Exploring One Preservice Teacher's Emerging Pedagogical Beliefs during an Online Book Club

Marla K. Robertson
Utah State University

Jennifer M. Smith
Texas Christian University

This article focuses on a preservice teacher's participation in an online book club using professional literature. The purpose of this study was to understand how one student's participation within an online book club on teaching contributed to a shifting in pedagogical beliefs. Data include online discussion transcripts and end-of-course questionnaire responses. Our analysis led us to conclude that the online book club participation provided opportunities for efferent and aesthetic transactions with the text, provided opportunities for learning from others and self, and provided opportunities to learn about pedagogy that influenced lesson planning and interactions with students.

Keywords: online book club, preservice teachers, teacher beliefs

I can't believe that 54.3% teachers were unenthusiastic about reading!!! That is more than half! How are they supposed to motivate students to read if they themselves do not enjoy it? Why aren't more adults creating a life reading habit to model for children? (Julie, 2/17/2014)

Julie (pseudonym), an undergraduate student in our literacy methods course, posted this as part of an online book discussion. The purpose of this online book club was to provide preservice teachers with the opportunity to read professional literature on teaching as part of their coursework, with the hope that their participation would fulfill three purposes: provide exposure to technology that they could use in their future classroom, help them understand that reading professional texts is part of professional learning for practicing teachers, and influence the planning and execution of a lesson with a student during a field experience. Our focus for this research is the online participation of one preservice teacher, Julie, who participated in an online book club as part of a larger study (Smith & Robertson, 2017/2018), specifically looking for what types of participation

---

Marla Robertson is an Assistant Professor in the School of Teacher Education and Leadership, College of Education, at Utah State University. Jennifer Smith is an Assistant Professor of Professional Practice in the College of Education at Texas Christian University. Marla Robertson can be reached at marla.robertson@usu.edu

within this online book club discussion might contribute to a shifting in pedagogical beliefs.

CONCEPTUAL ORIENTATION OF ONLINE BOOK CLUBS

In designing this online book club, we considered four different areas: technology and online book clubs, transactional theory, teacher beliefs, and professional learning.

TECHNOLOGY AND ONLINE BOOK CLUBS

As expectations for preservice teacher learning increase, we continually search for ways to provide learning opportunities for our preservice teachers in digital spaces such as online literature discussions (Bromley et al., 2014; Day & Kroon, 2010; Larson, 2008). For one thing, we know that embedding technology into our courses is shown to influence future classroom use as well as use in field experiences (Anderson et al., 2011; Labbo & Reinking, 1999: Larson, 2008). We also understand that providing preservice teachers with opportunities to discuss text, even online, allows them to personally understand and share socially constructed meaning of the text (Vygotsky, 1978) through individual and shared transactions (Rosenblatt, 1994). These opportunities for shared language online can influence our preservice teachers learning (Moreillon, Hunt, & Ewing, 2009: Wolsey, 2004) and provide alternate interpretations and new ways of thinking (Rizopoulos & McCarthy, 2009). Studies of online literature discussions have shown an increase in community building, literacy, and communication (Carico, Logan, & Labbo, 2004; Grisham & Wolsey, 2006), and book clubs have been used effectively as professional development opportunities for preservice and inservice teachers (Burbank, Kauchak, & Bates, 2010).

TRANSACTIONAL THEORY

Rosenblatt's transactional theory (1978; 1994) also provided a conceptual framework that guided this study. Rosenblatt says that "Every reading act is an event, or transaction," (1994, p. 1369) and meaning is made within each transaction. Each transaction differs, as this event is influenced by the reader's past experiences, present circumstances, and current mindset (1978). Rosenblatt suggested that each reader will adopt a stance, or purpose, during reading (1994). This stance may favor either efferent or aesthetic reading, falling somewhere on the continuum between the two, but being predominantly one or the other. Efferent reading can be summed up as "scientific" reading, paying attention to the facts and logic while reading. Aesthetic reading, sometimes called "artistic," focuses on the emotions experienced during a reading event. Since every reading event is specific to a reader's past and present circumstances, "the same text may be read either efferently or aesthetically" (p. 1376).

Furthermore, Rosenblatt noted that language encompasses both the social and individual components (1978). Meaning-making involves the past experiences and present state of mind of the reader. When students discuss their understanding of a text, they learn how their interpretation differs from others and can return to the text with a renewed awareness of themselves as readers (1994). Thus, students' language experiences, social interactions, and both individual and shared meanings, all contribute to the transactions that they have with a text.

