



Full length article

Socialization of a student teacher on teaching practice into the discursive community of the classroom: Between a teacher-centered and a learner-centered approach



Kateřina Lojdvová

Department of Education, Faculty of Education, Masaryk University, Porici 31, Brno 639 00, Czech Republic

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Classroom management
Discourse analysis
Learner-centered approach
Student teacher
Cooperating teacher

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate the socialization of a student teacher on teaching practice into the discursive community of the classroom. Discourse analysis of interviews and video recordings of classes taught by a student teacher and cooperating teacher was conducted. The results showed interpretative repertoires of classroom management of the cooperating teacher and the student teacher, where those of the student teacher are more learner-centered. However, during the teaching practice of the student teacher, the teacher-centered approach is reproduced, especially through rituals and teaching practices. The implications for undergraduate teacher education are discussed.

1. Introduction

This study describes the socialization of a student teacher on teaching practice into the classroom as a discourse community, which is shaped especially by the cooperating teacher who normally teaches in the classroom. It focuses on classroom management as the area in which novice teachers report the greatest difficulty (Bromfield, 2006; Emmer & Stough, 2001; Jones & Jones, 1998). However, "we know little about how a newcomer manages to gain entry into an existing discourse community and to incorporate her own discourse and ideas into this community" (Smith, 2005, p. 53). This question is nonetheless crucial to understanding the experience gained by student teachers and their reflection. Socialization into classroom discourse can be defined as the process by which student teachers as active agents selectively acquire the values and attitudes, the interests, skills and knowledge - in short the school culture in question (Staton-Spicer & Darling, 1986). According to Smith (2005) the cooperating teacher and student teacher relationship is a central vehicle for inducting novice teachers into the discourse community. It is also a vehicle which forms the student teacher's beliefs and classroom management practices within a particular discourse.

2. Discourse of classroom management

Classroom management is like a "system of strategies employed by a teacher to influence the physical and social space of the classroom in order to foster an environment where learning can occur" (Christofferson, Sullivan, & Bradley, 2015, p. 248). It includes both behavior and instructional management. Behavior management (BM) consists of creating and maintaining rules, methods of maintaining pupils' attention and applying disciplinary interventions (Brophy, 1988). Instructional management (IM) addresses teachers' instructional aims and methodologies, e.g. establishing teaching goals, using educational methods, and monitoring pupils'

E-mail address: lojdova@ped.muni.cz.

independent work (Martin & Sass, 2010).

Focusing on how classroom management is performed, classroom discourse lies at the heart of everything that takes place in classrooms (Walsh, 2013). Classroom discourse is shaped by specific organizational features of the school as a public institution, where communication differs from everyday conversation insofar as classroom discourse is objective in its orientation, carried out to reach the aim of teaching, curriculum, and learning (Strobelberger, 2012).

The classroom can be understood as a discourse community that shares certain communicative repertoires and at the same time forms these repertoires as a specific social environment (Heller, 2014). In terms of discourse, it is not just a matter of what is being talked about, but also how it is spoken about and whose world views make up the scaffold (Cazden, 2001).

As in any institutional discourse setting, the roles of participants are not equal; they are asymmetrical (Walsh, 2013). Despite this imbalance and inequality of power between the learner and the teacher, classroom discourse is a collectively built enterprise where meanings of different types are constructed moment by moment (Strobelberger, 2012). The asymmetrical roles are represented especially in the IRE communication structure. Although it was described by Mehan in the late 1970s, it still prevails in today's classrooms (Cazden, 2001; Nystrand, 1997; Recuerda, 2010; Walsh, 2013), including the Czech Republic (Sedova, Salamounova, & Svaricek, 2014). IRE (Initiation – Reply – Evaluation) is a three-part sequence in which the teacher elicits information, and a student provides a reply, which is then evaluated by the teacher (Mehan, 1979).

Based on IRE and other sources, in general two different discourses of classroom management are described: teacher-centered and learner-centered. "A teacher-centered discourse underscores the long held philosophy that instructors are the gatekeepers of knowledge whose job is to convey their knowledge through a lecture, with students as passive receivers during the learning process" (Brown, Castor, Byrnes-Loinette, Bowman, & McBride, 2016, p. 493). It mainly consists of the traditional approach characterized by the IRE sequence (Strobelberger, 2012). In contrast, learner-centered discourse consists of the more recent learner-centered approach to education (Kramer et al., 2007). The learner-centered approach derives from Rogers' humanistic psychology and the theoretical framework of constructivism founded by Piaget (Kayler, 2009). It criticizes the expert-driven, transmission model of teaching (Tangney, 2014). Constructivism highlights the fact that learning is an active process in which learners perform different actions to get to know the world around them, thus building their own conceptualization and understanding of it. Therefore, teaching needs to provide opportunities for students to get involved in activities that allow for exploration, creativity, and active communication (Harakchiyska, 2018). In terms of communication sequence, it is more dialogical than the IRE communication structure (cf. Sedova et al., 2014). However, a more equitable distribution of even the most responsive voices is not in itself sufficient to build a different discourse: more specific social and cognitive functions of classroom talk, important in discourse in any democracy, need to be taken into account (Cazden, 1995). To summarize, the learner-centered approach requires teachers to be attentive to issues surrounding children's cognitive development, the affective and motivational dimensions of instruction (e.g. intrinsic motivation to learn), the developmental and social aspects of learning and individual differences in learning strategies (e.g. children choose their learning activities) and so on (Daniels & Perry, 2003).

3. Socialization of student teachers into the discourse of classroom management: a research gap

Existing research into classroom management of student teachers, has explained difficulties of student teachers in classroom management, in particular, on differences between a beginning teacher and an expert teacher. As a result, there is description of what student teachers or novices lack. Oral (2012) describes that student teachers lack necessary knowledge about classroom management, does not have enough practice experience and lack field knowledge. Graduated teachers do feel unprepared to cope with pupil discipline (Dicke, Elling, Schmeck, & Leutner, 2015) and lack contextualized, purposeful, practice-oriented event knowledge to selectively guide their attention to the kinds of cues and classroom events that need to be noticed in the first place (Wolff, van den Bogert, Jarodzka, & Boshuizen, 2015). This research brings another angle of view focusing on what a student teacher could bring into the classroom discourse in comparison to the cooperating teacher and how can their concepts of classroom management differ.

