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The ability to reflect on one’s own thoughts and consciousness is a significant power. This goes back as far as progressive education and *Dewey on Education* (1964). This reflectivity has its tenets in teacher and action research. Oftentimes, this type of research is relegated to K-12 research questions for the classroom teacher. The impetus of action research has been to encourage K-12 classroom teachers to improve instruction and make their work public, as well as their processing. In this study, the author seeks to make the work of teacher educators public. In looking at the way in which teacher educators make their work public, in the context of surfacing culture in the classroom, the tools used to do this are just as important. In this case, protocols are those tools.

Teacher Educators and Research
What is teacher research? “Teacher research is a process in which educators determine research “problems” in the context of their schools and classrooms, propose investigative methods appropriate to the problems, systematically observe the results, analyze those results in light of their professional knowledge, and share the results with others while at the same time
enacting change in their classrooms (Bissex & Bullock, 1987; Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1999; Goswami & Stillman, 1987; Kincheloe, 2003; Loughran, 2002; Mohr & MacLean, 1999).” Teacher educators are capable of participating as well as conducting teacher research, especially in the context on modeling pedagogy. Loughran and Berry (2003) found that teacher educators model the tenets of their university’s conceptual framework for education on two levels: “doing” what they expect the preservice teachers to do in the classroom and “offering” students the opportunity to engage with pedagogical affective features like thinking, reasoning, feeling, and responding to a variety of opportunities to teach and learn. Teacher educators use protocols such as think-alouds, journals, and discussions to surface cognition.

Teacher educators provide insight in self-examination as a part of research. World Educational Links (WEL) primes future teachers for non-oppressive teaching, critical pedagogy, and social activism. Reed and Black (2006) found through the WEL program, “(1) Deconstructing the current educational system within its historical and political context, (2) Deep inquiry into issues of equity and social justice in a multicultural world, (3) Constructing a new perspective on our essential task as educators. Implicit in these three tasks is a difficult process of self-scrutiny. This self-examination is impelled by an accumulation of evidence concerning the intern’s privileged position in an unjust social order that is founded on the existence of just such privilege.” Early results seem to authenticate the value of a teacher education model that incorporates theory with practice in a total immersion experience, instead of providing theory in the university classroom apart from meaningful fieldwork. Mentors and WEL faculty correspondingly regarded the interns from each cohort to be very well equipped as teachers, and graduates have had success in finding employment.

A critical question for the field asks, "Are we preparing teacher educators as researchers with purposeful intent”? Harris (2003) found that of 11 Texas universities offering doctoral degrees, while only three programs prepare doctoral candidates for higher education, the rest of the programs target educational leadership in K-12 school settings. When we say as a field that we are nurturing teacher educators as researchers, are we aiding in the transition to develop what we need? Dinkleman’s (2002) research examined the transition from classroom teacher-to-teacher educator. He found four wide-
ranging categories in this metamorphosis: role identification, school and cultural context, frames of understanding, and practitioner's knowledge. If indeed we are, we must be aware of the multiplicity of contexts in which this happens.

When we develop teacher educators who are confident in being able to examine themselves, who is paying attention? Croasdaile (2007) found that teacher research is underutilized, though well reported. Teachers indicated that administration support would enhance instructional implementation devised from the research. The test for school leaders is to take up the concept of prescribed reflective practice and set in the concept into the existing professional development models in their schools; with these supports in place, teacher research may become a more visible means of reflective practice and school improvement.

Little attention is given to the professional knowledge of teacher educators (Brouwer & Korthagen, 2005). Smith (2003) found that in examined the difference between the professional knowledge of teachers and teacher educators, and found similarities as well as distinct differences. The differences actually surfaced through the choice and types of artifacts presented by teacher educators in their dossiers and the standards used to classify the artifacts. Teacher educators have a specialized skill set that bridges pedagogy to practice when it comes to curriculum and instruction. What does the research say about the pedagogy to practice bridge when it comes to culture?

