Example used with the second-most frequency, the Book-Club Text used with third-most frequency, and Other Experts used least frequently. The minor variation in Linda’s rank orders was in Session 4, where Hypothetical Example and Book-Club Text were transposed (see Table 3, row 5).

The tables also show that the percentage range of source use was similar across sessions within teacher, again with minor variations. For example, columns 3 through 6 of Table 4 show that across sessions Allison used Personal Experience in 74.14% to 97.1% of her coded turns, Hypothetical Example in 3.7% to 18.97% of coded turns, the Book-Club Text in 1.45% to 22.22% of coded turns, and Other Experts in 0% to 15.52% of coded turns. Percentage ranges of source use for the other teachers were similar to Allison’s, suggesting that the number of coded turns for each source across sessions was similar for each teacher.

Therefore, for the following analyses, I determined that the pattern of source use for each teacher was similar enough to collapse across sessions within teacher.
Table 2. Total Number of Coded Turns, Rank Order, and Percentages of Source Use for Each Session for Brenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Number of coded turns</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Second</th>
<th>Third</th>
<th>Fourth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Personal experience (72.92%)</td>
<td>Hypothetical example (22.92%)</td>
<td>Book-club text (10.42%)</td>
<td>Other expert (6.25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>Personal experience (78.49%)</td>
<td>Hypothetical example (20.43%)</td>
<td>Book-club text (8.6%)</td>
<td>Other expert (4.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Personal experience (93.98%)</td>
<td>Hypothetical example (6.02%)</td>
<td>Book-club text (4.82%)</td>
<td>Other expert (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Personal experience (90.32%)</td>
<td>Book-club text (6.45%)</td>
<td>Hypothetical example (3.24%)</td>
<td>Other expert (3.24%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Personal experience (80%)</td>
<td>Hypothetical example (17.5%)</td>
<td>Book-club text (17.5%)</td>
<td>Other expert (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>Personal experience (46.94%)</td>
<td>Hypothetical example (38.78%)</td>
<td>Book-club text (28.57%)</td>
<td>Other expert (4.08%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Total Number of Coded Turns, Rank Order, and Percentages of Source Use for Each Session for Linda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Number of coded turns</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Second</th>
<th>Third</th>
<th>Fourth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>Personal experience</td>
<td>Hypothetical example</td>
<td>Book-club text</td>
<td>Other expert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(88.35%)</td>
<td>(32.03%)</td>
<td>(1.94%)</td>
<td>(1.94%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>Personal experience</td>
<td>Hypothetical example</td>
<td>Book-club text</td>
<td>Other expert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(80.41%)</td>
<td>(28.87%)</td>
<td>(12.89%)</td>
<td>(1.03%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>Personal experience</td>
<td>Hypothetical example</td>
<td>Book-club text</td>
<td>Other expert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(81.3%)</td>
<td>(16.26%)</td>
<td>(5.69%)</td>
<td>(3.25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Personal experience</td>
<td>Book-club text</td>
<td>Hypothetical example</td>
<td>Other expert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(85.29%)</td>
<td>(14.7%)</td>
<td>(10.29%)</td>
<td>(0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>Personal experience</td>
<td>Hypothetical example</td>
<td>Other expert</td>
<td>Book-club text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(91.94%)</td>
<td>(9.68%)</td>
<td>(4.84%)</td>
<td>(2.42%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>Personal experience</td>
<td>Hypothetical example</td>
<td>Book-club text</td>
<td>Other expert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(58.62%)</td>
<td>(35.63%)</td>
<td>(10.34%)</td>
<td>(0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. *Total Number of Coded Turns, Rank Order, and Percentages of Source Use for Each Session for Allison*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Number of coded turns</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Second</th>
<th>Third</th>
<th>Fourth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Personal experience</td>
<td>Hypothetical example</td>
<td>Other expert</td>
<td>Book-club text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(74.14%)</td>
<td>(18.97%)</td>
<td>(15.52%)</td>
<td>(8.62%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Personal experience</td>
<td>Hypothetical example</td>
<td>Book-club text</td>
<td>Other expert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(88.89%)</td>
<td>(15.52%)</td>
<td>(12.96%)</td>
<td>(12.96%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Personal experience</td>
<td>Other expert</td>
<td>Hypothetical example</td>
<td>Book-club text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(91.23%)</td>
<td>(10.53%)</td>
<td>(5.26%)</td>
<td>(3.51%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Personal experience</td>
<td>Other expert</td>
<td>Hypothetical example</td>
<td>Book-club text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(93.18%)</td>
<td>(9.09%)</td>
<td>(6.82%)</td>
<td>(4.55%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Personal experience</td>
<td>Hypothetical example</td>
<td>Book-club text</td>
<td>Other expert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(97.1%)</td>
<td>(7.25%)</td>
<td>(1.45%)</td>
<td>(1.45%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Personal experience</td>
<td>Book-club text</td>
<td>Hypothetical example</td>
<td>Other expert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(81.48%)</td>
<td>(22.22%)</td>
<td>(3.7%)</td>
<td>(0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session</td>
<td>Number of coded turns</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Second</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>Fourth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Personal experience (93.62%)</td>
<td>Hypothetical example (10.64%)</td>
<td>Other expert (4.26%)</td>
<td>Book-club text (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>Personal experience (94.26%)</td>
<td>Hypothetical example (6.9%)</td>
<td>Other expert (4.6%)</td>
<td>Book-club text (2.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>Personal experience (88.42%)</td>
<td>Hypothetical example (15.8%)</td>
<td>Book-club text (0%)</td>
<td>Other expert (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Personal experience (92.59%)</td>
<td>Hypothetical example (14.81%)</td>
<td>Book-club text (0%)</td>
<td>Other expert (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Personal experience (71.43%)</td>
<td>Hypothetical example (34.69%)</td>
<td>Book-club text (0%)</td>
<td>Other expert (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session</td>
<td>Number of coded turns</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Second</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>Fourth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Personal experience (50%)</td>
<td>Book-club text (37.5%)</td>
<td>Hypothetical example (12.5%)</td>
<td>Other expert (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Personal experience (58.33%)</td>
<td>Hypothetical example (41.67%)</td>
<td>Book-club text (0%)</td>
<td>Other expert (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Personal experience (75%)</td>
<td>Hypothetical example (37.5%)</td>
<td>Book-club text (0%)</td>
<td>Other expert (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Personal experience (87.5%)</td>
<td>Hypothetical example (9.38%)</td>
<td>Other expert (6.25%)</td>
<td>Book-club text (3.13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Personal experience (97.72%)</td>
<td>Hypothetical example (6.82%)</td>
<td>Other expert (4.55%)</td>
<td>Book-club text (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Personal experience (61.29%)</td>
<td>Hypothetical example (29.03%)</td>
<td>Book-club text (16.13%)</td>
<td>Other expert (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7. Total Number of Coded Turns, Rank Order, and Percentages of Source Use for Each Session for June

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Number of coded turns</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Second</th>
<th>Third</th>
<th>Fourth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Personal experience (100%)</td>
<td>Hypothetical example (6.67%)</td>
<td>Book-club text (0%)</td>
<td>Other expert (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Personal experience (86%)</td>
<td>Hypothetical example (16%)</td>
<td>Book-club text (16%)</td>
<td>Other expert (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Personal experience (83.78%)</td>
<td>Hypothetical example (13.51%)</td>
<td>Other expert (5.41%)</td>
<td>Book-club text (2.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Personal experience (77.27%)</td>
<td>Book-club text (18.18%)</td>
<td>Hypothetical example (13.64%)</td>
<td>Other expert (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Personal experience (85.71%)</td>
<td>Book-club text (10.71%)</td>
<td>Hypothetical example (3.57%)</td>
<td>Other expert (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Hypothetical example (57.14%)</td>
<td>Personal experience (28.57%)</td>
<td>Book-club text (14.29%)</td>
<td>Other expert (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparison of each teacher’s relative source use to the overall relative source use of all teachers. To recall, as was determined for the first research question, the overall rank order of the frequency of source use was as follows: (1) Personal Experience; (2)
Hypothetical Example; (3) Book-Club Text; and (4) Other Experts. As Table 8 shows, four of the teachers, Brenda, Linda, Nancy, and June, used the four sources of information in the same rank order as the overall rank orderings determined for the first research question. Two of the teachers, Allison and Mary, differed in a very minor way from the pattern found in the results of first research question in that they both used Other Experts with the third most frequency and the Book-Club Text with the fourth most frequency.

*Teacher-to-teacher comparison of relative source use.* There was very little variation among teachers in which sources of information they used in their book-club discussions. For all six of the teachers, Personal Experience was the most frequently used source of information. Hypothetical Example was most commonly ranked as the second most frequently used source for all six teachers. Four of the teachers, Brenda, Linda, June and Nancy used the Book-Club Text with the third most frequency and Other Experts with the fourth most frequency, which is the same as the overall third and fourth place rankings for the first research question. Only Allison and Mary differed slightly from the other teachers in that they both used Other Experts with the third most frequency and the Book-Club Text with the fourth most frequency.