Socialization of a student teacher on teaching practice into the classroom discourse of cooperating teacher is critical due to the problem of reproduction of traditional practices. Though, on one hand, cooperating teachers are very important agents for socializing student teachers to the institution of the school. They provide feedback and vocational support, model practices and give support for reflection (Clarke, Triggs, & Nielsen, 2014; Riedler & Eryaman, 2016). On the other hand, researchers have found that student teachers move toward their cooperating teachers' traditional style (Hewson, Tabachnick, Zeichner, & Lemberger, 1999) and authoritative stance toward their students (Ng, Nicholas, & Williams, 2010). When student teachers engage in classroom practices and develop competencies under the influence of the cooperating teacher, their beliefs about teaching shift in that process. Rozelle and Wilson (2012) described some student teachers in their ethnographic research as "reproducers". Reproduction in this research meant gaining the behavior and skills of their cooperating teacher and shifting their beliefs and identities to match. Teachers' practices and instruction are influenced by their personal beliefs about learning (Chen & Bonner, 2017), but especially in terms of teaching practice, it is also important to focus on the influence that enacted practice have on what student teachers come to believe (Meirink, Meijer, Verloop, & Bergen, 2009). One of the reasons of this influence can be found in asymmetric relations of student teachers and mentor teachers, where student teachers are more in a situation of assessment rather than guidance (Ohlsson, 2018). An important aspect of these asymmetries is how different perspectives are made relevant. For example, through IRE, the teacher "establishes" and "controls" discourse by the initiation and evaluation (Vogler, Prediger, Quasthoff, & Heller, 2018). Thus, student teachers who adopt mentor teacher's IRE structure might be evaluated by mentor teachers as successful regardless of whether or not they were experiencing success (cf. Rozelle & Wilson, 2012). Recently, more research has focused on the interaction between mentors and student teachers (Izadinia, 2015; Mena, Hennissen, & Loughran, 2017; Pillen, Den Brok, & Beijaard, 2013; Taskin, 2006), yet little is still

known about how classroom discourse in mentor teachers' and student teachers' classes interfere. This research can contribute toward understanding of the socialization of the student teacher into the discursive community of the classroom from the point of view of different beliefs and practices of a student teacher and her cooperating teacher.

Two theoretical and methodological perspectives of classroom discourse (phenomenology and critical discourse analysis) were applied. Such endeavour aims research to disclose conceptions of classroom management (phenomenology) as well as performance of classroom management in practice (critical discourse analysis). Phenomenology and discourse analysis are products of different intellectual traditions, however, their coevolution in the history means that the boundaries between them are porous. Phenomenologists ask questions about lived experiences while discourse analysts explore how knowledge, meaning, and identities are negotiated and constructed through language-in-use ([Starks & Brown Trinidad, 2007](#)). Phenomenology was used to describe interpretative repertoires used to construct different versions of events ([Smith & Osborne, 2015](#)), and self ([Potter & Wetherell, 1995](#)). In the context of this study I speak about the interpretative repertoires of classroom management and look at how these are connected to teaching. Interpretative repertoires are context-specific, locally produced discourses ([Potter & Wetherell, 1987](#)). Critical classroom discourse analysis (CCDA) takes place here in order to find out classroom discourse patterns in relationship to interpretative repertoires. CCDA focuses on discourse patterns that might represent something beyond the words, and labels data with codes and chunk codes into broader themes ([Bloome, Carter, Christian, Otto, & Shuart-Faris, 2004](#)). Within CCDA "critical" emphasizes issues of context, influence, and how power, dominance and inequality are expressed, enacted and reproduced in discourse ([Brooks, 2016](#)). The role of language as a tool in creating and negotiating everyday life is taken into account ([Bloome et al., 2004](#)).

The use of a mixture of methods can help to explore a phenomenon from a number of angles, so long as such methods are based on a common methodological perspective that allows them to complement each other and to compensate for each other's limitations ([Johnson & Mercer, 2019](#)). However, phenomenology and discourse analysis are rather complementary to each other ([Martínez-Ávila & Smiraglia, 2013](#)). In this study, theoretical and methodological approaches enables to disclose complex relationship as people produce discourses (interpretative repertoires), and how these discourses also shape people's actions ([Hardy & Thomas, 2014](#)). The result of this analysis is a description of the interpretative repertoires of classroom management and classroom practices of the student teacher and her cooperating teacher in mutual interference.

4. Method

The research question was: how are the interpretative repertoires of classroom management of student teachers and cooperating teachers put into the practice?

In order to find out the student teacher's and the cooperating teacher's interpretative repertoires of classroom management and the fulfillment of the elements of these interpretative repertoires in their teaching, two research methods were employed: interviews and observation (video recordings) of classes.

The interviews took place after video recordings and focused on how the student teacher/cooperating teacher manages the classroom, what they perceive as effective in behavior and instructional classroom management, what classroom setting they consider the best and how the student teacher and her cooperating teacher cooperate in the area of strategies for classroom management. The interviews were semi-structured, they proceeded from the pre-prepared question scheme based on the research question and expanding the classroom management theory. The interviews were transcribed word-by word and coded. Due to the fact that the video recordings and interviews were made by the research author, field notes written down after each recording are also available and provided contextual information for analysis.

In terms of observation, six consecutive lessons in the same class taught by the student teacher Zdena and her cooperating teacher Iveta were recorded on video to find out how is classroom management put into the practice. The video footage was always recorded by two cameras, one of which was focused primarily on the behavior of the student teacher/cooperating teacher (a static camera) and the other which recorded the classroom as a whole or, if necessary, individual pupils who currently interacted with the student teacher/cooperating teacher (a dynamic camera). Transcripts of the video recordings were made according to conversation analysis ([Jefferson, 2004](#)). However, for the analysis, the video itself was always necessary, mainly in order to detect non-verbal expressions.

4.1. Participants

This study concerns a student teacher and her cooperating teacher in lower secondary comprehensive classes (ISCED 2A) in the Czech Republic. For this study a cooperating teacher, Iveta, and a student teacher, Zdena, were selected. Student teacher Zdena specializes in Czech language and literature (subject chosen because of large dotation in teaching plan) and is willing to become a teacher (as many as 60% of student teachers in the Czech Republic do not become teachers according to [Hanušová et al., 2017](#)). The teacher has been teaching for more than 30 years, which may represent traditional classroom practice in comparison to the student teacher. Age criteria also correspond with the current situation in the Czech Republic, where average age of teachers is 45 years ([ČŠI, 2016](#)). One obvious limitation of this study is the small number of participants reported here, however collected qualitative dataset is extensive and in-depth.

4.2. Data

The dataset consists of record of six consecutive lessons of Czech language and literature in the sixth grade taught by the student teacher Zdena and record of the same amount of lessons of her cooperating teacher Iveta recorded afterwards. Content of these

lessons was diverse: Czech grammar (Iveta: 3 classes, Zdena: 2 classes), literature (Iveta: 2 classes, Zdena: 3 classes) and creative writing (both 1 class). Semi-structured interview with the student teacher and her cooperating teacher after recording was conducted. Data were transcribed word-by-word and anonymized.

4.3. Analysis

Various methodological approaches are hidden under the discourse analysis. Because the study uses different data sources, interpretative phenomenological analysis (IPA) procedures were used to analyze interviews and critical classroom discourse analyses (CCDA) were used to analyze teaching transcripts and videos. In general, data was analysed inductively (Braun & Clarke, 2006). The researcher was familiar with the data through data gathering. The programme Atlas.ti 7 was used for the qualitative data analysis, using coding, memos and families (categorisation) functions.