**Teacher Preparation, Culture, and the Teacher Educator**

Part of the cacophony of culture in higher education is the voices included. This serves to make the overall message authentic. Torrez (2003) states that there is a substantial lack of diverse teacher educators with sensitivities to “ethno-linguistic minority” children as the influx of students with diverse backgrounds continue to grow rapidly. Surfacing culture is the one of the most important features of teacher preparation. It is one of the most critical issues facing the most diverse teaching population in the history of public schooling in the Unites States.
The achievement gap locates its fault lines along the race, class, and gender lines (Monroe, 2006). Preservice teachers need exposure to this early in their program and field experiences. “Beyond increasing cultural competency regarding African American children’s communal orientations, teachers can substantially alter negative behavioral trends by creating strong learning communities and promoting a firm sense of attachment among students, families, and educators. When students are intellectually immersed in the academic tasks at hand and hold positive feelings about their schools, teachers, and roles as students, they are clearly more likely to become productive citizens” (Monroe, 2006). A teacher educator who is willing to model taking a risk for a “courageous conversation” is required to get the job done.

As far as teacher preparation is concerned for Native American students, Deloria and Wildcat reiterate the thought that Indian education should become a practice "that moves within the Indian context and does not try to avoid or escape this context" (2001, p. 85). “Teachers can support parent and community teachings, realizing that "book knowledge," while having its place, should not thoughtlessly supplant the collective wisdom" learned through the ages and passed on to each new generation by elders. Teachers cannot be expected to carry the major responsibility for facilitating the development of Native identity, but they can honor the important contributions of families and elders” (Jacobs and Reyhner, 2002).

Surfacing the culture of preservice teachers is an essential task for teacher educators. “Connectivity is the foundation of Native teacher preparation programs and is essential for Native people, teachers, professors, and educational institutions (Pavel, Larrimore & Van Alstine., 2003, p. 210-211)”. This is true of all diverse cultures and ethnic groups. Manuelito (2003) surveyed teacher preparation candidates and found that “Few respondents (26%) felt prepared to teach their Native/tribal language, English as a second language (25%), or bilingual education (24%). While half of the respondents felt prepared to teach multicultural education, only about a quarter (26%) felt prepared to teach Native/tribal culture. Respondents (61%) were more confident about their preparation to deal with issues of parent and community involvement”. In comparison to the rest of the recent research on culture and teacher preparedness, this data (though not encouraging) is actually more positive than the rest. How do teacher educators combat this in the higher education classroom? One option is protocols.
Protocols
How do we define protocols?

"Protocols – structured ways of listening, conversing, and conducting activities such as classroom visits – help practitioners get the most out of looking closely at each other’s work. A protocol provides guidelines that all participants understand and agree to before the conversation or activity takes place. Protocols that provide guidelines for listening and speaking are an especially important part of any structured process. These protocols keep the dialogue – often on topics that people are not in the habit of discussing – respectful, collegial, and productive. People will be more likely to participate in classroom visits if they feel that they can share their work in an environment of respect and receive helpful feedback (Fruchter, Gray & Rothman, 2006)."

How do protocols aid in classroom instruction? Monroe (2006) states “to deliver powerful instruction and, in turn, affect behavioral outcomes, teachers must consciously shape their instruction to fit the needs of the young learners they serve. Despite the breadth and complexity of such a responsibility, a number of tools exist to support practitioners’ efforts”. Protocols serve as that tool. The work that a teacher and students do creates a "cycle of inquiry" that has incalculable significance in the work of altering schools, and school educators, and many researchers concur. They foster a spirit of investigation and thoughtfulness (Cushman, 1999).

In a critical friends’ group, teachers commonly focus their work using two main techniques: examining student work in concert and monitoring each other in the classroom. Innovative to many teachers, each of these practices profits from using a meticulous "protocol" that alleviates the apprehension of revealing the core of one’s practice to contemporaries. Teacher
inquiry groups that take a hypothesis-testing approach to action research often have difficulty framing a good research question. This protocol presumes that the observer and the observed will work jointly to fashion some new knowledge; they are in it in chorus. The observation is a collective experience, and so is the debriefing. Protocols fall into four categories according to Annenberg Institute for School Reform (2006):

**Classroom Observations Protocol**
In this protocol, pairs of observers spend time in classrooms examining the curriculum "as enacted" – that is, as it is experienced by students in their classrooms, not simply as it is intended in state standards. The purpose of the observations is to raise questions about current practice and the conditions under which it occurs and to check classroom instruction for quality, coherence, and alignment with standards. The protocol can be used at all levels of the system, from primary grades through late high school.