*Teacher-to-teacher comparison of the extent of source use.* With some minor exceptions, the extent to which the teachers used each source of information was similar. To compare the teachers on the extent to which they relied on each source, I examined the percentages reported in Table 8 for each teacher. The teachers’ reliance on Personal Experience, the most frequently used source, was consistent across teachers within 10.32% of one another. The range of coded turns referencing Personal Experience was
Table 8. *Total Coded Turns, Rank Order, and Percentages of the Use of Each Source of Information by Teacher*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Total coded turns</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Second</th>
<th>Third</th>
<th>Fourth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brenda</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>Personal experience (78.2%)</td>
<td>Hypothetical example (18.02%)</td>
<td>Book-club text (10.47%)</td>
<td>Other expert (4.07%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>Personal experience (81.55%)</td>
<td>Hypothetical example (22.75%)</td>
<td>Book-club text (8.01%)</td>
<td>Other expert (2.29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allison</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>Personal experience (87.22%)</td>
<td>Hypothetical example (10.22%)</td>
<td>Other expert (8.63%)</td>
<td>Book-club text (7.35%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>Personal experience (88.52%)</td>
<td>Hypothetical example (15.41%)</td>
<td>Other expert (1.97%)</td>
<td>Book-club text (0.66%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>Personal experience (79.26%)</td>
<td>Hypothetical example (17.78%)</td>
<td>Book-club text (6.67%)</td>
<td>Other expert (2.96%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>Personal experience (80.72%)</td>
<td>Hypothetical example (15.66%)</td>
<td>Book-club text (10.84%)</td>
<td>Other expert (1.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

78.2% (Brenda) to 88.52% (Mary). The teachers’ use of Hypothetical Example was also similar across teachers within 12.53%, with percentages ranging from 10.22% (Allison) to 22.75% (Linda) of their coded turns. The teachers’ use of the Book-Club Text was
similar within 10.18%, with percentages ranging from 0.66% (Mary) to 10.84% (June) of their coded turns. Finally, the teachers’ use of Other Experts was similar within 7.43% in 1.2% (June) to 8.63% (Allison) of their coded turns. The percentage differences suggest that there was not much variation among teachers in the extent to which they used each source.

Did the Facilitator Impact Which Sources of Information Teachers Used in Book Club Discussions, and if so, Did the Facilitator’s Impact Differ From the Impact of the Teachers on One Another?

In the current section, I consider the potential impact of the Facilitator on the teachers’ source use during their book-club discussions. I first relate how often the Facilitator spoke during the book-club discussions. Then I discuss which sources of information the Facilitator used in the book-club discussions. Finally, I report whether the teachers used the same source of information after the Facilitator did, and for comparison, whether the teachers used the same source of information after another teacher did.

How often did the Facilitator speak during the book-club discussions? The Facilitator did not speak very often during the book-club discussions. The percentages of turns that the Facilitator spoke were as follows: Session 1—11.5%, 90/782; Session 2—5.39%, 54/1002; Session 3—2.87%, 27/941; Session 4—7.75%, 50/645; Session 5—7.7%, 66/857; and Session 6—7.38%, 54/732.

I also calculated the Percentage of Coded Turns Spoken by the Facilitator. The percentages were as follows: Session 1—3.07%, 9/293; Session 2—5.16%, 27/523; Session 3—0.74%, 3/408; Session 4—7.32%, 18/246; Session 5—4.63%, 15/324; and
Session 6—9.5%, 27/284. The percentages again suggest that the Facilitator did not speak a large number of the coded turns, representing from 0.74% to 9.5% of coded turns across the six sessions. Because the Facilitator spoke so infrequently, any impact he had on the discussions was minimal.

*Facilitator relative source use compared to the overall relative source use.*

Although the Facilitator’s was minimal because he spoke so infrequently, on the occasions when he did speak, the teachers generally followed within three turns using the same source as the Facilitator used. Therefore, I continued with the analyses of the Facilitator’s coded turns. I determined which sources of information the Facilitator used in the discussions by first creating four variables for each session for the Percentage of the Facilitator’s Coded Turns that Referenced the Book-Club Text, the Percentage of the Facilitator’s Coded Turns that Referenced Other Experts, the Percentage of the Facilitator’s Coded Turns that Referenced Personal Experience, and the Percentage of the Facilitator’s Coded Turns that Referenced a Hypothetical Example. To determine the relative frequency with which the Facilitator used each source of information, I created Table 9, which shows the rank ordering the four variables from most frequently used (first) to least frequently used (fourth) for each session.

The rank orders reported in Table 9 indicate that on the small number of occasions when the Facilitator spoke, he differed from the teachers in the sources of information that he used. While the teachers used Personal Experience most frequently in nearly all of their discussions, the Facilitator used both Personal Experience and the Book-Club Text with the highest relative frequency of the four sources. It is also notable that while the teachers often used Hypothetical Example more often than the Book-Club
Text or Other Experts, the Facilitator rarely used Hypothetical Example as a source of information.

Table 9. Rank Order of the Percentage of the Facilitator’s Coded Turns for Each Source by Session

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Second</th>
<th>Third</th>
<th>Fourth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Personal experience</td>
<td>Book-club text</td>
<td>Hypothetical example and other expert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Personal experience</td>
<td>Other expert</td>
<td>Hypothetical example and Book-club text</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Personal experience</td>
<td>Book-club text</td>
<td>Hypothetical example and Other expert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Book-club text</td>
<td>Personal experience</td>
<td>Hypothetical example and Other expert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Personal experience</td>
<td>Book-club text</td>
<td>Hypothetical example and Other expert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Book-club text</td>
<td>Personal experience</td>
<td>Other expert</td>
<td>Hypothetical example</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* An empty cell indicates that there is no variable in the fourth place position because two variables had equal value in the third place position for the session.

*Did the teachers use the same source of information after the Facilitator did?* The Facilitator did not speak often during the book-club discussions. However, on the
occasions when the Facilitator did talk, the teachers appeared to use the same source after
he did. I determined how often a teacher spoke within three coded turns using the same
source of information as the Facilitator. To create the variables for the Percentage of
Occasions a Teacher Used a Source of Information after the Facilitator used the Same
Source, I identified and counted for each source how often, within three coded turns after
the Facilitator’s coded turn, a teacher spoke using the same source of information that the
Facilitator used. Then, I counted the total number of coded turns spoken by the Facilitator
using each source of information. For each source of information, I divided the number of
coded turns in which the Facilitator’s use of the source was followed by a teacher’s use of
the same source by the total number of turns in which the Facilitator used the source. In
Table 10, I report the Percentage of Occasions a Teacher Used a Source of Information
after the Facilitator Used the Same Source for each session. I examined of the table to
determine whether the teachers used the same sources of information after the Facilitator
did. I also examined the table to determine whether the teachers used some of the sources
of information after the Facilitator did but not others and, if so, which sources were the
teachers more likely to use after the Facilitator used them.

The results reported in Table 10 show that when the Facilitator used Personal
Experience, Hypothetical Examples, or the Book-Club Text in the book-club discussions,
the teachers were likely to follow the Facilitator using the same source. The teachers used
the Book-Club Text from 40% to 100% of the time within three turns after the Facilitator
used it. They used Personal Experience from 88.89% to 100% of the time within three
turns after the Facilitator used it. And they used Hypothetical Examples from 66.67% to
100% of the time within three turns after the Facilitator used it. However, the teachers did
not use the Other Expert source within three turns when the Facilitator used it, except for in 33.33% of the turns in Session 2. A possible explanation for the teachers not frequently using the Other Expert source when the Facilitator used it is that the teachers may not have been familiar with the particular expert sources that the Facilitator referenced, and therefore were unable to further elaborate on what the Facilitator said.

Table 10. Percentages with Numerators and Denominators of Occasions a Teacher Used a Source of Information after the Facilitator Used the Same Source for Each Session

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Personal experience</th>
<th>Hypothetical example</th>
<th>Book-club text</th>
<th>Other experts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>100 (6/6)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40 (2/5)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>95.45 (21/22)</td>
<td>100 (1/1)</td>
<td>100 (1/1)</td>
<td>33.33 (1/3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>100 (3/3)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100 (2/2)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>100 (4/4)</td>
<td>66.67 (2/3)</td>
<td>81.82 (9/11)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>90 (9/10)</td>
<td>100 (1/1)</td>
<td>100 (6/6)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>88.89 (8/9)</td>
<td>100 (3/3)</td>
<td>100 (12/12)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. A dash indicates that the facilitator did not use the source of information in the session.