Firstly, interviews were analysed to achieve overall familiarity with beliefs about classroom management. Secondly, video recordings of classes taught by the student teacher and by cooperating teacher took place. The analysis of interpretative repertoires in the interview data was based on IPA techniques (Parker, 2002; Potter & Wetherell, 1995; Smith & Osborne, 2015), namely three-dimensional data encoding: descriptive, linguistic, and conceptual. In the first phase, descriptive remarks were made when reading the interviews repeatedly. The second encoding phase focused on the linguistic strategies that speakers use to communicate in an indirect or a nonliteral way (hints, association cues, understatements, overstatements or hyperbole, tautologies, irony, metaphor, euphemisms, proverbs, vagueness) (Cazden & Beck, 2003). Special attention was paid to pronouns. Pronouns can identify how a person locates him- or herself within a situation or toward an object (Weller, 2018). In the conceptual phase of data analysis, conceptual categories were created from codes and notes. These conceptual categories became the core of the interpretative repertoires (capitalized in the text).

Secondly, CCDA focused on how interpretative repertoires of classroom management are performed in practice via video recordings and their transcripts. Encoding phase took place repetitively focused on authoritative roles (i.e. who is in charge) and knowledge ownership (i.e. who seemed to "know" at any given time) through patterns of talk (i.e. who took control of the conversational floor, and when) (cf. Brooks, 2016). This approach enables to identify allowed patterns of participation in the classroom (Kumaravadivelu, 1999) and thus patterns of teacher-centered and learner-centered discourse.

While the IPA contributes to the knowledge of individual experience, the CCDA allows for a description of discursive teaching practices. These two approaches were linked with the constant comparison and analytical induction method (Boeije, 2009; Powell, 2006) for comparing the codes from the conversations with the video transcription codes and for comparing data from the student teacher and her cooperating teacher. This approach was employed as it best captures discursive practices in interviews and classroom practice.

Even if further analysis in larger samples is required, we can already describe some patterns of teacher-centered and student-centered discourse and how these can interfere in teaching practice. Not only because these are not ideal types (both actors perform patterns of both discourses, cf. Watkins, 1952) the goal is not to generalize the findings, but open a discussion on different classroom management of a student teacher and cooperating teacher, which might also comprise opposite setting (student as more teacher-centered). Validity is strengthened by multiple methods of data gathering and analysis, triangulation of resources and theories, systematic processes used and reflexivity applied (Hoepfl, 1997). The researcher may have influenced results through the life-long career in teacher education, however discussions of results with colleagues in international conferences (e.g. ECER, EARLI) may help to reflect researcher's bias (Maxwell, 2012).

4.4. Context

The data for this research was collected in the Czech Republic. The Faculty of Education chosen to perform this study places great emphasis on teaching practice. Students carry out teaching practice at elementary schools in three out of four semesters within their follow-up Master's program. Students are under the supervision of a cooperating teacher and faculty supervisor (in reflective seminars at the faculty).

5. Findings

The findings describe the interpretative repertoires of the cooperating teacher Iveta and their reproduction in classroom practice. After that, interpretative repertoires of the student teacher Zdena are introduced. Finally, the classroom practices of the student teacher are discussed not only within the framework of her interpretative repertoires, but also within the interpretative repertoires and classroom practices of her cooperating teacher.

5.1. Interpretative repertoire of classroom management of the cooperating teacher Iveta: teacher-centered

Iveta's view on classroom management is more teacher-centered approach, so I refer to her classroom interpretive repertoire as teacher-centered, however it is blended with some elements of the learner-centered approach. The cooperating teacher views her role in classroom management as dominant, which is reflected in both instructional management and behavior management.

In **instructional management**, when Iveta describes the problems of pupils in learning, she describes them as the teacher's problems: "If they get grade five (the worst grade), I have problems than".¹ Iveta understands this as "her problem". Learning responsibility is not attributed to the pupil from the teacher's perspective, but to the teacher him/herself, which is particularly connected to the *teacher-centered approach*. Teacher Iveta's partner in the management process of learning corresponds to a teacher-centered approach in the fact that it is not the pupil, but their parents: "They have it on a piece of paper, the parents sign it so they can get acquainted with it so they don't have any excuse".

Iveta uses parental signatures as a control mechanism in the pupils' learning process, and at the same time distributes control over this process between herself and the parents. This could be cultural historical setting in Czech schools, however Iveta places great emphasis on this control mechanism. She places herself into responsibility to the institution of the school, or to the parents of the pupils, but not to the pupils themselves. In this approach, they are more a "passive product" on which the parties are working. The teacher's responsibility for learning is based on her interpretation of her role as the GUARANTOR OF KNOWLEDGE. This role leads to teaching practices in which the teacher is responsible for the pupils' learning and is better fulfilled in transmissive than in constructivist teaching, in which knowledge is more likely to be shaped by the interaction of the teacher and the pupils. The role of the guarantor of knowledge is also reflected in the choice of teaching methods. Iveta prefers to use traditional teaching methods rather than constructivist methods (based on a *learner-centered approach*): "I prefer normal frontal teaching, I know it's not in these days". The use of traditional methods is legitimized by Iveta through the teacher's responsibility for learning: "When teaching grammar, I keep strictly in line with a traditional approach, because I need pupils to know it. In creative writing I allow the use of group work, because it is more open". In other words, from the Iveta's teacher-centered perspective, constructivist teaching methods do not lead to the learning outcomes in grammar that she guarantees, however in creative writing she admits some aspects of constructivism. Therefore her approach is also dependent on curricula.

Another feature of the teacher-centered approach is AN EMPHASIS ON THE EXTERNAL MOTIVATION OF PUPILS. As a tool for motivation, the teacher repeatedly uses grades: "Children respond to me giving them a grade one (A). Not everyone, but almost all of them respond well to it".

She notes that this is not a universal tool of motivation that is suitable for all pupils. However, the other motivational tools she mentions are also external: school report, admission to school. From the point of view of internal motivation, I can give the example of mastering grammar, which the teacher conceives as something pupils can use in their personal/love lives: "I always say, do not write anything to a girl, just say it to her (because of bad spelling) although these days I don't know if girls really mind that".

This also seems to be more about the teacher's need than the needs of pupils. Working with the needs of pupils and their internal motivation is side-lined in the *teacher-centered interpretative repertoire*.

For **behavioral management**, emphasis is placed on behavior in the classroom, its establishment and observance. Although Iveta declares that the rules in the classroom are democratic, which is apparent in her use of the first-person plural, they are actually teacher-mandated rules, namely PSEUDODEMOCRATIC RULES: "We set rules, for example, they know exactly when they will get homework." Iveta's concept of working with the rules also fulfills the interpretive repertoire of *teacher-centered approach*. The teacher does not create a discursive field of rules for pupils and teachers, as the pupils are referred to as "they" and the formal rules (school rules) apply only to "them": "They have it set in the school regulations".

Personal pronouns need to be interpreted in the context of other linguistic means, in this case the use of the passive. Through the use of the passive in statements about the school regulations, the teacher reveals her non-involvement and distinction of her work from these rules from the "top". She designates them as given, not looking for an active role in their transmission.