**Basics of Structured Conversations**
Discussions, feedback sessions, and debriefings occur in all types of peer observation practice. This page outlines the basic steps and rationale for these kinds of structured conversations.

**The Consultancy: A Structured Conversation**
A consultancy is a structured process for helping an individual or small group of people think more expansively about a particular, concrete issue. Outside perspective is critical to this protocol working effectively, so some of the participants in the group should be people who do not share the specific issue of the person observed at that time.

**Classroom Visit Protocol**
A classroom visit provides opportunities for colleagues to develop and to share their understanding and knowledge about professional practices, student achievement, and their school community. They can be held either after school, without students present, or during a class with the students present.

Protocols are structured to elicit higher-order cognitive skills and this is what teacher educators are striving for when working
with preservice teachers. When Marzano (2003) documented nine types of instructional approaches related to student learning, he found four that address explicitly with higher order thinking skills:

- identifying similarities and differences
- nonlinguistic representations
- generating and testing hypotheses
- questions, cues, and advanced organizers

There are larger bodies within the profession of teacher educators that recognize the power of protocols. American Association for the Colleges of Teacher Education appreciates the value of protocols as a powerful ally in teacher research and as a fruitful instructional technique in the teacher education classroom. In 2002, the organization in tandem with Western Oregon University and the United States Department of Education, created a handbook on teacher work sampling. A number of recommendations are given and the major points are:

- Provide a work sample methodology
- Provide instructions for appropriate work samples
- Structure teacher preparation programs to accommodate teacher work sampling methods

Ellison, Boykin, Towns and Stokes (2000) utilized protocols in twenty-one schools serving African-American students in low-income populations. They protocols surfaced data in five themes: (1) social/psychological relations, (2) technical core of instruction, (3) physical structure and organizational routines, (4) discipline and classroom management, and (5) attitudes, perceptions, and expectations.
One of the most enlightening studies in the literature on protocols and higher education classrooms is “Using Think-Aloud Protocols to Compare Cognitive Levels of Students and Professors in College Classrooms” study. The data found with the use of protocols, using Bloom’s Taxonomy as a level of measure that professors taught 43% of the time at the knowledge level of cognition. However, the most common type of thought displayed by students in class was “random or nonsense thoughts” (68%). The least frequently utilized cognitive levels by professors were application (7%), analysis (7%), synthesis (7%), and evaluation (6%). Students constituted an average of 4.5% of their thoughts in class at the analysis level, less than 1% at the synthesis level, and an average of 1% at the evaluation level (Ewing & Whittington, 2007).

Professors need to be aware of cognitive levels of teaching in order to use teaching techniques that develop students’ ability to think at higher cognitive levels. On the other hand, students should dare themselves to “think” during class about the purpose of the classroom pertinent to their everyday lives.

This is reflective of what all teacher preparation programs want preservice teachers to independently think and reflect. We also want them to go beyond the reflecting and move toward changes in instructional and pedagogical behavior. In a children’s literature methods course for early childhood education majors, the professor experienced a moment of disequilibrium when teaching a previous lesson on the problematic “Dick, Jane and Spot” stories’ lack of inclusiveness. This led to a multilayered question, how do I get my students to surface culture within themselves in order to further the developmentally and culturally appropriate use of children’s trade books?

Methodology

Research Question
When surfacing culture, what themes emerge from the use of protocols in the context of a children’s literature methods
course?

**Population and Subject**
The subject of the study is an early childhood teacher educator currently teaching a children’s literature methods course to junior education majors in the teacher preparation program. The program is housed at a state university in the southeastern United States. The teacher educator is an African-American female. The population of methods students is composed of thirty students: 17 Caucasian, 10 African-American, 2 biracial students and 1 Latina.