*Did the teachers use the same source of information after another teacher did?*

Some of the teachers did not speak very often during the book-club discussions. For
instance, Nancy spoke only eight coded turns in Session 1 and nine coded turns in Session 3. Additionally, even those teachers who did speak more often overall during the book-club discussions spoke very few turns using certain sources. For example, the following shows the total number of coded turns in which Allison used Hypothetical Examples by session: Session 1 — 11; Session 2 — 9; Session 3 — 3; Session 4 — 3; Session 5 — 5; and Session 6 — 1. Similarly, the total number of coded turns in which Brenda used the Book-Club Text was as follows: Session 1 — 5; Session 2 — 4; Session 3 — 4; Session 4 — 2; Session 5 — 7; and Session 6 — 14. Such low numbers affected the percentages of coded turns that each teacher spoke reported in the following section.

As a comparison to the determination stated above that when the Facilitator spoke using a source the teachers were likely to follow within three turns using the same source, I examined whether the teachers also used the same source of information after another teacher used it. I randomly selected three of the teachers, Brenda, Allison and Nancy. I created the variables for the Percentage of Occasions a Teacher Used a Source of Information after Another Speaker Used the Same Source for each of the three teachers using the procedure explained above when creating the same variable for the Facilitator. I then created a table for each session with a column each for the Facilitator, Brenda, Allison and Nancy, and with a row for each source showing the percentage of occasions a teacher used the source within three turns after the Facilitator or selected teacher used it (see Tables 11 through 16). I examined the tables to determine if the pattern of how often a teacher used a source of information after the Facilitator used it was the same as the pattern for the three selected teachers.
Often the teachers did not use a source of information enough times to adequately gauge whether or not the other teachers were likely to follow within three turns using the same source (see Tables 11 through 16). However, when a teacher used a source in enough coded turns to gauge, it was evident that the teachers did use the same source of information within three coded turns after another speaker. I created Table 17, which highlights the occasions when the speaker used a source 20 or more times, providing a sufficient number of coded turns to gauge.

As Table 17 shows, on the whole teachers appeared likely to use Personal Experience after another teacher used the source. For example, in Sessions 4 and 5, the teachers used Personal Experience within three turns after another teacher used it between 90.24% and 100% of the time. The percentages show that when another teacher used Personal Experience, the other teachers were likely to also use Personal Experience more than 90% of the time. None of the other three sources was used frequently enough to adequately gauge whether the teachers were likely to use them after another teacher did.

Is there a source use increase or decrease progression over time?

I created a time-ordered matrix (Miles & Huberman, 1994) to determine if there were significant progressive increases or decreases in the use of any of the sources over time during the course of the six book club sessions (see Table 18). I found no significant progressions, though there were some slight tendencies for change in extent of use of some sources. As can been seen in rows 2 and 4 in Table 18, no discernible progression was noted for the Book-Club Text or Personal Experience. As can be seen in row 5, the use of Hypothetical Example diminished minimally over time through
Table 11. Percentages with Numerators and Denominators of Occasions a Teacher Used the Same Source of Information within Three Turns after the Facilitator or Selected Teacher for Session 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
<th>Brenda</th>
<th>Allison</th>
<th>Nancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal experience</td>
<td>100 (6/6)</td>
<td>100 (35/35)</td>
<td>88.37 (38/43)</td>
<td>100 (4/4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothetical example</td>
<td>- (8/11)</td>
<td>72.73 (8/11)</td>
<td>72.73 (8/11)</td>
<td>100 (1/1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book-club text</td>
<td>40 (2/5)</td>
<td>60 (3/5)</td>
<td>20 (1/5)</td>
<td>66.67 (2/3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other expert</td>
<td>- (2/3)</td>
<td>66.67 (2/3)</td>
<td>33.33 (3/9)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* A dash indicates that the speaker did not use the source of information in the session.

Table 12. Percentages with Numerators and Denominators of Occasions a Teacher Used the Same Source of Information within Three Turns after the Facilitator or Selected Teacher for Session 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
<th>Brenda</th>
<th>Allison</th>
<th>Nancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal experience</td>
<td>95.45 (21/22)</td>
<td>93.15 (68/73)</td>
<td>97.92 (47/48)</td>
<td>57.14 (4/7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothetical example</td>
<td>100 (1/1)</td>
<td>52.63 (10/19)</td>
<td>100 (9/9)</td>
<td>100 (5/5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book-club text</td>
<td>100 (1/1)</td>
<td>50 (2/4)</td>
<td>85.71 (6/7)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other experts</td>
<td>33.33 (1/3)</td>
<td>37.5 (3/8)</td>
<td>28.57 (2/7)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* A dash indicates that the speaker did not use the source of information in the session.
Table 13. Percentages with Numerators and Denominators of Occasions a Teacher Used the Same Source of Information within Three Turns after the Facilitator or Selected Teacher for Session 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
<th>Brenda</th>
<th>Allison</th>
<th>Nancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal experience</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>89.74</td>
<td>90.38</td>
<td>83.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3/3)</td>
<td>(70/78)</td>
<td>(47/52)</td>
<td>(5/6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Hypothetical example | -       | 80      | 33.33   | 66.67  |
|                      |         | (4/5)   | (1/3)   | (2/3)  |

| Book-club text       | 100     | 100     | 50      | -      |
|                      | (2/2)   | (4/4)   | (1/2)   |        |

| Other expert         | -       | -       | 50      | -      |
|                      |         |         | (3/6)   |        |

Note. A dash indicates that the speaker did not use the source of information in the session.

Table 14. Percentages with Numerators and Denominators of Occasions a Teacher Used the Same Source of Information within Three Turns after the Facilitator or Selected Teacher for Session 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
<th>Brenda</th>
<th>Allison</th>
<th>Nancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal experience</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>96.43</td>
<td>90.24</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4/4)</td>
<td>(27/28)</td>
<td>(37/41)</td>
<td>(28/28)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Hypothetical example | 66.67   | 0       | 0       | 0      |
|                      | (2/3)   | (0/1)   | (0/3)   | (0/3)  |

| Book-club text       | 81.82   | 100     | 50      | 100    |
|                      | (9/11)  | (2/2)   | (1/2)   | (1/1)  |

| Other expert         | 0       | 100     | 25      | 100    |
|                      | (0/1)   | (1/1)   | (1/4)   | (2/2)  |

Note. A dash indicates that the speaker did not use the source of information in the session.
Table 15. Percentages with Numerators and Denominators of Occasions a Teacher Used the Same Source of Information within Three Turns after the Facilitator or Selected Teacher for Session 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
<th>Brenda</th>
<th>Allison</th>
<th>Nancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal experience</td>
<td>90 (9/10)</td>
<td>96.88 (31/32)</td>
<td>94.03 (63/67)</td>
<td>90.7 (39/43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothetical example</td>
<td>100 (1/1)</td>
<td>71.43 (5/7)</td>
<td>60 (3/5)</td>
<td>33.33 (1/3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book-club text</td>
<td>100 (6/6)</td>
<td>71.43 (5/7)</td>
<td>0 (0/1)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other experts</td>
<td>0 (0/4)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0 (0/1)</td>
<td>0 (0/2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. A dash indicates that the speaker did not use the source of information in the session.

Table 16. Percentages with Numerators and Denominators of Occasions a Teacher Used the Same Source of Information within Three Turns after the Facilitator or Selected Teacher for Session 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
<th>Brenda</th>
<th>Allison</th>
<th>Nancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal experience</td>
<td>88.89 (8/9)</td>
<td>82.61 (19/23)</td>
<td>90.91 (20/22)</td>
<td>89.47 (17/19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothetical example</td>
<td>100 (3/3)</td>
<td>84.21 (16/19)</td>
<td>100 (1/1)</td>
<td>66.67 (6/9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book-club text</td>
<td>100 (12/12)</td>
<td>42.86 (6/14)</td>
<td>100 (6/6)</td>
<td>100 (5/5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other experts</td>
<td>0 (0/2)</td>
<td>0 (0/4)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. A dash indicates that the speaker did not use the source of information in the session.
Session 5, but the slight decrease in use was not sustained in session 6. As can be seen in row 3, the Other Expert source showed a very slight decline across all sessions, from 5.8% in Session 1 to 2.11% in Session 6. While decreases over time in the use of Hypothetical Example and Other Experts could be identified, the actual changes in the percentages were very small.

*Were There Occasions When the Teachers Connected the Hypothetical Example Source to the Book-Club Text Source and Vise Versa?*

The results from previous analyses suggested that teachers did not use the Book-Club Text much as a source of authority. It remained possible that there might be instances when teachers did connect the Book-Club Text to their Hypothetical Examples. To determine whether there were occasions when use of the Book-Club Text as a source of authority was connected to the use of Hypothetical Example, I first determined how often the two sources were used in the same turn. The number of such turns was very small, so small that it was clear that, on the whole, teachers did not connect text to hypothetical examples or vice versa. The number of coded turns that used both sources was as follows: Session 1—0%, 0/293; Session 2—3.44%, 18/523; Session 3—0%, 0/408; Session 4—0.41%, 1/246; Session 5—0.31%, 1/324; and Session 6—0.35%, 1/284.