In Iveta's behavioral management, a GAP between ME AND THEM can be identified, which is characteristic of the overall concept of Iveta's teaching. It is manifested by the frequent use of the pronoun "they" in the interview. The teacher almost does not use the pronoun "we" to describe the teaching activities. This clearly defines the participants in the classroom and places a barrier between them.

One of the means for negotiating rules in behavioral discourse for Iveta is community circles, where classroom problems are dealt with. However, the pupils' agenda in these community circles must be within the limits of the discourse defined by Iveta. The teacher directs what pupils can discuss and which remarks are relevant. For example, complaints about the teacher are not considered by Iveta to be on the agenda for community circles. Again, it is about working with rules that apply only to pupils, not teachers. Under the "guise" of solving pupils' problems, it is more the teacher's problems that are discussed in the community circle: "Today we have been talking about vulgar language they use, so we do try to solve it."

Vulgar language among pupils may not be perceived by pupils as a problem, but it becomes a problem more in relation to the norms of the school and its representatives. Community circles are sometimes forcibly used to solve problems that are not real problems for pupils: "We are sending a ball round, so now you have the ball, what problem do you have?". Community circles built in this way may not be productive in building functional class rules.

The question arises as to what the disciplinary situation in this teacher's class looks like. The teacher states: "I don't have a problem with discipline, perhaps it is because of age, I don't have to deal with discipline, to think about how to keep it ...". However, the analysis of the interview and in particular of the video recordings shows that misbehavior is an issue for her. Iveta especially uses subtle discipline mechanisms: "If they are misbehaving, I stop talking, I don't shout, I look at my watch, we'll be here for two more minutes, it's far better than when someone shouts at them." However, Iveta encounters even more serious manifestations of misbehavior, which she deals with in a traditionally repressive way, such as by an official reprimand from the teacher, for speaking about another teacher

¹ All quotations in this chapter by cooperating teacher Iveta.

vulgarily, for example.

There is a lack of proactive classroom management strategies which leads to the application of a reactive strategy of classroom management. Iveta's disciplinary strategies show a one-way relationship between the teacher and pupils; the teacher as the "holder" of the school agenda, who advises pupils to submit to this agenda. If that is not the case, repression follows.

Thus, Iveta understands DISCIPLINE AS A TOOL WHICH SERVES TEACHERS: "*Class self-government, even that is to help the teacher.*" She does not explicitly mention the importance of discipline for pupils or for building an environment suitable for learning.

The teacher's responsibility for the learning process is related to her construction of a CONTROLLING ROLE, which Iveta associates with both instructional management (where she is the guarantor of knowledge) and behavioral management (where she is the guarantor of normative order). In the next chapter, I will highlight how patterns of *teacher-centered interpretative repertoire* is legitimated.

5.1.1. Iveta's legitimization of the teacher-centered interpretative repertoire

It is interesting to look at Iveta's legitimization tools for her teacher-centered interpretative repertoire of classroom management. The most frequently mentioned legitimization tool is her age. The teacher is already old enough to retire, while the pupils attend the 6th grade, i.e. they are 11 years old. The teacher emphasizes age as a factor that legitimizes her authority and overall dominance in classroom management. On the other hand, the teacher indicates the age difference as a barrier between the teacher and the pupils: "*We are two generations apart*".²

The GENERATIONAL GAP of the teacher is constantly emphasized. She considers herself to be very distant from the pupils age-wise. Despite this (and because of this), age is an important legitimizing tool for her *teacher-centered interpretative repertoire*. She calls the pupils CHILDREN. The use of the term child instead of pupil may point to the roles of these participants being missed out in the school discourse (Štech, 2016). The context of the asymmetric relationship is given by the large age difference between Iveta and the children, but also by the discursive role of the pupils. The teacher has to supervise the pupils because "*they are children, aren't they?*"

If pupils are discursively viewed as children, then the *teacher-centered approach* can be legitimized by the children's needs as a result of their asymmetric relationship: "*Some children can work with me, but some of them can't, some really need a firm hand and leadership.*"

By reference to childhood, however, this asymmetry and hierarchy goes beyond school boundaries, becoming a general principle of inequality. Children are therefore those who need strong leadership. At the same time, this discourse of childhood can carry the signs of support, help and protection. However, this can also be a "cover" for strengthening the teacher's position of power. Within the asymmetric relationship between the teacher and the children there are a number of inequalities, with perhaps the most striking being the inequality in responsibility. Here I come back to the character of a *teacher-centered interpretative repertoire*, reflected in both instructional and behavioral management, which is the assumption of responsibility by the teacher when all the pupils' problems become those of the teacher. In the area of behavioral management, the legitimization mechanism of assuming responsibility is discursively constructed through the pupils' childhood - children have to listen to adults. In the field of instructional management, the legitimization mechanism is knowledge itself - the pupils have to learn. Since the teacher is the bearer of knowledge, the expertise lies solely with the teacher. The process of learning is in the teacher's hands, that is, the teacher knows best who, when, how and what the pupil should learn.

5.2. Functions of Iveta's interpretative repertoires in her teaching

The function of Iveta's interpretative repertoires within the local learning context is described on the basis of the video analysis. Specifically, I focus on how *teacher-centered interpretative repertoires* are used and negotiated in rituals in teaching, linguistic strategies and teaching practices.

Iveta's teaching includes some **teacher-centered rituals**. These are the power rituals that are fulfilled in communication acts. Iveta defines and maintains the distinctive roles of teacher and pupils through these rituals. A typical ritual she uses is a *ritual of apology*. Every time the teacher enters the classroom, the pupils stand up and sit down when the teacher indicates they should do so. This is a traditional way of pupils greeting teachers in Czech schools. In Iveta's class, the greeting ritual is directly linked to the ritual of apology. Pupils who have to apologize for something do not sit down when the teacher gives permission to sit, but they remain standing and apologize one after each other. The reason for their apologies may be, for example, a forgotten workbook, homework, or a parental signature. Pupils do this without the teacher asking them to do it; this is a regular practice:

Barca: Miss, sorry, my homework hasn't been signed.

Teacher: Fanda.

Fanda: Miss, I forgot to write the title, so should I write it somewhere above it?

Teacher: Write it down under it.

Teacher: Julča.

Julča: Miss, sorry, my homework hasn't been signed.

Teacher: Same as yesterday.

...

² All quotations in this chapter by cooperating teacher Iveta.

Teacher: So, Nikola and Světlana haven't done their homework, so come here and I will write a note in your student's book, but quickly!

As such, this apologizing ritual does not work in helping pupils to be able to perform their tasks, as it does not contribute to improving the situation. The apologizing ritual does not serve to support the process of pupils' learning, rather it is a power tool for the teacher. Its inclusion at the very beginning of the lesson "introduces" the discourse of teaching as asymmetrical. The teacher ignores some of the less serious "misdemeanors"; and for the more serious ones she uses a formal repressive sanction. She does not work with proactive classroom management tools that could help prevent pupils from forgetting their homework. The *ritual of apology* is thus an everyday part of her teaching practice and a symbol of teacher domination.