**Procedure**
The teacher educator in the study looked at the questions of her own teaching. She essentially asked, “How can she invite her students to participate in exploring issues of culture”? This question pervaded over four semesters of teaching the course and prompted the action research project. During the seminar portion of the course fall 2009 the teacher educator/researcher chose to use three protocols with the students; one to surface their own culture, the second to engage in a critique of a selected title and its multiple interpretations, and third to reflect on the process of the entire seminar.

**Data Collection**
The teacher/researcher collects data using three protocols: Lines of Communication (Appendix A), What I Know-What I Have to Find Out, Finding Out - What I Learned (KFFL) (Appendix B), and Thoughts Feelings Question (TFQ) (Appendix C). The Lines of Communication protocol is designed to overcome inadequate listening practices by requiring parties to listen to and then speak their statements, emphasizing the feelings articulated as well as the substance. The purpose is to verify that the listener precisely understands the message sent and recognizes that message, although the listener is not required to agree.
The What I Know—What I Have to Find Out—Finding Out—What I Learned (KFFL) is a teaching strategy that is designed to investigate active thinking and involvement during instruction. K stands for what I KNOW about the subject, F stands for what I want to FIND out, F what I am FINDING out, and L stands for what I LEARN as I read and participate.

Thoughts-Feelings-Question (TFQ) activity includes reflective discussions. Reflective discussions support students to think and talk about what they have observed, experienced or read. The teacher or student begins the discussion by asking a question that compels students to reflect upon and interpret films, experiences, stories, or illustrations. As students interrogate and reconstruct information and events in an experience or story, they shed light on their thoughts and feelings, as well as generate questions. The questions posed should encourage students to relate story content to life experiences and to other stories. These questions will extract personal interpretations and feelings. Interpretations will vary, but such variations validate that differences of opinion are beneficial. The data is collected after the seminar and analyzed by the teacher/researcher.

**Data Analysis**

The data were analyzed using qualitative methods specifically coding. The researcher categorized codes based on context codes, situation codes, and ways of thinking codes. The setting for all of the protocols is uniform in that they all took place in the methods course on the same day. The context codes vary based on the rationale of the instructional activity, which is governed by the protocol used. Guided questions and categories are embedded in each protocol. This will help to establish themes as the protocols are enacted by the professor and preservice teachers. The ways of thinking codes surface after the researcher reviews the responses for each protocol and compares the data to the initial questions about the surfacing culture generated by the professor. The codes are then clustered to reveal thematic statements and generalizations to illuminate possible relationships in the data.
Results
What I Know-What I Have to Find Out-Finding Out-What I Learned (KFFL) Protocol

The “What I Know-What I Have to Find Out- Finding Out-What I Learned (KFFL)” protocol produces approximately thirty responses and codes. Fractured codes combine to generate the categories and themes. The overarching themes are prior knowledge inquiry investigative practices, and meaning making. Within the theme of prior knowledge, six categories appear diversity, story types, classroom use, variety, exposure, and understanding. Within the theme of inquiry, six categories: appropriate/inappropriate, genre, authors, choice, parents, and controversy. Within the theme of investigative practices, eight categories appear; they are variety, selection, instruction, activity, voice, identity, learning, and marginalization. Lastly, within the theme of meaning-making, nine categories are identified as accuracy/inaccuracy, subgenres, incorporation, commonalities, reflection, terms, relevancy, authenticity, and culture/race.

Preservice teachers report that their prior knowledge includes knowledge of diversity. They report that diversity is defined by race, ethnicity, religion, language, cultures, and sexuality. They also report knowledge of various types of stories including historical, international and true stories. Preservice teachers share a prior knowledge of classroom use including individualization, topic starters, inclusion and holidays. A knowledge of exposure is also reported in prior knowledge including an exposure to literature, critical issues, and personal values. Participants report knowledge of understanding that literature brings awareness, it is more than about holidays, it was created to satisfy diverse populations, understanding of differences, and it meets the basic needs of all cultures.

Within the theme of inquiry, several categories appear including appropriate/inappropriate, genre, authors, parents, and controversy. When examining the inquiry theme, the first category that surfaces is questions about appropriate/inappropriate use.
What is appropriate?
Where do my little kids in my class come from and how do I ask?
How can I be culturally sensitive?
How do I optimize understanding of other cultures?
How do I talk about cultures I do not know about?
How do I make connections between cultures?