TEACHER BELIEFS

Another consideration in our research design was the literature on when teacher beliefs are formed. Some researchers posit that teacher's beliefs begin to form with their early schooling experiences, even prior to their preservice teacher education experiences

(Pajares, 1992; Nishino, 2012) and "may be shaped by belief systems beyond the immediate influence of teacher education" (Nespor, 1987, p. 326). For example, beliefs about children, about the role of the teacher, and about the purpose of education play a role in teachers' actions (Priestley, Biesta, & Robinson, 2015). Many researchers recognize that teachers' beliefs influence their practice in various ways and that there is a complex relationship between beliefs and practice (Fang, 1996; Shavelson & Stern, 1981).

However, teachers' beliefs about teaching and learning can be a combination of theoretical and pedagogical knowledge, strategies that work for them personally, and previous successful experiences in the classroom that influence subsequent decisions about teaching (O'Brien & Norton, 1991). Therefore, in preservice teacher experiences, it is important to expose preservice teachers to theories and pedagogy in successful practice because beliefs about subject matter can influence what and how teachers choose to teach (Schmidt & Kennedy, 1990).

Also, there seems to be a relationship between preservice teachers' beliefs and the possible use of technology in their future classrooms (Anderson, Groulx, & Maninger, 2011). However, preservice teachers perceived skills and experience with technology also influence their attitude towards technology integration (Spaulding, 2013). Thus, opportunities for experiential learning may influence preservice teachers' beliefs about the benefits of technology integration for learning (Stover, Yearta, & Harris, 2016).

PROFESSIONAL LEARNING

We know that our preservice teachers need to learn how to participate in learning communities that provide opportunities to strengthen their knowledge of pedagogy and content. This includes applying what they learn in authentic and useful ways and learning to use resources such as technology (Learning Forward, 2011). On a journey to become a master teacher, our preservice teachers need to move from declarative-situated knowledge along a continuum to eventually becoming more expert and reflective (Snow, Griffin, & Burns, 2005). In order to achieve this goal, preservice teachers need to have experiences in learning how to continuously learn from professional literature and from collaboration with colleagues, particularly about teaching literacy. Also, learning activities that allow teachers the opportunity to apply learning in real-life situations through practice and reflection are shown to provide preservice teachers the opportunity to move along this continuum to becoming expert teachers (Wei, Darling-Hammond, Andree, Richardson, & Orphanos, 2009).

These four areas factored into the decision to use an online book club and influenced the design. For example, the decision to use professional trade books for the online book club fit our goal of helping preservice teachers investigate some overarching ideas of literacy education: reading, writing, and language. We chose books that a practicing teacher might read as part of their ongoing professional learning in length and readability. Another consideration regarding book choice was our goal to expose our preservice teachers to theories about literacy that might shift their emerging pedagogical beliefs. The choice of online platform and the expectations for the online book club were also designed with Rosenblatt's theories in mind (1978, 1994).

BACKGROUND OF THE LARGER STUDY

During the 2013-2014 school year, we investigated how preservice teachers from two undergraduate literacy and assessment courses participated in an online book club using professional teacher trade books prior to a field placement experience (Smith & Robertson, 2017/2018). The larger study focuses on the design and implementation of the online book club into the course.

PARTICIPANTS

Each of us taught one section of an undergraduate literacy course and implemented the online book club within the course content. Since the online book club was part of the normal curricular activities, all preservice teachers in both classes participated. However, we only analyzed the data from the 31 preservice teachers who signed the consent form.

PROCEDURES

In this study, the preservice teachers chose one of three books to read: *The Book Whisperer* (Miller, 2009), *A Writer's Notebook* (Fletcher, 1996), or *Choice Words* (Johnston, 2004). We created small groups using the online platform, Edmodo (www.edmodo.com), and preservice teachers engaged in asynchronous discussions with their group members over the course of four weeks. Each student was expected to post at least three responses each week, including both original comments and replies to their peers.

Following the online book discussions, each group presented key information from their chosen text to the class and provided everyone with a handout summarizing the presentation. Thus, everyone was exposed to all three books in some way. This was important, as the preservice teachers then began a field placement experience in which they were working on literacy skills with an elementary student. We wanted them to have information from the three texts as they planned lessons and interacted with the children.