Iveta's **linguistic strategies** lead to a *teacher-centered discourse* being built. They are particularly noticeable in pupil instruction. If a teacher wants to address the class, she uses the term CHILDREN. She thus not only thinks about the pupils as children, as I have mentioned in the chapter on interpretative repertoires, but also addresses them in this way. The pupils' attention is further gained by the teacher drawing attention to herself: "*Now please listen to me.*" She does not refer to learning objectives nor does she point out the usefulness of the learning for pupils. In some cases the instruction starts with a question for learners as in the *learner-centered approach*, but the teacher expects a response within the borders of school routines, not in terms of something meaningful for pupils or their lives:

Teacher: So you should know these works, why?

Eliška: Because we wrote them in our reading diaries.

Teacher: Yes, excellent, you wrote them in your reading diaries, that's right.

Her work with timing also corresponds to the TEACHING IS IN THE HANDS OF THE TEACHER. During the instruction, questions for the pupils related to managing the task are replaced by the teacher's views: "*I think you'll have already finished it, it wasn't that long.*" In the classroom there are also signs of the interpretative repertoire ME AND THEM. The teacher, for example, emphasizes her dissimilarity of pupils from the teacher by saying that the pupils speak in another language: "*If I say it in your words - a gig.*"

Iveta's teaching practices are varied. In accordance with her interpretive repertoire of classroom management, in the monitored lessons the transmissive approach characterized by the IRE communication structure prevailed.

In Iveta's teaching the pressure of traditional vs. modern teaching is reflected in the fact that the teacher applies some elements of constructivist teaching in relation to selected teaching content (for example, in creative writing), while based on her interpretive repertoire, classroom management remains more *teacher-centered*. Thus, the potential of constructivist-oriented teaching methods is not fulfilled. In essence, this is a *pseudo learner-centered approach*, when constructivist methods are applied as a formality because the teacher does not "believe" in them:

"That group work is nice, and I think it leads to some creative activity, but if I have to explain something new and I want to really know that they have understood a point, I think that the teacher's explanation is important."

Constructivist methods are used by the teacher to improve her teaching, but she does not see their potential in learning as much as in traditional transmissive teaching methods. Iveta's didactic strategies are mainly characterized by a one-way relationship, where the teacher is the one who explains and passes the knowledge to the pupils. The elements of constructivism have not been developed because the teacher has not empowered pupils in the process of learning, letting them build knowledge on existing foundations.

5.3. Interpretative repertoires of classroom management of the student teacher Zdena: semi-learner-centered approach

In the early stages of career development, the interpretative repertoire is not only about the classroom management (with which the student teacher has only a little experience) but also the motivation for choosing the teaching profession. For Zdena, this was her interest in pupils: "*I definitely love children.*"³

INTEREST IN PUPILS is part of the interpretative repertoire of classroom management which is called *learner-centered*. Zdena speaks about elements of the *learner-centered approach* while also blending it with some elements of the *teacher-centered approach*. This is why I refer to her interpretative repertoire as a *semi-learner-centered approach*. This interpretative repertoire, like that of the cooperating teacher, manifests itself in both instructional and behavioral management.

In **instructional management**, we can see in Zdena's accounts about teaching that she herself is the GUARANTOR OF KNOWLEDGE. She determines what is right and wrong, mainly related to the teaching of grammar, which the student teacher referred to. At the same time, however, Zdena stresses the NEED FOR THE PUPILS TO UNDERSTAND WHAT IS TAUGHT: "*What I give to the pupils or what I teach them, they accept it, understand and use it in practice.*" Transmission of the curriculum thus legitimizes elements of the *learner-centered approach* - pupils understanding and using the knowledge in practice. To fulfill this process, Zdena names some important assumptions. She speaks in particular about BUILDING THE CLASS ATMOSPHERE, which is her responsibility. She stresses "*the relationship of mutual trust, that they can ask when they do not understand or when I explain it and they do not understand it, they just ask.*"

The class atmosphere can be associated with behavioral management; trust as a sign of the class atmosphere is one of the prerequisites for successful instructional management from the Zdena's perspective. In terms of pupil motivation, Zdena emphasizes

³ All quotations in this chapter by student teacher Zdena.

external motivation with marks in her teaching. In addition, she adds the need to explain to the pupils the PRACTICAL BENEFIT OF THE TAUGHT MATERIAL: “Always tell them what it will be useful for … you can explain the new topic and then let them take a while to think, reflect and ask about what they do not understand.” From the point of view of motivating pupils, she emphasizes the space for pupils to ask questions about the topic and she also begins to discuss the subject by asking questions about the EXPERIENCE OF THE PUPILS UP TILL NOW: “We were studying Jaroslav Foglar and he led a scout club. And so we started talking about whether the children attend scouts or another club. And the children suddenly began to be interested.”

The cooperating teacher Iveta also works with motivation with the practical benefit of the curriculum and with questions, but these do not always focus on experiences that are relevant to pupils. In the case of asking about the scouts, the student teacher Zdena spoke about the real experiences of the pupils, which is evident in the recording of the lessons, where the pupils actively participated in the topic.

The conditions for understanding **behavioral management** are quite different for the student teacher than the cooperating teacher. The student teacher enters the class for a limited time, does not know individual pupils, the class rules are already set to a large extent, and her communication with the parents is limited due to her role as a trainee. The student teacher is socialized into a discourse community of a classroom established by the cooperating teacher. In this socialization, however, she is an active agent who can change the discourse practice.

In particular, Zdena emphasizes the need for a good relationship with pupils and the need to “*deal with them fairly*”. At the same time, she is aware of the boundaries between the teacher and the pupils and the asymmetry of their relationship: “*I just have to maintain the relationship of superiority, not slip into just chatting to each other*.” Unlike the cooperating teacher in this asymmetric setting, Zdena emphasizes THE COMMON DISCUSSION FIELD: WE. When talking about teaching, she usually does not talk about the pupils as “they”, but in the teaching activity she uses the pronoun “we”. If the activities are referred to as shared, we can assume there is SHARED RESPONSIBILITY FOR LEARNING. Zdena describes those who are responsible for learning as follows: “*I showed them that they are definitely not learning for me or for parents. I already know it. Even if they do not realize it now, then it will be useful in life when they are older. And that it's up to them.*”

In Zdena's view, teaching serves the pupils, not the parents or teachers, to whom Iveta assigns responsibility for learning. Pupils' responsibility for learning is legitimized by Zdena through their interest in learning.

Zdena also fulfills the CONTROLLING ROLE in her teaching, which she states in the statement: “*Before the lesson began, I had to settle the children down.*” Her use of the word children for pupils is especially in the context of discipline and power-oriented situations: “*Getting on top of the screaming children.*” The use of the word children may thus be a means of constructing asymmetric and hierarchical relationships as it is for the cooperating teacher. These relationships are not legitimized by the student teacher by age (although she is an adult person for the pupils), but in the roles of teacher and pupil.