In the few cases where Book-Club Text and Hypothetical Example source use occurred in the same turn, the teachers first referenced the Book-Club Text as authoritative then railed against the authority with the use of Hypothetical Example. The following are two examples. In the first, the teachers were discussing some challenging
Table 17. Percentages with Numerators and Denominators of Occasions when the Speaker used a Source in Enough Coded Turns to Gauge the Potential Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
<th>Brenda</th>
<th>Allison</th>
<th>Nancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Personal experience 100</td>
<td>Personal experience 88.37</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(35/35)</td>
<td>(38/43)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Personal experience 95.45</td>
<td>Personal experience 93.15</td>
<td>Personal experience 97.92</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(21/22)</td>
<td>(68/73)</td>
<td>(47/48)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Personal experience 89.74</td>
<td>Personal experience 90.38</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(70/78)</td>
<td>(47/52)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Personal experience 96.43</td>
<td>Personal experience 90.24</td>
<td>Personal experience 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(27/28)</td>
<td>(37/41)</td>
<td>(28/28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Personal experience 96.88</td>
<td>Personal experience 94.03</td>
<td>Personal experience 90.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(31/32)</td>
<td>(63/67)</td>
<td>(39/43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Personal experience 82.61</td>
<td>Personal experience 90.91</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(19/23)</td>
<td>(20/22)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* A dash indicates that the speaker did not use a source in enough coded turns to gauge for the session.
interactions they had with parents. Brenda tied their discussion of parents back to the text, but then quickly refuted what the text said. In the second example, Allison referred to the structure of Reading Recovery instruction, which was the text topic, then asserted that the structure itself makes Reading Recovery teachers less responsive to students’ needs.

BRENDA: Well that’s what it said in here (the text) was that they had parents all buy into that (Success for All program), too…That would be nice, but in reality, that doesn’t really happen.

ALLISON: …But you said something too about how structured Reading Recovery is, and I think that does benefit some of the children with learning difficulties, and it benefits some others. But I think a piece of that too is that because it is so structured, there is not flexibility, and they are not really taking cues from the children, and teaching them based on how they learn.

Summary of Results

On the whole, teachers used Personal Experience far more than any other source of information. The teachers used Hypothetical Example with the second most frequency, the Book-Club Text with the third most frequency, and Other Experts with the least frequency of the four sources. On the whole the teachers used the sources of information with the same relative frequency as one another and as they did overall, with only two minor exceptions. There were some very minor variations in the extent to which the teachers relied on the sources.

The impact of the Facilitator was negligible because he did not speak much during the book-club discussions. However, when the Facilitator did speak the teachers were likely to use three of the sources, Personal Experience, Hypothetical Example, and the Book-Club Text after the facilitator did, but were not likely to use Other Experts after the facilitator did. I also found that the teachers were likely to use the same source of
Table 18. *Time-Ordered Matrix of Progression of Source Use Across Sessions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Session 1</th>
<th>Session 2</th>
<th>Session 3</th>
<th>Session 4</th>
<th>Session 5</th>
<th>Session 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Book-Club Text</td>
<td>6.48</td>
<td>8.98</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>11.79</td>
<td>6.48</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Experts</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Experience</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>86.76</td>
<td>82.52</td>
<td>89.19</td>
<td>57.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothetical Example</td>
<td>21.16</td>
<td>19.89</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>9.76</td>
<td>8.95</td>
<td>31.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

information after another teacher used it, suggesting that the Facilitator’s impact on which sources of information the teachers used was the same as the impact of the teachers on one another.

There were no significant progressive increases or decreases in the use of any of the sources over time during the course of the six book-club sessions, though there were some slight tendencies for change in extent of use of some sources. The use of Hypothetical Examples decreased slightly between Sessions 1 and 5, but the slight decrease was not sustained during Session 6. The use of Other Experts decreased slightly over all six sessions.

The teachers rarely used the Book-Club Text and Hypothetical Examples as sources of information within the same turn, making it clear that the teacher did not connect the two sources. Still, on the occasions when the Book-Club Text and
Hypothetical Examples were used in the same turn by the teachers, they railed against the authority of the Book-Club Text as a source of information by using a Hypothetical Example.
Chapter 5

Conclusions and Discussion

In the present chapter I present and discuss the conclusions related to the research questions. First, conclusions are presented for the two main research questions. Next, limitations of the study are named. Then, a discussion of the possible meanings of the conclusions is provided. Finally, implications for professional development facilitators and further research are suggested. Recall that the research questions guiding the current study were: What sources of information do teachers use in book club discussions; and is there variability among teachers in which sources of information they use in book club discussions?

Conclusions

First, teachers used Personal Experience as a source of information in their book-club discussions far more than they used any other source. The source they used with the next greatest frequency was Hypothetical Example, followed by the Book-Club Text and finally, Other Experts. The teachers used the Book-Club Text and Other Experts infrequently in their discussions.

Second, with one very minor exception, there was not substantial variability among teachers in their source use. The teachers were similar to one another in that they all used Personal Experience with the greatest frequency and Hypothetical Examples with the second greatest frequency. They used the Book-Club Text with the third most
frequency and Other Experts the least frequently. An exception to the pattern was that two of the teachers, Allison and Mary, differed slightly from the other four, using Other Experts with the third most frequency and the Book-Club Text the least.

Limitation of the Current Study

A limitation of the current study is that the book club relied on a single text. As I stated in the Results chapter, the teachers asserted during their Session 5 discussion that the text used in the current study was too research focused. The text the teachers read for the current study presented results of several research studies, and may have been difficult for the teachers to relate to. The teachers wanted more practical information that they could apply in their classrooms and did not seem to regard the information in the text as relevant to their professional practice. If the teachers read and discussed a variety of texts, the results may have been different. Different types of texts may have led teachers to draw on different sources of information as authority in their discussions. For example, research has shown that when teachers read other types of texts, such as adolescent literature (Bean, Valerio, Mallette & Readance, 1999; Chevalier & Houser, 1997; Flood, et. al., 1994; Flood & Lapp, 1994; George, 2001; George, 2002; Kooy, 2006), autobiographical texts related to teaching (Florio-Ruane, 2001; Florio-Ruane & Raphael, 2001; McVee, 2004; Raphael, Damphousse, Highfield & Florio-Ruane, 2001), case studies for teaching (Cennamo, 1998; Levin, 1999), or texts that presented specific instructional strategies (Adger, Hoyle & Dickinson, 2004), the teachers were likely to discuss concepts from the text.
Discussion

In the present section I discuss possible meanings for the conclusions for the two research questions.

*What sources of information do teachers use in their book-club discussions?* It was surprising that teachers used the Book-Club Text as a source of information so infrequently in their discussions. In the Introduction I argued that if teachers used the Book-Club Text as a source of information and an authority in their discussions, they might be more likely to critically assess the book-club topics. Research has shown that when teachers make direct reference to the text during professional development discussions, they are likely to develop new or enhanced understandings of the text topic (Adger, Hoyle & Dickinson, 2004). Also, because texts selected for teacher book clubs typically contain information that is research-based, it stands to reason that if teachers used the Book-Club Text they would be more likely to critically assess and potentially adopt theoretical views and/or professional practices from the text. However the teachers in the current study used the Book-Club Text with the third most frequency of the four sources, in only 8.66% of total coded turns (see Table 1).

A possible explanation for the relatively low percentage with which the teachers used the Book-Club Text is that the particular text the teachers chose for their book club, *Getting Reading Right From the Start* (Heibert & Taylor, 1994) may have been difficult for the teachers to understand and/or relate to their teaching. As was described in the Methods chapter, the Book-Club Text presented the results from a series of research studies in a format typical of research articles, but included only a few ideas for lesson planning or direct suggestions for working with struggling readers. Instead the
suggestions were implied through the research findings. As was presented in the Results chapter, the teachers explained during Session 5 that the text contained more “percentages and research data” and fewer practice-based suggestions than they hoped for (recall the example presented in the Results chapter). Because the teachers viewed the book as irrelevant in some ways to their teaching, they may have been unlikely to use the Book-Club Text as a source of information.

Another possible explanation of the teachers’ infrequent use of the Book-Club text might involve a difference between teachers’ views of published research versus researchers’ views of published research. It is possible that the teachers did not believe that the research presented in the text, and research in general, had much to offer them in relation to their teaching practice. Jensen (1985) observed that teachers often view published research as difficult to understand and irrelevant to their classroom. A way to address the teachers’ views of research in the context of teacher book clubs may be for professional development facilitators to spend time helping teachers identify the value of research for improving their practice.

It was also surprising that the teachers used Personal Experience so frequently in their discussions. In the Introduction, I asserted that using Personal Experience could be more or less likely to lead to the desired outcomes of the book club, which is to help teachers critically assess and potentially adopt the proposed instructional practice or view presented in the text. The use of Personal Experience may help teachers connect epistemic knowledge (Fitzgerald, 2004; Kessels & Korthagen, 1996) from the text with phronetic knowledge (Fitzgerald, 2004; Kessels & Korthagen, 1996) of their classroom experience, making Personal Experience a useful way to critically assess and potentially
adopt new practices. On the other hand, if teachers focus their discussions on Personal Experience they may over-emphasize specifics of their own classrooms and schools that contradict information from the text.