The participants report in the genre category, a number of central questions.

What is the origin of the genre?
Are bilingual books part of the genre?
How do I verify authenticity?
What are the advantages of this genre?
How do I select the books?
Is the genre inclusive of language, religion?
What about white culture, holidays and relatives for this genre?

The participants report of a final category in this theme, controversy and parents.

What are the controversial issues in this genre?
How do you deal with parents and controversial books?
How do I use religious books without upsetting parents?
How can I use parents to be culturally sensitive with a language that is new to me?
Within the theme of investigative processes, two categories appear selection and incorporation. The students report that knowledge of genre aids in the selection of the books they choose. This also affects the varieties of books which children in the classroom are exposed. They want to investigate literature that is educational and entertaining. The investigative practices associated with selection includes reading the books, researching the books, critiquing books based along the guidelines of critical theory in tandem with the guidelines of major book awards including the Coretta Scott King and Pura Belpre’ awards.

The most often mentioned of these was the examination of stereotypes. The participants specifically discussed how the wish to reject books with gross race, and gender stereotypes. The second category within the theme of investigative practices is incorporation. Participants report incorporation of the literature through instruction, which to them is sharing the books with children. They state sharing the books includes how to ask the types of questions that further the discussion of culture, not race. Incorporation, to the preservice teachers, also consists of how to surface civil action with marginalized groups, and increasing the self-esteem of all children as they are engaged in civil action.

The final theme of this protocol is meaning making. This theme was more concentrated than the previous constructs. The only category that surfaced was importance. The participants share that relevancy of the literature, accuracy of the author’s account, as well as the power of commonalities of the learners are all critical to importance in their schema. Finally, the participants state that opportunities for themselves and the children in the classroom were extremely important.

**Thoughts-Feelings-Questions Protocol (TFQ)**

The overarching themes from the Thoughts-Feelings-Questions Protocol (TFQ) are thoughts and reflections, feelings about the topics of the day, and questions about the experience. The three categories that surface within the thought theme are; benefits of the days’ seminar activities, inaccuracies/accuracies, and the differences between race and culture. The participants describe the benefits of this activity as eye opening, enjoyable and engaging when it comes to learning about the
heritage of other participants in the class. The most often referred to activity was the lines of communication protocol. Participants report they never would have learned this much about the background of classmates otherwise.

The next category in this theme is accuracies/inaccuracies. The preservice teachers report that initially they had not thought about this but now worry that inaccurate books are still on shelves in use. They report a positive response to multicultural literature and the example of accurate stories assists them in properly using it during instruction.

The last category in this theme is the difference between race and culture. The participants report a broadening of horizons. Examination of dialect and music from the region of the stories' origin helps them learn more about the authenticity of the tales. Participants respond that they can try to see a difference between race and culture because they can use themselves as possible examples.

The next theme in this protocol is feelings. Feelings include three categories: enthusiasm, motivation and offensiveness. Participants report that they feel enthusiastic about classmates as well as what they learn about them. Participants are also enthusiastic about exposure to multicultural literature and the doors it opens to learn about others. The participants feel motivated about expanding the concept of culture modeled by the professor. This is important to them because culture at present in society has a limiting view. Finally, the participants report they feel offended. They report feeling offended by the commercialization of some authentic stories. They report they are confused as to how some children will react to multicultural literature stories. They experience offensiveness when reading the racial mockery in some of the stories they read in class and its inappropriate dialogue as well as the stereotypes they manage to recognize.

The last theme in this protocol is questions. The theme includes five categories: origin of the genre, appropriateness,
technology, authors, and learning about other cultures. The origin of genre category is reported as highly significant to the preservice teachers. Questions about the origin of the genre include questions about the date of the genre and country of the genre. The participants report that the category of appropriateness includes questions about its introduction, purpose, and adaptations for English language learners and special needs learners. Questions about websites that check for accuracy of books, review of books and banned books also appear in this category. Finally, questions about how to spot racism in a book and what lessons can we learn from racist books also appear in this category.