The area of behavioral management is understood by Zdena especially in the reactive plane. She thinks more about how to solve problems in class rather than how to prevent them. However, some of the reactive means she uses are different from those used by the cooperating teacher Iveta. Zdena, also came across vulgarism in her teaching when the pupils started calling each other “morons”. Zdena asked her pupil why he used the word moron, which surprised the pupils because the word became part of the teacher's vocabulary or teacher's register (Cazden, 2001). According to her, by using these words in this way she makes it clear that the pupils “*will not be judged*” by the teacher. She mentions a weakening in the hierarchical relationship, even though in the teaching communication she aims for an asymmetrical realization of the roles typical of the relationship between teacher and pupils. In relation to the rules in the classroom, the pupils' voices are important to Zdena, although she adds that “*the teacher should have the final word*”. This represents DELIMITED PUPILS' VOICES. Overall, however, Zdena perceives behavioral management as a sphere that does not fully fall into her sphere of influence. If pupils come to the class with personal problems, for example, the teacher needs to listen to them, but the solution to these issues is not seen by Zdena as part of the teacher's work.

Zdena's interpretative repertoire of classroom management blends elements of the *learner-centered approach* with elements of the *teacher-centered approach*, in that some elements of the *learner-centered approach* are to a large extent delimited (the voices of the pupils), while others are replaced by elements of the *teacher-centered approach*.

5.4. Functions of Zdena's interpretative repertoires in her teaching in the context of her cooperating teacher

In the student teacher Zdena's teaching, in addition to her *semi-learner-centered approach interpretative repertoire*, the rituals and practices of her cooperating teacher are also reflected. As their interpretative repertoires are partly different, it is interesting to see how their teaching differs. It should be noted that the difference in teaching is also given by the stage of the student's professional development and her role as a trainee. Therefore, I do not focus on problems in instruction (which are related mainly to the stage of professional development), but rather on rituals and discourses (which are rather linked to the interpretative repertoire of classroom management). I will focus on them in the context of the cooperating teacher's teaching so that I can discuss the socialization of the student teacher into the discourse community of the classroom. Some rituals, linguistic strategies, and teaching practices of the cooperating teacher are also found in the Zdena's teaching. The pupils' apology ritual is one such obvious example:

Student teacher Zdena: Hello, sit down.

((Some sit down, others stay standing at their desks.))

Student teacher Zdena: Have you all forgotten something? ((Speaks to the students who are standing.))

Vojta: Miss, sorry, I haven't done my homework.

Student teacher Zdena: Okay, so next time, yeah.

K: Miss, sorry, I wasn't here. I didn't know that we were supposed to read it.

Student teacher Zdena: Okay.

Eliška: Miss, sorry, I remembered it, but I haven't got my exercise book.

Student teacher Zdena: It doesn't matter if you don't have your exercise books, the important thing is to know it, yeah.

...

The apology ritual happens repeatedly in Zdena's classes. The ritual, which does not work in terms of changing the behavior of the pupils, as described for the cooperating teacher Iveta, is reproduced here. Zdena maintains the ritualized structure of the lessons which was set up in cooperating teacher Iveta's classes.

From the point of view of pupil instruction, Zdena uses name tags because she does not know the pupils' names. She most often addresses a pupil named Eliška, the pupil with whom the cooperating teacher also works most often. Zdena thus adopts a model of interaction with an active pupil in the class. This model does not lead to all pupils being involved in the classroom, typical of the *learner-centered approach*. So, by adopting this model, Zdena chooses an "easier way" of interacting with pupils.

Zdena's instruction differs from that of the cooperating teacher as there is occasional peer teaching and choice-making. An example of peer instruction is in the use of a classmate to help a pupil who does not know the answer to the question, to show him the exercise in the textbook, or to share study materials with him. Choice-making occurs with Zdena in the form of basic instructions: "*When you do not want to read any more, choose another one of your classmates ...*", "*Do you want to continue?*" (student teacher Zdena, literature class).

It is a strategy of Iveta's to "choose a classmate", but when Zdena does this, she supplements it with the added value of the pupils' choice.

Overall, however, the student teacher moves within a decontextualized school discourse. When a conversation with pupils develops which is difficult to manage, she ends it, for example by switching to a didactic medium: "*So open your readers on page one hundred and forty-two and read a piece of the work*" (student teacher Zdena, literature class).

From the point of view of **teaching practices**, Zdena also mainly has a transmissive way of teaching. Her lessons copy the teaching phases of the cooperating teacher, which may also be a result of direct instructions from the cooperating teacher. Zdena mostly used transmissive teaching with the IRE communication structure. This corresponds to a *teacher-centered approach* in the fact that the dominant communication activity is based on the teacher, who controls the communication structure.

Although Zdena's and Iveta's interpretative repertoires of classroom management are different (Zdena has elements of a *learner-centered approach*), their teaching is similar, in particular, in the formation of a teacher-centered discourse. However classroom discourse of the cooperating teacher Iveta is not fully teacher-centered, student teacher Zdena is being socialized into teacher centered discourse typical for the dominant role of a teacher, transmissive teaching methods rather than constructivist, the teacher having a controlling role and the responsibility for learning.

6. Discussion

Through research, I have found out what interpretative repertoires are used by a student teacher and her cooperating teacher to construct classroom management, and what classroom practices these repertoires imply. In the discussion, these interpretative repertoires can be related to classroom discourses on classroom management, which, unlike interpretative repertoires, are conceived as less contextually bound and therefore less variable across contexts (Wiggins & Potter, 2008).

For the student teacher Zdena, the concept of a teacher, pupils, and responsibility for the learning process is closer to the *learner-centered approach*. Her interpretative repertoire of classroom management therefore has a greater likelihood of embracing constructivist teaching leading to a change in her discursive practice. The student teacher on teaching practice is, however, in a discursive community of a class formed by the cooperating teacher and institutional context. This discourse community is made up of rituals, linguistic strategies, and teaching practices which influence the student teacher. A typical example is the apology ritual, representing a stable pattern of behavior which attributes a broader meaning to a situation (Bernstein, Elvin, & Peters, 1966). Teaching practice takes place in established cultural practices that are not only held in the minds of a group of people, but also in the material structure and organization of a setting (Bloome et al., 2004), in Czech schools, for example, in a typical arrangement of the room or apology ritual. The teacher-centered discourse can be strengthened not only by cooperating teacher, but especially by cultural codes and discursive practice reproduced in schools as institutions (McLaren, 1999). Thus, there could be also cultural historical explanations for the more teacher-centered classroom discourse in Iveta's case. However, it is also important to find out how actors perceive these institutional settings and which of them are seen as possible to change.