The use of Personal Experience may have been helpful to the teachers in critically assessing the topics of the book club because the use of Personal Experience may have assisted teachers in connecting the information in the book-club text to their personal experiences as teachers. Theoretically, if teachers connected Personal Experience with the topic from the text, they would synthesize information from a variety of sources and develop more complete understandings of the text topic (Bakhtin, 1986; Dysthe, 1999; Gee, 2001; Gumperz, 1982; Lemke, 1990; Tedlock & Mannheim, 1995; Wu, 2003). Making connections between the text and personal experience within the context of professional development discussions could result in more complete understandings of the topics from the text, as it has in the context of other teacher book clubs (Bean, Valerio, Mallette & Readance, 1999; Chevalier & Houser, 1997; Flood, et. al., 1994; Flood & Lapp, 1994; George, 2001; George, 2002) and other professional development discussions (Adger, Hoyle & Dickinson, 2004; Levin, 1999). Discussion focused on personal experience has been shown to help teachers develop their understandings of professional development topics (Cavazos, 2001; Chevalier & Houser, 1997; Rust, 1998; Rust & Orland, 2001; Swidler, 2001) and may have similarly helped the teachers in the current study.

On the other hand, the extensive use of Personal Experience may have been less likely to lead to the desired outcomes of the book club, which is to help teachers critically assess and potentially adopt the proposed instructional practice or view presented in the
text. In the Introduction, I suggested that if the Personal Experience source was used too often by teachers as a source of information in book-club discussions, it could result in an overemphasis on the specifics of the individual teachers’ classrooms at the expense of critical evaluation of professional topics presented in the book-club text. Recall the example presented in the Results chapter from Session 2 during which the teachers began to discuss nutrition as a possible explanation for some students’ difficulties in school, causing them to stray from the literacy topic that was to be the focus of the discussion. The discussion about nutrition may have helped the teachers develop their understandings of their students’ difficulties in school, but it also caused the teachers to stray from the topic presented in the book-club text, which was Reading Recovery.

While the teachers used the Book-Club Text very infrequently in their discussions, they used Personal Experience far more than they used any other source of information. It is possible that when the Book-Club Text seemed too far removed from their professional practice, the teachers drew on Personal Experience as a way to connect information from the text to their classrooms. For example, the topic from the Book-Club Text for Session 3 was a small-group intervention for Chapter-1 students. Rather than referencing information from the text about the specifics of the small-group intervention, the teachers talked about their Personal Experiences implementing small-group instruction in their own classrooms. What ensued was an extensive discussion using examples from the teachers’ classrooms about small-group instruction. While the discussion appeared to enhance the teachers’ understandings of small-group instruction in general, and in particular how they all used small-groups for literacy instruction in their classrooms, they talked very little about the research presented in the text. Had they
incorporated information from the Book-Club Text along with Personal Experience more frequently in the discussion, it is likely that they would have enhanced or added to their understandings of using small-groups for literacy instruction rather than reinforcing their previously held understandings.

As with the Book-Club Text, the teachers used Other Experts as a source of information very infrequently in their discussions, in only 3.75% of total coded turns across sessions. The result is surprising considering that when teachers use Other Experts as a source of information and an authority in their book club discussions, they may be more likely to develop research-based understandings of the topic that align with the instructional practices or theoretical views presented in the book-club text. Information presented by other experts such as professors and workshop facilitators is typically grounded in a sound research base, making the information drawn from those sources reputable. Also, some studies (Cavazos, 2001; Dysthe, 1999; Flood, et al., 1994) and theoretical writings about how people create meaning in discussions by drawing upon previous encounters with the topic (Bakhtin, 1986; Dysthe, 1999; Gee, 2001; Gumperz, 1982; Lemke, 1990; Tedlock & Mannheim, 1995; Wu, 2003) suggest that referencing Other Experts, such as professors and other workshop facilitators, during professional development discussions may help teachers combine their previous understandings of a topic with new information from the text, resulting in new understandings.

There are three possible explanations for the infrequent use of Other Experts. First, the teachers may have had few other professional development experiences with the topics from the current book club. If the teachers did not participate in previous
professional development with a similar focus to the current book club, the teachers may have had limited information from Other Experts to use as a source of information.

Second, if the teachers did have prior experiences with the book-club topics, they may not have made connections to those experiences for reasons similar to the ones I suggested related to the infrequent use of the Book-Club Text. Because the Book-Club Text may have been difficult for the teachers to understand, they may not have made connections between the topics presented in the text and their classroom practice. Similarly, they may not have made connections between the book-club topics and Other Expert sources they encountered in the past if topics presented by Other Experts were difficult to understand or did not seem relevant to their classroom practice.

A third possible explanation for the infrequent use of Other Experts as a source of information is that some of the knowledge teachers gained from Other Experts in the past may have been internalized by the teachers and presented by them as Personal Experience. For example, if a teacher learned how to conduct an Interactive Writing lesson from a college professor and used the lesson structure numerous times since, the teacher may have referenced Interactive Writing as something that she knew about without citing the professor from whom she learned it. In the Results section, I suggested that there were two kinds of Personal Experience turns, some associated with professional knowledge that the teachers already possess through their prior professional training combined with classroom experience and others associated with students or events the teachers have encountered in their classrooms or schools. When teachers possessed knowledge that they previously gained from professors or workshop
facilitators and internalized into their professional practice, the knowledge was likely to be presented as Personal Experience.

After Personal Experience, the teachers used Hypothetical Examples as a source of information with the next greatest frequency in their discussions. As with the Personal Experience, the teachers may have used Hypothetical Examples frequently if they felt the text was too research focused and not relevant to their teaching. Because Hypothetical Examples are based on teachers’ self-made, generalized understandings of the topic at hand, teachers may have created and used them during their discussions in an effort to make sense of topics they had difficulty understanding or relating to. To draw on an example presented in the Introduction, during a book-club discussion a teacher may claim that students already reading above grade level do not need much instructional time. The statement is a generalization based on a teacher’s assumption about something she may have experienced or observed. A teacher making the statement above may have encountered students who excelled as readers with little instructional support, and based on her understanding of the particular situation, made an assumption about all higher-level readers.

The assumptions associated with Hypothetical Examples can be value-laden. Hypothetical Examples are akin to Gee’s “cultural models” (2001), which are representations of the world people create based on their value set and ideology. People use cultural models (Gee, 2001) and Hypothetical Examples as a means to understand the world and simplify it. As I suggested in the Results section, teachers sometimes used Hypothetical Examples to contradict a point they made from the Book-Club Text. It is possible that teachers turned to Hypothetical Examples when the point from the text
contradicted their value set. Additionally, teachers used Hypothetical Example far more than they used the Book-Club Text. The reliance on Hypothetical Example may indicate reluctance on the part of the teachers to reconsider their previously held values and ideology. If teachers are not willing to reconsider their values and ideology when contradicted by the Book-Club Text, it is unlikely that they will meet the goals of the teacher book club, which are to critically assess and potentially adopt new theories or practices.

The results of the current study have implications for the possibility of teachers meeting the goals of professional development book clubs. In the Introduction I suggested that if teachers used more reliable sources of information such as the Book-Club Text and Other Experts, they would be more likely to meet the goals than if they used less reliable sources such as Hypothetical Examples and in some cases Personal Experience. The results show that teachers in fact used what I considered to be less reliable sources far more often than they used the sources I considered to be more reliable. The emphasis on potentially less reliable sources may have hindered the teachers’ achievement of the desired outcomes of the teacher book club. Therefore, the results of the current study may lead facilitators to reconsider how teacher book clubs for professional development are structured. In the Implications section I discuss ways the facilitator might reconsider the structure of teacher book club discussions to encourage teachers to use the potentially more reliable sources.

Because a Facilitator was present, it was important to explore whether he may have impacted teachers’ source use. If he did not impact the teachers’ source use, then the conclusion about rank order of source use could more reliably be untainted by his
presence. If he did impact the teachers’ source use, then the conclusion about teachers’ rank order of source use might not hold true for occasions when a Facilitator would not be present. In fact, the Facilitator did not speak very often during the book-club discussions, making his impact difficult to gauge. When he did speak the teachers in general were likely to use the same source of information after he used it. However, whatever impact he may have had did not vary from the impact teachers had on one another because, similarly, the teachers were likely to use the same source after another teacher did.