QUESTIONNAIRE

A questionnaire was completed by all preservice teachers at the end of the semester and included three open-ended questions. The questions were designed to help us understand if any of the books influenced the preservice teachers' teaching during the semester and if preservice teachers believed the books would influence their future teaching (Smith & Robertson, 2017/2018).

DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

We documented our instructor observations, preservice teachers online and questionnaire responses, and subsequently identified how preservice teachers integrated ideas from their online book club participation into lesson plans toward the end of the semester. This qualitative case study (Creswell, 2014) drew on data that was generated during normal curricular activities. Online transcriptions were coded using a priori codes based on a rubric that was used to guide and evaluate student responses and participation. Additional codes were added when responses fell outside the a priori codes. Student questionnaire responses were coded using open coding techniques. Finally, we generated descriptive statistics to find patterns in the data.

We discovered clear patterns through our data analysis. For example, patterns in student online responses showed the power of dialogue as preservice teachers built off each other's posts, provided support to each other, and showed evidence of learning from each other. Online discussions also showed preservice teachers were making connections in their reading to personal experiences by referencing a portion of the reading, stating why it was chosen, and then connecting to it personally or as a way it would influence their teaching. In addition, although there was a rubric for participation, preservice teachers were moving beyond the rubric expectations by not only showcasing what they were learning from their reading, but also engaging in authentic conversations that challenged each other's thinking.

Analysis of student questionnaires showed preservice teachers were integrating new ideas into lesson plans/interactions within their field placement and showed evidence of

potentially influencing future teaching. Participation in the online book club influenced preservice teachers' emerging beliefs about teaching and learning through rich discussions about the specific content of their book, impacted their lesson planning and interactions within their field placement, and exposed them to the importance of continued professional learning as a way to transform teaching (Smith & Robertson, 2017/2018).

These patterns were clearly identified, but we also noticed differences across the preservice teachers. One interesting difference we noted was each preservice teacher's response to the end-of-semester questionnaire regarding whether their participation in the online book club would influence their teaching with their field placement student and whether this would influence their future teaching. There was a range of responses from maybe to unequivocal yes responses.

Our continuing analysis has focused on one preservice teacher, Julie, who seemed to enthusiastically believe that this experience would change her future teaching. She also fit the patterns that we saw in the large data set including building off others' posts, making connections to the readings, moving beyond the rubric, and engaging in authentic conversations using the online platform. We were interested in looking more closely at her participation and how this may have influenced her emerging beliefs about teaching and learning, particularly on the topic of her professional text. We sought to identify specific components of her thinking and online interactions by understanding how she participated online and transferred that knowledge to her current teaching experience. In this paper, we share the ways in which Julie interacted with others in her online book club, patterns in her participation, and evidence that this experience contributed to her emerging beliefs about teaching and learning.

A CLOSER LOOK AT JULIE

In order to look more closely at the ways in which a preservice teacher's pedagogical beliefs are shaped and shifted (Merriam, 1998), we looked for evidence of active participation within the online book club. We also read all questionnaire answers looking for preservice teachers who specifically mentioned the influence of the books on their teaching. We focused on the three open-ended questions included on the questionnaire that asked (a) if the book she read influenced how she taught during the field placement, (b) if any of the other books influenced how she taught during the field placement, and (c) if she thought any of the three books would influence her future teaching.

Julie was chosen as an informative case (Swanborn, 2010) after careful review of all discussion transcriptions and questionnaires. She was an active participant as she posted at least three times a week during the four-week book club, combining both original posts with replies to her peers. Her questionnaire responses also met our criteria for responses that indicated that the experience influenced her teaching beliefs and pedagogy. We did not choose Julie because we felt she was an exemplar student. We chose Julie because she fit the criteria we set forth: active participation within the online book club and responses on the questionnaire that showed evidence of a shifting of pedagogical beliefs.

DATA ANALYSIS

Data from the online discussions were analyzed in several distinct phases. In phase one, the comments that Julie posted within her book club group were coded using a priori codes based on the course rubric for online discussion participation. Posts were kept intact, but could be assigned multiple codes if the content transitioned from one coding category to another. For instance, in one post Julie agreed with a peer's response, cited specific examples from the text to support her agreement, explained her interpretation of the text examples, and discussed how these ideas could impact teachers. We coded this one post

(six sentences) as building off peer response, discusses specific part of reading and why, and teaching (three codes).