Participants generate questions about the role and function of the author. Questions about the author's credentials as they retell fables and folktales, and verification of the author's information appear in this category. Questions about the premier authors in the genre and multiple versions of stories also appear in this category.

The last category in this theme is the notion of learners and learning. Participants question how to celebrate cultures other than their own. In reference to learning, participants to ask questions about how to incorporate this into their classroom, what lesson does this teach small children, and finally, what if the children are not interested in learning about other cultures?

**Lines of Communication Protocol**
The video analysis of protocol consists of examining five tasks: exposure, movement, engagement, communication and reflection on information received. The video consists of sixty-eight minutes broken down into four, seventeen-minute time segments. Each participant dyad has approximately 4 minutes per interaction to answer protocol questions:

- What languages do you speak?
- What languages do your parents speak?
What languages do (did) your grandparents or elderly relatives speak?
What celebrations are most important to you and your family?
Which of your relatives lives the farthest away?

Due to the structured protocol utilized and the 4-minute time limit, the frames showed a definite progression about every seventeen minutes when analyzing each of the tasks. The researcher uses EUDICO Linguistic Annotation (ELAN) to assist in coding and analysis. The summary results are in the table below. The expanded results are found in Appendix D.

Table 1

Lines of Communication Video Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Segment</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Description of Anecdote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Duration: 1-17 minutes</td>
<td>Exposure</td>
<td>exposing of the information was awkward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Duration: 1-17 minutes</td>
<td>Movement</td>
<td>the movement from one partner to the next was tentative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Duration: 1-17 minutes</td>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>the engagement was surface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Segment</td>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Description of Anecdote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Duration: 1-17 minutes</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>the students were only answering 2 of the 5 questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2**

Lines of Communication Video Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Segment</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Description of Anecdote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Second Duration: 17</td>
<td>Exposure</td>
<td>exposing of the information was less awkward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Movement</td>
<td>the movement from one partner to the next was less tentative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Duration: 17</td>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>the engagement level was intentional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Segment</td>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Description of Anecdote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Duration: 34-51 minutes</td>
<td>Exposure</td>
<td>exposing of the information was somewhat comfortable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Duration: 34-51 minutes</td>
<td>Movement</td>
<td>the movement from one partner to the next was somewhat consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Duration: 34-51 minutes</td>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>partner utilized all the time allotted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Duration: 34-51 minutes</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>the students were now</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4

Lines of Communication Video Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Segment</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Description of Anecdote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fourth Duration: 51-68 minutes</td>
<td>Exposure</td>
<td>exposure of the information was free flowing and continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth Duration: 51-68 minutes</td>
<td>Movement</td>
<td>very consistent and participant-directed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth Duration: 51-68 minutes</td>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>more laughter is heard, expanded dyads into quartets to expand the discussion. Students had to be reminded of the period, as they were very engrossed in the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fourth Duration: 51-68 minutes  Communication  -the students not only answered 5 of 5 questions, but added follow-up questions

Findings

The study finds a number of important points. First, the protocols are actually effective in surfacing preservice teachers concerns about diversity and its effect on classroom instruction. It also brings up major concerns about critiquing for accuracies and inaccuracies in the portrayal of characters on the text. They are very concerned with selection and choice of text in this genre.

Secondly, the study finds that preservice teachers/participants are beginning to engage in meaning-making through identifying commonalities across groups and ethnicities through the development of characters in the text. The preservice teachers are concerned with the authenticity of the stories as it relates to the credibility of the author. They are not quite sure as to how the authenticity is verified, but they want to know how to go about it.

Preservice teachers are beginning to flirt with the notion of “culture instead of race”. This heightens their awareness of what is actually relevant in the context of the stories told and retold in the genre. They experiment with the notion of voice and identity in the context investigating their
own practices. This connects one protocol to the next. The preservice teachers found protocols to be very engaging and thought provoking. The amazement the students felt about the volume of information learned about the other heritages of their classmates was the most referenced point as reported by the participants. The comments, “we are more than white” spoke volumes about what they could offer each other in terms of what identity is to them presently. The broadening of definitions is another finding from the study. The definition of what they feel during the activities opens the door to understanding the lives of others and how they are interconnected. The level of offensiveness felt by the students was evident in the issues of commercialism and authenticity. This was more so evident with race than with gender bias. Participants cared about the notion of learning but needed more ways in which to do it.