Because the Facilitator spoke so infrequently, his impact on the teachers’ source use was negligible. However, had he spoken more frequently in the discussions, the Facilitator may have led the teachers to spend more time critically assessing the topics from the Book-Club Text than they did because he was more likely to use the Book-Club Text and Other Experts than any of the teachers were, Similarly, because the Facilitator was less likely to use Hypothetical Examples than were any of the teachers, had he spoken more his participation may have led the teachers to rely on Hypothetical Examples less than they did. I suggested in the Introduction that the Book-Club Text and Other Experts are potentially more reliable sources of information in leading the teachers to critically assess the book-club topics and that Hypothetical Examples are potentially a less reliable source. It follows that if the Facilitator had spoken more often, using the Book-Club Text and Other Experts more often than the teachers did and Hypothetical Examples less than the teachers did, then the teachers may have spent more time critically assessing the text. Also, had the Facilitator spoken more often during the book-
club discussions, he may have contributed more turns that referenced the Book-Club Text, and in turn the teachers may have also referenced the Book-Club Text more often.

Is there variability among teachers in which sources of information they use in book-club discussions? The results indicated that, on the whole, there was not much variability among the teachers in which sources of information they used in the book-club discussions. There are two possible reasons for the conclusion. The first possible reason that the teachers did not vary from one another in their source use may be due to the fact that all six teachers comprised the first-grade team at a single school, they likely shared many professional experiences. Therefore, they may have been more likely to talk about the same things than if they had more varied professional experiences. It may have been easier for them to draw on Personal Experience, for example, since their Personal Experiences were often shared.

A second possible reason the teachers did not vary much from one another in their source use was that they did not seem to value the research they read in the text, and they wanted more practical information that they could apply in their classrooms. The teachers all appeared to share the opinion that the Book-Club Text was too far removed from their professional practice for the teachers to make connections. Since the teachers viewed the text as research-focused and lacking in practical value, as evidenced in their discussions, they may have all used Personal Experience and Hypothetical Examples more and the Book-Club Text and Other Experts less.

Implications

In the present section I discuss possible implications of the current study for professional development facilitators. I then discuss implications for future research.
Implications for professional development facilitators. When designing professional development activities, and teacher book clubs in particular, facilitators are likely to select texts and materials that present sound, research-based pedagogical practices and theoretical views to teachers because theoretically facilitators would like teachers to critically assess and potentially adopt such practices and views. Additionally, facilitators are likely to choose activities such as teacher-led discussion, which has been shown in some cases to positively affect teachers’ understanding of the material (Adger, Hoyle & Dickinson, 2004; Cavazos, 2001; Deglau, Ward, O’Sullivan & Bush, 2006; Florio-Ruane, 2001; Florio-Ruane & Raphael, 2001; Levin, 1999; Passman & McKnight, 2002; Rust & Orland, 2001; Shafer, 1995; Swidler, 2001; Wiltz, 2000). An assumption implicit in these decisions is that professional development facilitators want teachers to discuss, critique, and potentially adopt ideas presented in the materials they have selected. Therefore, facilitators must design professional development activities to optimize the desired outcomes.

An assumption of the current study, based on adult learning theory (Baumgartner, Lee, Birden & Flowers, 2003; Clardy, 2005; Kiely, Sandmann & Truluck, 2004; Knowles, 1978; Knowles, 1984; Merriam, 2001) is that adults are self-directed learners and when given autonomy in their professional development, they will be motivated to learn (Knowles, 1978; Knowles, 1984). However, research is inconsistent in regards to whether self-directed approaches to adult learning lead to successful outcomes (Clardy, 2005). Some research suggests that self-directed approaches to adult learning such as teacher book clubs and study groups may not lead to successful outcomes of helping teachers critique and potentially adopt new views and/or practices (Clardy, 2005; Lloyd,
2005). For example, Lloyd (2005) found that when teachers who participated in a self-directed study group were asked to record what they discussed in their meetings, they were unlikely to record that they discussed the new instructional practices that were to be the focus of the discussions. Instead, after meeting for two years, the teachers appeared to repeatedly discuss topics related to practices they used prior to the study groups. The results imply that with complete autonomy in their discussions, teachers may not venture to discuss novel topics. Lloyd (2005) suggests that facilitator support may be key to changing the results. Knowles’ (1978; 1984) suggestions for ways that the facilitator might support and motivate self-directed learning, such as “reacting to student inquiries Socratically by asking questions” (Clardy, 2005, p. 11) could potentially keep teachers engaged and motivated to explore novel professional development topics.

Adult learning theory (Baumgartner, Lee, Birden & Flowers, 2003; Clardy, 2005; Kiely, Sandmann & Truluck, 2004; Knowles, 1978; Knowles, 1984; Merriam, 2001) suggests several ways that the facilitator might support learning in an adult learning context. The facilitator might play a crucial role in orchestrating the professional development activities to optimize learning. The facilitator could engage with the learners in mutual planning and work with the learners to create learning objectives for the professional development activity (Knowles, 1978; Knowles, 1984). Additionally, the facilitator is charged with creating a climate of acceptance, trust, and respect among learners (Clardy, 2005; Knowles, 1984), which is essential for constructive discussion to take place (Brookfield & Preskill, 1999). Finally, the facilitator could spend time before the professional development activities commence preparing the learners by informing them about the skills of self-directed learning such as how to build relationships and learn
on one’s own (Clardy, 2005; Knowles, 1984) and discussing how research presented in the text connects with their classroom practice (Jensen, 1985). The above recommendations imply that the facilitator might spend more time during the planning and pre-implementation phase of a professional development book club working with the teachers to plan and prepare them for the learning task.

One way that facilitators might work with teachers to mutually plan professional development activities (Knowles, 1978; Knowles, 1984) is to provide more guidance in text selection. For example, a type of text that may lead teachers to use the text more frequently as a source of information is case studies for teaching, which are short written scenarios that “represent the problems, dilemmas, and complexity of teaching something to someone in some context” (Levin, 1999, p. 63). Because case studies are in narrative form and often present complex dilemmas from classrooms and schools, when used as the text for professional development discussions, case studies may seem more relevant to teachers and help them focus on the topic. Kiely, Sandmann and Truluck (2004) suggest “finding ways to engage adult learners in more authentic activities that require learning for real-life problems and situations” (p. 25). Case studies for teaching target real-life problems and situations by presenting classroom scenarios, therefore case studies may be more engaging to adult learners.

Levin (1999) found that when teachers discussed case studies for teaching, their discussions led them to consider new perspectives on the topic of the case study. It is more likely that teachers would view classroom scenarios represented by a case study for teaching as relevant to their own classroom teaching, in contrast to the text used in the current study, which presented research results in the format typical of research articles.
In light of the results presented in the current study, it might be beneficial for professional development facilitators to take a greater role in teacher book-club discussions. Facilitators should be aware that teacher book clubs with teacher-led discussion as the primary activity may or may not optimally target the desired outcomes because teachers appear to talk about Personal Experience and Hypothetical Examples very often and the Book-Club Text and Other Expert sources very little. Facilitators might help teachers achieve the goals of critically assessing and potentially adopting information from the text if they participate during the discussions by referring to information from the text, supplementing information from the text with other knowledge about the topic, posing guiding questions, and offering their own opinions.

Facilitators would be wise to remain aware of the extent to which Personal Experience is used in professional development discussions. At times when teachers use the Personal Experience source to connect information from the text to their classroom practice, the facilitator might encourage its use. However, at times when the Personal Experience source is used in such a way that it focuses the discussion on particulars from the teachers’ classrooms or schools and away from the book-club topic, the facilitator may refocus the discussions toward the book-club topic should the use of Personal Experience focus the discussion on specifics of the personal experience that contradict the Book-Club Text.

It might benefit professional development facilitators to be aware of the frequent use of Hypothetical Examples by teachers in book-club discussions. Teachers are unlikely to benefit from the use of Hypothetical Examples in their book-club discussions because Hypothetical Examples represent simplified understandings of situations or
events related to the topic that may or may not hold true in all situations. Because the current study showed that teachers used Hypothetical Examples in 17.28% of their coded turns, facilitators should be aware of the potential impact of the source. When teachers use Hypothetical Examples in their discussions, facilitators would be wise to challenge the assumptions present in the Hypothetical Examples and help teachers either substantiate or refute the statements.

Teachers used the Book-Club Text or Other Experts infrequently in their discussions. The limited use of the two sources is something for facilitators to be aware of. Since the Book-Club Text and Other Experts represent sources of information that are potentially more likely to lead to desired outcomes of book-club discussions, it is recommended that facilitators guide discussions toward the use of the two sources. For example, the facilitators of the professional development course researched by Adger, Hoyle and Dickinson (2004) used guiding questions that were specifically aimed at focusing the discussion on the text and other assignments related to the topic. The guiding questions led teachers to develop more complete understandings of the topic through their discussions. Facilitator involvement in book-club discussions may be one way to guide discussions to the professional development topic, the goal being for the teachers to critically assess the topic.