Student teachers often have a clear idea of how they want to manage the class (linked to the learner-centered approach), but they do not manage to apply it in practice (Fung & Chow, 2002; Poom-Valickis & Löfström, 2018), partly due to this institutional order as the research has revealed. Especially the rituals and teaching practices of the cooperating teachers (and school institutions) appear to be rather rigid and difficult for the student teacher to negotiate if they aim to transform the discourse of classroom management. According to Smith (2005, p. 54) some student teachers play a role "as change agents who can help to reconceptualize instruction and its discourse". This kind of active role is taken by the student teacher in her choice of discursive means, in which the student teacher relatively frees herself from the discourse of the cooperating teacher, in particular by building a common discursive field with the pupils, who she refers to as "we". However, the IRE structure is predominant in student teacher's teaching, not only because of the cooperation teacher, but also because IRE is "the default pattern of classroom discourse – doing what comes naturally" by the nature of school as an institution (Cazden, 2001, p. 53). Changing this pattern of classroom discourse, for the student teacher who is on

teaching practice for only a short period of time and who is evaluated by cooperating teacher (Rozelle & Wilson, 2012), is difficult. In addition to the career development phase of the students characterized by a lack of experience, broader discourse of classroom management of student teacher and cooperating teacher should be taken in an account. Thus, the question remains whether teaching practice, in addition to giving student teachers experience, also serves to reproduce *teacher-centered discourse* in education.

7. Implications and conclusion

The research brings some implications for teacher education. The first findings concern the undergraduate teacher education. It has been shown that interpretative repertoires of classroom management are reflected in the teaching itself, both in instructional management and in behavior management. One of the prerequisites for learner-centered classroom management is therefore the teacher having a corresponding interpretative repertoire. Therefore, competence-based training is not enough in teacher education (cf. Smith, 2005). Undergraduate teacher education should be considered as "education" focusing on the principles, starting points and philosophy of approaches to classroom management (a comprehensive understanding of classroom management discourse). One way in which student teachers can get a perspective on classroom management discourse is by "understanding how pedagogic goals and language use are interconnected" (Walsh, 2013, p. 132). Students should also be prepared to negotiate issues of voice and power when planning with their cooperating teacher (Smith, 2005).

The second finding confirms that teacher-centered discourse seems to be a very difficult challenge whether for teachers or students, who are too familiar with this kind of participation pattern and institutional order (Recuerda, 2010). To be able to change teacher-centered discourse it is not enough just to change the instructional and behavior management sub-procedures. It is a holistic change in the paradigm of the learning community: the instructor's role evolves from being an expert who controls and imparts knowledge to that of a facilitator (Brown et al., 2016). The facilitator uses content to promote learning rather than to define what will be learned (Kayler, 2009), builds self-confidence and empowerment in pupils (Tangney, 2014), pupils take an active role in learning (Blumberg, 2008), including adopting responsibility for their learning (Kayler, 2009), and the importance of the personal domain including interpersonal relationships, beliefs and perceptions that are affected by and/or supported by the organization and educational system as a whole is obvious (Deakin Crick, McCombs, Haddon, Broadfoot, & Tew, 2007). Communication in the classroom is closely interrelated with power (McCroskey & Richmond, 1983). To switch a teacher-centered discourse to a student-centered discourse means a change in the power relationship within the classroom.

Thirdly, the choice of cooperating teacher in teaching practice is also a challenge. This does not mean that teachers with more teacher-centered approach should be eliminated from the teaching practice system. Instead, student teachers should gain experience from a variety of teaching discourses and critically reflect these discourses within school institution. Competing discourses can provide rich zones of collaborative learning (Smith, 2005).

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the Czech Science Foundation (Grantová agentura České republiky) under Grant GA16-02177S Classroom Management Strategies of Student Teachers and Experienced Teachers (Their Mentors) in Lower Secondary Education.

References

- Bernstein, B., Elvin, H. L., & Peters, R. S. (1966). Ritual in education. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B, Biological Sciences*, 251(772), 429–436.
- Bloome, D., Carter, S. P., Christian, B. M., Otto, S., & Shuart-Faris, N. (2004). *Discourse analysis and the study of classroom language and literacy events: A micro-ethnographic perspective*. Routledge.
- Blumberg, P. (2008). *Developing learner-centered teaching: A practical guide for faculty*. San Francisco: Jossey Boss.
- Boeije, H. (2009). *Analysis in qualitative research*. Sage.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101.
- Bromfield, C. (2006). PGCE secondary trainee teachers & effective behaviour management: An evaluation and commentary. *Support for Learning*, 21(4), 188–193.
- Brooks, C. F. (2016). Role, power, ritual, and resistance: A critical discourse analysis of college classroom talk. *Western Journal of Communication*, 80(3), 348–369.
- Brophy, J. (1988). Educating teachers about managing classrooms and students. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 4, 1–18.
- Brown, T. J., Castor, T., Byrnes-Loinette, K., Bowman, J., & McBride, C. (2016). The LOCs and the shift to student-centered learning. *Communication Education*, 65(4), 493–495.
- Cazden, C. B. (1995). New ideas for research on classroom discourse. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29(2), 384–387.
- Cazden, C. B. (2001). *Classroom discourse: The language of teaching and learning*. Portsmouth: Heinemann.
- Cazden, C. B., Beck, S. W., Gernsbacher, M. A., & Goldman, S. R. (2003). Classroom discourse. In A. C. Graesser (Ed.). *Handbook of discourse processes* (pp. 165–197). Routledge.
- Chen, P. P., & Bonner, S. M. (2017). Teachers' beliefs about grading practices and a constructivist approach to teaching. *Educational Assessment*, 22(1), 18–34.
- Christofferson, M., Sullivan, A., & Bradley, E. (2015). Preservice teachers' classroom management training: A survey of self-reported training experiences, content coverage, and preparedness. *Psychology in the Schools*, 52(3), 248–264.
- Clarke, A., Triggs, V., & Nielsen, W. (2014). Cooperating teacher participation in teacher education a review of the literature. *Review of Educational Research*, 84(2), 163–202.
- ČSÚ (2016). Annual report 2015–2016. http://www.csicr.cz/html/VZCSI2015_2016/html5/index.html?&locale=ENG.
- Daniels, D. H., & Perry, K. E. (2003). "Learner-centered" according to children. *Theory Into Practice*, 42(2), 102–108.
- Deakin Crick, R., McCombs, B., Haddon, A., Broadfoot, P., & Tew, M. (2007). The ecology of learning: Factors contributing to learner-centered classroom cultures. *Research Papers in Education*, 22(3), 267–307.
- Dicke, T., Elling, J., Schmeck, A., & Leutner, D. (2015). Reducing reality shock: The effects of classroom management skills training on beginning teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 48, 1–12.
- Emmer, E. T., & Stough, L. M. (2001). Classroom management: A critical part of educational psychology, with implications for teacher education. *Educational*