The lines of communication protocol truly surfaced the awkwardness of unpacking the beginning of the “courageous conversation”. In this setting, the courageous conversation is defined by Singleton and Linton (2006) as, “a conversation that engages those who won’t talk, sustains the conversation when it gets uncomfortable and deepens it to the point where the talk is linked to authentic changes in practice. Though the questions start as surface, they lead to a practice of developing inquiry-based techniques for investigating others. They learn how to gently pry their way into the lives of others with adequate support. A level of comfort is identified frame by frame, segment by segment. The video analysis allows a continuum to be uncovered for making this work public. The students knew they were being videotaped and were initially apprehensive. By the last frame, they were completely comfortable with each other often using a sense of humor as a transition to the next question being asked. The protocols were flexible enough to allow guided coaching for discussions and interjection of the participant’s actual personalities.

Implications

In this study, the researcher learns that with coaching, surfacing culture and planting the seed of inquiry about multicultural literature can happen in the context of the classroom. The researcher also learns that her purposeful techniques can help to bridge a gap that usually
appears between the university’s generic multicultural education course and what real diversity looks like in an intimate classroom setting. Finally, the researcher learns that the planning she does mirrors that of a primary teacher creating a lesson for the life cycle of a butterfly or the character analysis of a favorite childhood heroine. What does she want them to know at the end of a lesson? What outcome does she anticipate?

This implies a series of questions for further research and they are tenuous and calculating. First, how can this research inform future courses on this genre? How will the carryover or effect be measured on field placement classrooms? Can this inquiry be made in terms of working with families? Will this in turn develop advocacy in the students? Will they find their voices? Will the whispers in the protocols result in resounding shouts of social justice in the classroom? The final question for the field is, “what is the larger impact on the field of teacher education?” It is the intention of this research that the voice of the teacher educator-as-researcher is made public and moves beyond noteworthy to pure, purposeful utilitarianism as a stream of intentional consciousness. The voice of the teacher educator and viable protocols are two of the most powerful tools the field can use to tell its story. This situation allows for the narrative of teacher research to be told from the inside out, not dictated by outside the field.
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Appendices

Appendix A

Strategy: Lines of Communication

A cooperative learning, community building activity that involves participants in structured dialogue surrounding a common learning experience.

Overview: *Lines of Communication* provides a structure for discussing various topics, texts or salient points from a common learning experience.

Skills Addressed:

Active Listening-Students listen to partners as their partner shares their own learning connections.

Interpersonal Communication-Students discuss various concepts with several partners.
Steps Involved:

Teacher creates 3-4 prompts for discussion.

Prompts can be created to reflect on a learning experience, to make connections to a particular text, to discuss a current event, to explore points of view on a controversial topic, etc.

Teacher divides students into two groups (A and B).

Groups A forms a line that faces Group B.

Each student should be facing a partner in the other group. If there is an odd number, the teacher should participate.

The teacher shares the first prompt with the entire group.

At the teacher’s signal, the students in Line A share their responses to the prompt, simultaneously, with their partners in Line B. *Partners in Line B listen only.*

After approximately 90 seconds, the teacher gives the attention signal and says, “**Switch**”! In addition, the students in Line B share their responses to the same prompt. *Partners in Line A listen only.*

After approximately 90 seconds, the teacher gives the attention signal and says, “**Shift**”!
The first student in Line A walks (either between the two lines or on the outside of Line A) to the end of Line A and the other students in Line A take one step to the side to face a new partner in Line B.

The teacher shares the second prompt with the entire group.

At the teacher’s signal, the students in Line A share their responses to the prompt, simultaneously, with their partners in Line B. *Partners in Line B listen only.*

After approximately 90 seconds, the teacher gives the attention signal and says “**Switch**”! In addition, the students in Line B share their responses to the same prompt. *Partners in Line A listen only.*

After approximately 90 seconds, the teacher gives the attention signal and says, “**Shift**”!