*Implications for future research.* Future research on teacher book clubs could consider how source use affects teachers’ developing understandings of book-club topics and whether they adopt new pedagogical practices as a result of participation in the book club. Additional data sources combined with an examination of source use similar to the current study could enhance the current findings. For instance, teacher interviews or
surveys as an additional data source could allow researchers to investigate whether teachers’ understandings of the book-club topics changed after the teacher participated in the book club. A way to investigate whether the teachers’ understanding of the topics changed after they participated in the discussions would be to ask teachers about their understandings of the book-club topic before the first book-club meeting and after the last one, and identify instances where the teachers’ understandings appeared to develop or change. A comparison of the teachers’ interview responses to the discussion transcripts, looking for evidence that teachers talked about the particular topics that appeared to develop or change, could allow future researchers to identify whether the teachers’ understandings of the topics changed as a result of the discussions. Also, classroom observations could allow researchers to investigate whether teachers used new information from the book-club discussions in their classrooms.

As I suggested in the Introduction, the Book-Club Text and Other Experts may be more useful sources of information for teachers to use as authority in their discussions while Personal Experience and Hypothetical Examples may be more or less helpful. Conclusions from the current study suggest that teachers talk about Personal Experience and Hypothetical Examples very often and the Book-Club Text and Other Expert sources very little. Additional information gained through future research could allow researchers to make more direct connections between the sources of information the teachers use, the understandings they develop, and changes teacher make in their teaching through participation in teacher book clubs.
Appendix A

Transcription conventions

Overlapping talk

Overlapping talk is signified by single brackets placed around the overlap.

Example: Allison: [I know!]
          Brenda: [created such] an argument

Continuous talk

Talk that is overlapped by another but continues without pause is signified by double backslashes at the end of one turn and the beginning of the next.

Example: Nancy: it’s harder for these parents//
          Linda: [Oh, yeah.]
          Nancy: //[/because] I mean, I’m having you know, and um, so I can understand.

Extraneous vocalizations

Noises such as laughter or clapping are signified by the sound or a description of the sound put in parentheses.

Example: Linda: Well, the first year I was here I had a little boy from Korea. And you know, this is, this is, I was used to teaching in the hood, I mean I knew how to communicate with them, you know?
          (laughter)
          Linda: But then, now, they all spoke English!
          (laughter)

Pauses

Pauses are indicated by a period in parentheses.

Example: Linda: //I think if you start to you know really immerse them into the good, you know, into those simple little books and you (.) well you know they do talk here about the vowels and the vowel, I mean,

Continuers from unidentifiable speaker

Continuers, such as “yeah,” “right,” “OK,” and “um, hm” for which the speaker is unidentifiable are indicated by the continuer shown in parentheses on a separate line.
Example: June: At first I thought it was saying that they should learn to read in Spanish. Did you get that too?
(yeah)
June: First. Before the English.
(yeah)
Nancy: Yeah, the Spanish, in kindergarten, should be reading with the parents.

Transcriptionist doubt

Talk that is inaudible to the transcriptionist is indicated by the word “inaudible” in parentheses.

Example: Facilitator: Ok. That’s good.
Brenda: (inaudible) and then I learn from them.
Appendix B

Coding rules

The following are guidelines that will be followed when coding data.

*Code 1, Book club text:*

**Speaker makes direct reference to the text**

Example:  BRENDA: …is that it says “Effective Early Literacy Prevention” and it was written where we were thinking, “This is ideas. These are things you can take into your classroom and put into work.” And yet, as you are reading, it is just all the research. It’s the research on what others have found out, but I think the thing that is kind of disappointing is that it is not, um, really interventions to use

MARY: And I have a couple of things highlighted. Is that at one point I did highlight when I was reading through this is, there are a couple of things that I agree with, but, it said, “If Reading Recovery is to be effective, special events need to be limited during the brief period of Reading Recovery instruction.”

**Speaker makes direct reference to the topic dealt with in the text**

Example:  LINDA: Reading Recovery is all great and grand until it doesn’t work, and way we say it, Oh, well. We don’t worry about the non-successes.

JUNE: This is about literacy groups.

**Speaker makes reference to a topic from the text that was discussed during another book club session**

Example:  NANCY: [Wasn’t that something that] they pointed out, in the first, or maybe it was the second chapter, whatever I read, was that schools try to hide the fact that they have so many kids that are coming in that are not able to pass these assessments//

BRENDA: Is that what we were talking about last time, Reading Recovery?

*Code 2, Other expert:*

**Speaker makes direct reference to another source, for example naming a professor or workshop facilitator**
Example: ALLISON: Here’s something, though, that, you know, this talked about fluency, um, one workshop I went to, um, hearing this man say, and it, for some reason I had heard it before, but this, it just impressed upon me differently that time, that, at a literacy center, say the listening center, or the reading center, that a way to keep them accountable and get them more fluent is to tell them that they need to reread that same story until they can read it flawlessly.

MARY: …the two Reading Recovery teachers we had, Sally and Jane, they worked so closely with us. We were like, meshed. They came in and showed us how they were doing the reading, taught us how to do all of the different techniques.

**Speaker makes reference to another research-based instructional model or program in a way that attributes the model or program to its authors**

Example: MARY: This is the Fountas and Pinnell phonics.

FACILITATOR: Is that Literacy Collaborative (that you are describing)?

**Speaker discusses policy issues in a way that attributes them to expert decision-makers**

Example: LINDA: Well, the way No Child Left Behind is set up, the thinking is that it would close the achievement gap.

LINDA: Because they’re making, they’ve made an incredible amount of progress. But what the thing is, you’ve got those legislators saying, “Well, you know, that’s terrific, but this 8 needs to be an 18.”

*Code 3, Personal experience:*

**Speaker states that the topic of her turn is from her own classroom**

Example: ALLISON: So this year we are able to mix up the groups, and they know where to go, they have a centers chart, where they check off where they went each day. And, you know, if a center is full then they just go to the next one.

JUNE: We’ve got our two literacy people, they are pulling kids over and giving them explicit, maybe even one-on-one, you know?

**Speaker states that she was directly involved in the event that she describes**

Example: LINDA: And what I did is I looped up with my kids, so I was not a first grader last year, I was a second grader. SO…they started literacy groups last year, and then this year, of course, they say, OK we’re doing literacy groups
again, and I’m feeling like I’m not in the loop, you know? And I’m, what am I supposed to do with these three groups? And, what’s my plan? And, what do I do? And, what’s the best approach for?

BRENDA: I have Ms. Dole, she comes in, we have three groups. Ms. Dole does the word work with them, Patricia does the writing piece with them, and I do the reading, the guided reading groups.

**Speaker describes her own classroom or students from her own classroom, but does not explicitly state the source of the topic**

Example:  BRENDA: You know, with the children, you know, they are making alphabet books, they’re having some sort of book or some sort of dictionary that is just personally theirs. They have the word walls where they are concentrating on one word

ALLISON: Because that’s what happens, you know, in the listening center, they’re not really reading, they’re listening.

**Speaker describes her own interactions with a student, parent, administrator, or other professional contact**

Example:  MARY: That’s right, because um, well, Mr.--., well, his literacy teacher, well, now you all know who it is, but, um, his literacy teacher said to me, the last week when he was exited, that one little basic word, “and” or something, that they had been working on all 20 weeks.

ALLISON: Here’s a story. I had a student last year, um, having lots of troubles, but she ended up being a strong reader.

**Speaker describes administrative, school-based, or district-based policy that relates directly to her teaching or classroom**

Example:  ALLISON: Well, it is also the school. Like, I know it is site based decisions, too, because I’m on the literacy team, and the literacy team decided at the beginning of the year who we would consider for Reading Recovery and who we would not, and really it boils down to there needs to be communication between the Reading Recovery teacher and the classroom teacher, but that if a child is being served, in another area, then they would not be considered first on the list, so that is why I am curious about that.

ALLISON: They changed the writing (assessment) day on us…we found out today that it’s Tuesday.

*Code 4, Hypothetical example:*
Speaker describes an event, experience or relationship of which she does not have first-hand knowledge

Example: LINDA: The scary thing about it, too, is that now the learning disabled children are really fretting, and, and really freaking out, because it is really scary, third and fifth grade tests.

BRENDA: Well, the other thing is with the adults, too, is if they didn’t have money where ever they lived, they did not go to school, so they do not know letters, numbers, whatever…

Speaker generalizes about a topic without grounding statements in actual experiences

Example: LINDA: And you know these children aren’t getting any attention at home, any help with homework

BRENDA: You know, we could stand on our heads and teach them abc’s and 123’s all we want but if they are not interested…then they will be low performing.

None of the four sources mentioned:

Speaker makes a comment relevant to the professional development topic but uses a source of information other than the four sources already identified

Example: MARY: I just don’t believe in making children take these tests. I do not believe it helps children learn.

Uncoded turns:

Turns transcribed as inaudible

Example: BRENDA: Who was the ESL teacher who (inaudible)

Turns representing extraneous vocalizations

Example: ALLISON: Hmm.

Turns representing continuers

Example: ALLISON: Right. Yeah.