In the second phase of coding, we coded the online transcriptions further by breaking them into units of thought and using codes we adapted from codes developed for literature discussions (Eeds & Wells, 1989). These five coding categories included conversation maintenance, involvement/connections, literal comprehension, inference, and evaluation. In the same excerpt mentioned above, we coded conversation maintenance (agreement) and evaluation-analytic twice. By coding the online transcriptions in these ways, we were able to see patterns that emerged in Julie's online responses that illustrated how she was making meaning from the text.

We also considered the descriptive statistics, including the number of original posts and replies, the number of categories coded, and the dates from the online posts. This data helped us understand when Julie contributed to the online discussions and how this may have influenced her interaction with others in her group as well as how she was making meaning, both individually and as a group member.

Finally, the questionnaire was analyzed looking for evidence of how Julie's participation in the online book club influenced her teaching with her practicum student and her perception of how her experience would influence her future teaching.

FINDINGS

Our analysis showed that Julie's online participation influenced her meaning making during her online book club. First, we describe her online participation and then, using examples of Julie's posts, we show her critical analysis of the text and describe her emerging pedagogical beliefs.

Online Participation

In the online book club, each group decided how many chapters they would read and discuss using the online platform each week. Preservice teachers were expected to post at least three comments per week by Tuesday evening, as the next week of reading, responses, and grading began every Wednesday. Most of Julie's posts were written on a Monday or Tuesday, the end of the week for the discussion of specific chapters. Furthermore, Julie posted all her original comments on one day of each week. For instance, during Week 1, all of her original comments were posted on Saturday and generated two replies each. During Weeks 2 and 3, Julie's original posts were on Tuesday.

During the four weeks of online discussions, Julie posted 21 times to her book group. Seventeen of the posts were original comments and four posts were direct replies to a peer. We wondered if and how often preservice teachers were reading each other's posts, especially those that were posted later in the week. In analyzing posts for the remaining members of Julie's group, we discovered that each time Julie asked a question within a post, another student in her group responded to her question by either replying directly or addressing the question in an original post of their own. We also noted that most of Julie's replies to another group member were on a different day than her original posts. This suggests that even though Julie may not have posted her responses to the chapters until the end of the discussion week, she was logging onto the discussions and reading her group members' posts.

Influence of the rubric. The first round of data analysis of the online discussion transcripts was based on the rubric that was used for evaluation of preservice teachers' online discussions. The rubric required a minimum of three posts per week with requirements for contributions to the discussion, consistent and timely postings including new material and ideas, questions, responses to extend conversations, and connections to assessment and instruction (the topic of the course). The findings revealed that Julie most

often (18 times) discussed specific parts of the text with sufficient evidence of why she chose each excerpt, two additional times using quotations. She also made connections to the field of teaching (14 times). She asked few (3) questions of her peers and only built off their responses, in the form of replies, four times, with only one response coded as a personal connection. Thus, most of Julie's posts reflected an internal conversation that she was having as she thought about the readings and how they connected to teaching.

Analysis of online meaning-making. The second round of coding analyzed the online transcriptions using an adaptation of codes specifically designed for literature discussions (Eeds & Wells, 1989). While Eeds and Wells' study examined face-to-face discussions, their coding categories also applied to the online transcriptions from this study. Coding of the online transcripts showed the following numbers for each category (with subcategories in parentheses): seven conversation maintenance (4 agreement/disagreement, 1 clarification, and 2 synthesis), seven involvement/connections (4 involvement/connections, 3 personal feeling), eight literal comprehension, six inference (3 inference, 3 questions), and 14 evaluation (2 categoric, 12 analytic). Note that we only report the codes that included at least one comment after our analysis. Codes in which we did not find evidence in the transcriptions were excluded from the list.

This analysis revealed that Julie's online posts included a variety of ways she was responding to the text and her peers. In addition to the literal comprehension, in which Julie restated information from the text, we noted that she was making connections, discussing her personal feelings about topics, inferring, and evaluating the text in an analytic manner. We delve deeper into her conversations in the next section.

Critical Analysis of the Text

Close analysis of Julie's online discussion posts showed that she was critically analyzing the text. We show this by dissecting a typical post, discussing how her posts moved beyond literal comprehension, and describing a typical response to her group.