The first student in Line A walks (either between the two lines or on the outside of the lines) to the end of Line A and the other Line A members take one step to the side to face a new partner in Line B.

This process continues until each of the prompts has been discussed.

Protocol found in the Most Essential Strategies created by the National Urban Alliance for Effective Education found at [www.nuatu.org](http://www.nuatu.org)

*Appendix B*
What I know, what I have to find out, finding out, and what I learned (KFFL)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What I know</th>
<th>What I have to find out</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finding out</td>
<td>What I learned</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix C

Thoughts-Feelings-Question (TFQ)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thoughts</th>
<th>Feelings</th>
<th>Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Category</th>
<th>Time Frame-Set 1</th>
<th>Time Frame-Set 2</th>
<th>Time Frame-Set 3</th>
<th>Time Frame-Set 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENGAGEMENT: Confirms that own ideas are understood</td>
<td>Student does not engage in discussion to confirm understanding of ideas. He/she simply repeats his/her own ideas.</td>
<td>Student attempts to get some clarification that his/her ideas are understood by asking questions and engaging in discussion.</td>
<td>Student confirms that his/her ideas are understood by asking questions, engaging in discussion, and attempting to re-state ideas in new wording.</td>
<td>Student confirms that his/her ideas are understood by asking questions, engaging in discussions, and re-stating ideas in different wording for clarification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPOSURE: Asks questions to clarify and</td>
<td>Student does not ask questions of other participants.</td>
<td>Student asks some questions of other participants.</td>
<td>Student often asks questions of other participants.</td>
<td>Student asks a variety of thoughtful</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extend discussion</th>
<th>He/she contributes minimally and focuses mainly to his/her own thoughts and ideas.</th>
<th>He/she contributes to some discussions and shows occasional interest in the thoughts/ideas of others.</th>
<th>He/she contributes to sustain and extend interactions.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNICATION Pt-1: Builds on the ideas of others in postings</td>
<td>Student does not build on the ideas of others in postings. He/she focuses mainly on his/her own ideas and rarely engages in other discussions.</td>
<td>Student occasionally builds on the ideas of others by engaging in relevant discussions with other participants.</td>
<td>Student sometimes builds on other's ideas by engaging in relevant discussions with other participants.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| ENGAGEMENT: | Student does not engage | Student attempts | Student usually engages | Student regularly engages in discussions with other participants.
<p>| MOVEMENT: Shows awareness of audience | Student needs constant reminders from preservice teachers to consider his/her audience when posting to discussion threads. He/she generally expresses his/her own views appropriately. | Student shows some understanding of his/her audience when posting to discussion threads. He/she usually expresses his/her own views appropriately. | Student usually shows understanding of his/her audience when posting to discussion threads. He/she expresses his/her own views appropriately. | Student shows a clear awareness of his/her audience when posting to discussion threads. Views are nearly always expressed in an appropriate manner. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMUNICATION Pt-2:</th>
<th>Student uses simple, repetitive language in discussions with other participants.</th>
<th>When participating in discussions, the student uses clear language, which is sometimes vague and lacking details.</th>
<th>When participating in discussions, the student uses clear language with some variety with some expressive details.</th>
<th>When participating in discussions, the student uses clear, varied language. Some precise language with expressive detail is utilized.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REFLECTION: Makes connections to experiences of self and others</td>
<td>Student needs explicit guidance from preservice teachers to make simple and obvious connections in discussions. He/she offers vague, unsupported reasons.</td>
<td>Student makes some concrete and obvious connections in discussions. He/she offers simple and direct reactions and opinions; some reasons are provided with some logical support.</td>
<td>Student makes logical, relatively direct connections in discussions. He/she offers reasonable reactions and opinions with some logical support.</td>
<td>Student makes and supports insightful connections in discussions. He/she offers insightful reactions and opinions that often show complexity of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
reactions and opinions. prompting. thought.

Adapted from the EL RANCHO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT retrieved from http://www.preservice teachersupportprograms.org/cstprubric