Turns representing incomplete or undeveloped statements

Example: LINDA: But you never…
**Turns in which the speaker discusses a topic unrelated to the topic of the professional development or other educational experiences**

Example:  **BRENDA:** we having a party, and you know, we have parents sending food, she sent in a roasted chicken, it wasn’t cut up or nothin’
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Table of Reviewed Literature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s) and date of publication</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adger, Hoyle &amp; Dickinson, 2004</td>
<td>Locating learning in in-service education for preschool teachers</td>
<td>11 staff members from four preschool programs</td>
<td>video-tapes of professional development sessions</td>
<td>participants jointly constructed meanings during their discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crockett, 2002</td>
<td>Inquiry as professional development: Creating dilemmas through teachers' work</td>
<td>four mathematics teachers</td>
<td>audio-taped discussions</td>
<td>discussions around student work created disagreement and ultimately growth among teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher book clubs with books about school-related issues:</td>
<td>The teacher book club</td>
<td>eight teachers, one staff developer, two media specialists</td>
<td>audio-taped discussions, participant observer fieldnotes</td>
<td>participants reflected on their own reading processes and in turn changed instructional strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldberg &amp; Pesko, 2000</td>
<td>Book discussion groups</td>
<td>School administrators</td>
<td>participant interviews</td>
<td>administrators were introduced to new ideas and stretched their thinking as a result of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Methods</td>
<td>Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelletier, 1993</td>
<td>Professional development through a teacher book club</td>
<td>teachers across grade levels and disciplines</td>
<td>a survey and interviews with participants</td>
<td>participants benefitted from facilitator's style, physical environment, group members themselves, and integration with their daily routines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reilly, 2008</td>
<td>Occasioning possibilities, not certainties: Professional learning and peer-led book clubs</td>
<td>four teachers in a master's course in literacy</td>
<td>participant observer fieldnotes and teachers' written reflections</td>
<td>teachers built on one another's contributions to develop new understandings of literacy topics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selway, 2003</td>
<td>Leading a professional development book club: Staff development to build understanding and grapple with difficult issues</td>
<td>27 high school teachers in one school</td>
<td>participant-observer notes</td>
<td>participants dealt with difficult issues through discussion and changed the way they related to their students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher book clubs using adolescent literature:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Research Focus</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bean, Valerio, Mallette &amp; Readance, 1999</td>
<td>Preservice teachers' discussion of a multicultural young adult novel</td>
<td>20 pre-service teachers</td>
<td>Social Attitude Survey and observations of literature response circles, participant-observer field notes, audio-tapes, and interviews</td>
<td>significant exploration of the participants' own ethnic identities through reading and discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chevalier &amp; Houser, 1997</td>
<td>Preservice teachers' multicultural self-development through adolescent fiction</td>
<td>30 pre-service teachers</td>
<td>participant observation, audio-taped discussions, informal interviews, reflective journals</td>
<td>participants progressed from struggle and resistance to multicultural topics to deep reflection and heightened awareness; also changed plans for future action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood, et al, 1994</td>
<td>Teacher book clubs: A study of teachers' and student teachers' participation in contemporary multicultural fiction literature discussion groups</td>
<td>12 in-service and 10 pre-service teachers</td>
<td>video-taped discussions</td>
<td>participants gained new insights for instruction, increased understanding of multiculturalism, better understanding of their own literacy processing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood &amp; Lapp, 1994</td>
<td>Teacher book clubs: Establishing literature discussion groups for teachers</td>
<td>elementary school teachers and staff members</td>
<td>participant observation</td>
<td>participants developed an awareness of similarities among themselves, colleagues and students despite cultural differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Methods</td>
<td>Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George, 2001</td>
<td>Teachers learning together: Faculty book clubs as professional development in an urban middle school</td>
<td>23 middle school teachers</td>
<td>participant observation and surveys</td>
<td>teachers reflected on their beliefs and practice, engaged in the learning process, and incorporated different works of literature and instructional strategies into their classrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George, 2002</td>
<td>Professional development for a literature-based middle school curriculum</td>
<td>between 8-17 teachers and other faculty at one middle school</td>
<td>survey questionnaires, interviews, informal observation</td>
<td>at least five participants made significant curricular and pedagogical changes as a result of participation in the book club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harlin, Murray &amp; Shea, 2007</td>
<td>Broadening teachers' views of diversity through multicultural book discussions</td>
<td>Inservice teachers in graduate courses</td>
<td>audio-taped discussions</td>
<td>teachers developed culturally responsive stance through discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kooy, 2006</td>
<td>The telling stories of novice teachers: Constructing teacher knowledge in book clubs</td>
<td>six novice teachers</td>
<td>audio- and video-tapes of the discussions</td>
<td>participants co-created new knowledge and identity for developing their professional lives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straits &amp; Nichols, 2007</td>
<td>Using historical nonfiction and literature circles to develop elementary teachers' nature of science understanding</td>
<td>Preservice teachers in a science methods course</td>
<td>audio-taped discussions and students' written responses</td>
<td>making connections between texts and their lives helped teachers develop understandings of topics that are otherwise too cognitive in nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discussion groups using case studies for teaching:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cennamo, 1998</td>
<td>Wait 'til ya hear this one: Professional development through anecdotes</td>
<td>K-12 mathematics teachers</td>
<td>audio-taped discussions and video-tapes of classroom practice</td>
<td>teachers constructed their understandings through sharing and building upon one another's anecdotes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levin, 1999</td>
<td>Using the case method in teacher education: The role of discussion and experience in teachers' thinking about cases</td>
<td>8 student teachers, 8 beginning teachers, and 8 experienced teachers</td>
<td>written responses to cases; video and audio-tapes of discussions</td>
<td>participants who read, wrote about and discussed the case studies with colleagues were more likely to broaden their perspectives and consider new viewpoints related to the topics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher book clubs using autobiographical texts:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Data Collection Methods</td>
<td>Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florio-Ruane, 2001</td>
<td><em>Teacher education and the cultural imagination: Autobiography, conversation, and narrative</em></td>
<td>six pre-service teachers</td>
<td>audio-tapes of discussions and participant-observer fieldnotes</td>
<td>participants expanded their understanding of culture through discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florio-Ruane &amp; Raphael, 2001</td>
<td><em>Reading lives: Learning about culture and literacy in teacher study groups</em></td>
<td>10 teachers enrolled in a master's course</td>
<td>audio-tapes of discussions, fieldnotes, interviews, participants' written texts</td>
<td>through discussions, participants became more willing to talk about and reconsider challenging topics such as race</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McVee, 2004</td>
<td><em>Narrative and the exploration of culture in teachers' discussions of literacy, identity, self and other</em></td>
<td>six practicing teachers and one full-time student</td>
<td>audio- and video-tapes of discussions and fieldnotes</td>
<td>participants constructed narratives that contributed to their learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion groups with no text:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavazos, 2001</td>
<td><em>Connected conversations: Forms and functions of teacher talk</em></td>
<td>10 women secondary science teachers</td>
<td>audio-tapes of monthly discussions</td>
<td>through discussions teachers grew on several dimensions including pedagogical and curricular knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Sample Population</td>
<td>Data Collection Methods</td>
<td>Findings/ implications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rust, 1999</td>
<td>Teachers explore teaching through conversation, story, and narrative</td>
<td>15 undergraduates and recent graduates of a teacher education program</td>
<td>Audio-taped discussions</td>
<td>Peer-teaching through discussions was a powerful tool for new teachers' learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rust &amp; Orland, 2001</td>
<td>Learning the discourse of teaching: Conversation as professional development</td>
<td>Two groups of pre-service and more experienced teachers</td>
<td>Participant observer fieldnotes</td>
<td>Discussions allowed the teachers to contextualize and revisit professional development ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swidler, 2001</td>
<td>Heroes of our own tales: Presentation of self in conversation and story</td>
<td>Five elementary school teachers</td>
<td>Audio-taped discussions</td>
<td>Through discussion teachers repositioned themselves as &quot;heroes&quot; in the context of challenging work environments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deglau, Ward, O'Sullivan &amp; Bush, 2006</td>
<td>Professional dialogue as professional development</td>
<td>17 physical education teachers</td>
<td>Audio-taped discussions, fieldnotes, teacher artifacts, two questionnaires</td>
<td>Participants talked about a variety of school-related topics and drew on one another's expertise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passman &amp; McKnight, 2002</td>
<td>The reflective discussion group: Focused discussion in a high-stakes environment</td>
<td>Six elementary school teachers</td>
<td>Audio-taped discussions, interviews, fieldnotes</td>
<td>Discussions helped teachers understand their roles as guides for instruction; test scores were raised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shafer, 1995</td>
<td>Interactional processes and support structures which foster professional development: A qualitative study</td>
<td>23 first grade and kindergarten teachers and one counselor</td>
<td>audio-taped discussions, participant observer fieldnotes, interviews, document review</td>
<td>among other behaviors she identified &quot;thinking aloud together&quot; as an activity that generated different learning outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiltz, 2000</td>
<td>Group seminars: Dialogues to enhance professional development and reflection</td>
<td>15 student teachers</td>
<td>discussions and journal entries</td>
<td>discussion allowed participants to evaluate their value systems related to teaching</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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