- Psychologist*, 36(2), 103–112.
- Fung, L., & Chow, L. P. Y. (2002). Congruence of student teachers' pedagogical images and actual classroom practices. *Educational Research*, 44(3), 313–321.
- Hanušová, S., Píšová, M., Kohoutek, T., Minaříková, E., Janík, M., Janík, T., et al. (2017). *Chťejí zůstat nebo odejít? Začínající učitelé v českých základních školách*. Brno: Masarykova univerzita.
- Harakchiyska, T. (Ed.). (2018). *Learner-centered teaching manual. A training pack for university teaching staff*. Brno: Masaryk University.
- Hardy, C., & Thomas, R. (2014). Strategy, discourse and practice: The intensification of power. *Journal of Management Studies*, 51(2), 320–348.
- Heller, V. (2014). Discursive practices in family dinner talk and classroom discourse: A contextual comparison. *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction*, 3(2), 134–145.
- Hewson, P. W., Tabachnick, B. R., Zeichner, K. M., & Lemberger, J. (1999). Educating prospective teachers of biology: Findings, limitations, and recommendations. *Science Education*, 83, 373–384.
- Hoepfl, M. C. (1997). Choosing qualitative research: A primer for technology education researchers. *Journal of Technology Education*, 9(1), 47–63.
- Izadinia, M. (2015). A closer look at the role of mentor teachers in shaping preservice teachers' professional identity. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 52, 1–10.
- Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. *Pragmatics and beyond new series: vol. 125*, (pp. 13–34).
- Johnson, M., & Mercer, N. (2019). Using sociocultural discourse analysis to analyse professional discourse. *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction*, 21, 267–277.
- Jones, V. F., & Jones, L. S. (1998). *Comprehensive classroom management: Creating communities of support and solving problems*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Kayler, M. A. (2009). Teacher development and learner-centered theory. *Teacher Development*, 13(1), 57–69.
- Kramer, P., Ideishi, R. I., Kearney, P. J., Cohen, M. E., Ames, J. O., Shea, G. B., ... Blumberg, P. (2007). Achieving curricular themes through learner-centered teaching. *Occupational Therapy in Health Care*, 21(1–2), 185–198.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (1999). Critical classroom discourse analysis. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33(3), 453–484.
- Martin, N., & Sass, D. (2010). Construct validation of the Behavior and Instructional Management Scale. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26(5), 1124–1135.
- Martínez-Avila, D., & Smiraglia, R. P. (2013). Revealing perception: Discourse analysis in a phenomenological framework. *NASKO*, 4(1), 223–230.
- Maxwell, J. A. (2012). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach*. Sage Publications.
- McCrosskey, J. C., & Richmond, V. P. (1983). Power in the classroom I: Teacher and student perceptions. *Communication Education*, 32(2), 175–184.
- McLaren, P. (1999). *Schooling as a ritual performance: Toward a political economy of educational symbols and gestures*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Mehan, H. (1979). *Learning lessons: Social organization in the classroom*. Harvard University Press.
- Meirink, J. A., Meijer, P. C., Verloop, N., & Bergen, T. C. M. (2009). Understanding teacher learning in secondary education: The relations of teacher activities to changed beliefs about teaching and learning. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 25, 89–100.
- Mena, J., Hennissen, P., & Loughran, J. (2017). Developing pre-service teachers' professional knowledge of teaching: The influence of mentoring. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 66, 47–59.
- Ng, W., Nicholas, H., & Williams, A. (2010). School experience influences on preservice teachers' evolving beliefs about effective teaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26, 278–289.
- Nystrand, M. (1997). *Opening dialogue: Understanding the dynamics of language and learning in the English classroom*. New York: Teachers and College Press.
- Ohlsson, R. (2018). Student-teacher conferencing in Swedish upper secondary school: Dimensions of dominance and relations between perspectives in institutional discourse. *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction*, 18, 113–123.
- Oral, B. (2012). Student teachers' classroom management anxiety: A study on behavior management and teaching management. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 42(12), 2901–2916.
- Parker, I. (2002). *Critical discursive psychology*. Springer.
- Pillen, M., Den Brok, P., & Beijaard, D. (2013). Profiles and change in beginning teachers' professional identity tensions. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 34, 86–97.
- Poom-Valickis, K., & Löfström, E. (2018). "Pupils should have respect for you, although I have no idea how to achieve this?": The ideals and experiences shaping a teacher's professional identity. *Educational Studies*, 1–18.
- Potter, J., & Wetherell, M. (1987). *Discourse and social psychology: Beyond attitudes and behaviour*. Sage.
- Potter, J., & Wetherell, M. (1995). Discourse analysis. In J. A. Smith, R. Harré, & L. van Langenhove (Eds.). *Rethinking methods in psychology* (pp. 80–92). London: Sage.
- Powell, R. R. (2006). Basic research methods for librarians. *Library & Information Science Research*, 28, 149–167.
- Recuerda, E. A. (2010). Norm-transgression sequences in the classroom interaction at a Madrid high school. *Linguistics and Education*, 21(3), 210–228.
- Riedler, M., & Eryaman, M. Y. (2016). Complexity, diversity and ambiguity in teaching and teacher education: Practical wisdom, pedagogical fitness and tact of teaching. *International Journal of Progressive Education*, 12(3), 172–186.
- Rozelle, J. J., & Wilson, S. M. (2012). Opening the black box of field experiences: How cooperating teachers' beliefs and practices shape student teachers' beliefs and practices. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 28(8), 1196–1205.
- Sedova, K., Salamounova, Z., & Svaricek, R. (2014). Troubles with dialogic teaching. *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction*, 3(4), 274–285.
- Smith, E. R. (2005). Learning to talk like a teacher: Participation and negotiation in co-planning discourse. *Communication Education*, 54(1), 52–71.
- Smith, J. A., & Osborne, M. (2015). Interpretative phenomenological analysis. In J. A. Smith (Ed.). *Qualitative psychology: A practical guide to research methods*. Sage.
- Starks, H., & Brown Trinidad, S. (2007). Choose your method: A comparison of phenomenology, discourse analysis, and grounded theory. *Qualitative Health Research*, 17(10), 1372–1380.
- Staton-Spicer, A. Q., & Darling, A. L. (1986). Communication in the socialization of preservice teachers. *Communication Education*, 35(3), 215–230.
- Štech, S. (2016). Co přinesl "obrat k dítěti" a co naopak skrýl. *Pedagogika*, 66(1), 73–82.
- Strobelberger, K. (2012). *Classroom discourse in ESL teaching: A cross-cultural perspective*. Hamburg: Diplomica Verlag.
- Tangney, S. (2014). Student-centered learning: A humanist perspective. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 19(3), 266–275.
- Taskin, C. S. (2006). Student teachers in the classroom: Their perceptions of teaching practice. *Educational Studies*, 32(4), 387–398.
- Vogler, A. M., Prediger, S., Quasthoff, U., & Heller, V. (2018). Students' and teachers' focus of attention in classroom interaction—Subtle sources for the reproduction of social disparities. *Mathematics Education Research Journal*, 30(3), 299–323.
- Walsh, S. (2013). *Classroom discourse and teacher development*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Watkins, J. W. (1952). Ideal types and historical explanation. *The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science*, 3(9), 22–43.
- Weller, J. (2018). Critical reflection through personal pronoun analysis (critical analysis) to identify and individualise teacher professional development. *Teacher Development*, 1–16.
- Wiggins, S., & Potter, J. (2008). Discursive psychology. In W. Stainton-Rogers, & C. Willig (Eds.). *The Sage handbook of qualitative research in psychology* (pp. 73–90). London: Sage.
- Wolff, C. E., van den Bogert, N., Jarodzka, H., & Boshuizen, H. P. (2015). Keeping an eye on learning: Differences between expert and novice teachers' representations of classroom management events. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 66(1), 68–85.