Throughout the duration of the online discussions, Julie most often posted comments that discussed specific parts of *The Book Whisperer* (Miller, 2009) and why she felt these ideas were important. Often, Julie followed the discussion of the text with specific connections to the teaching field:

> I like what Mrs. Miller said that "readers are made, not born." She makes a good point when she states that many of the parents were once students in an elementary/middle [s]chool classroom. If a love for reading wasn't instilled in them, they are not going to instill it in their children. If we don't create a love for reading in our students, they will grow up not enjoying reading and the same problem will continue in the generations that follow. (2/17/2014)

In this excerpt, Julie discussed an idea from the text of readers being made and the implications for the teaching field. Many of Julie's posts followed this pattern, demonstrating her ability to go beyond literal comprehension when reading the text. She realized the importance of the ideas by applying them to teaching scenarios. In this way, Julie was engaging in analytic evaluation. She took an idea presented in the text, "evaluated" it by taking a clear stance on what she thought about the idea, and further explained this stance by providing supporting details related to the text and the field of teaching.

Julie had a combination of literal comprehension and other categories (involvement/connections, inferences, and evaluation) coded within her responses. She was able to read beyond the literal comprehension level with a depth that included connecting, extending her thinking, analytic thinking, and application thinking. For

instance, we noted that Julie made personal connections to the text, using phrases such as "it is sad to me…", "I can relate to this…", and "I had never thought about that before." These connections were cited within Julie's responses as she discussed specific ideas from the text and related them to the teaching field. Julie also included inferences within her posts, both in the form of statements and questions. She took the information that she had read and used her schema on the topic to either extend her thinking or ask a question of her peers. For instance, after discussing how some teachers have required reading for students without even knowing their reading level, Julie wrote, "This is only one example but I am sure it happens time and time again. When will ALL teachers realize and give importance to free reading for their students?" (2/24/2014). The combination of literal comprehension, connections, inferences, and evaluations within Julie's responses are evidence of her deep thinking and meaning making about the text. This shows that even though there was little collaborative dialogue in her online discussions, it seemed that Julie was engaged in meaning making by making her initial posts. At times, it seemed that she was having a conversation with herself. However, having the opportunity to think about what she was reading and put her thoughts together in writing for her post seemed to help her synthesize in her own mind what she was learning from reading the text.

Julie did make several responses to her group. These responses were typically coded as conversation maintenance but also included additional codes. These responses gave Julie the opportunity to engage with her group and build off of a peer response with either support from the text or an evaluative comment. For example, in one reply she wrote,

> I agree. In the book it seems like she was the one who really enjoyed that book. But on the other hand, she really never stopped to ask the class what kind of books they were interested in. [M]aybe they could have done a survey from a couple of book titles and which ever book had the most votes, that could have been used as the class reading. I noticed also that time and time again teachers go through the first few years using "trial and error" they implement many ideas that seem flawless and those ideas don't always work with the group of students in any given school year. Plus, we should always keep in mind that we can't always use the exact same techniques each year because the students needs vary. (2/5/2014)

In this reply, Julie agrees with the initial post from her group member, builds off her post, discusses a specific part of the reading, addresses teaching, and makes several analytic evaluations. This shows that the participation in reading this book together with her online group gave Julie the opportunity to engage in meaning making in a variety of ways.

Emerging Pedagogical Beliefs

One type of response that stood out in Julie's discussion posts was her obvious emotional reaction to reading this professional text. Almost every post displayed evidence of this. The examples discussed in this section are not entire posts but parts of Julie's posts to illustrate our claims.

For example, Julie wrote, "I am very shocked by the fact that this teacher has her students read 40 books throughout the year" (2/1/2014). Julie then went on to say that she can never remember reading that may books in middle school or high school. She used words like, "I had never thought about that before", "I am amazed", "I like", "I loved", "what worries me", "I can't believe", and "it is funny to me." Julie often used all caps, which is a way to show emphasis in online text, such as in these examples: "letting them pick books makes them ENJOY reading", "giving them time to read in class EVERYDAY!!", and "when will ALL teachers realize and give importance to free reading for all students?"

Julie also showed the beginnings of thinking of herself as a teacher in her posts. Many times Julie talked about what "Mrs. Miller says", starts with "the book whisperer speaks about", or just uses the generic word teacher. But towards the end of the online book discussion Julie begins to use the word "we" and other language that identifies herself in the role of the teacher. For example, in one reply to a group member, Julie talked about how in the first years of teaching teachers sometimes do the same things but stated that, "we should always keep in mind that we can't always use the exact same techniques each year because the students needs vary" (2/5/2014). In another reply, Julie addressed how teachers need to ask themselves the purpose of any activity they use, especially the use of worksheets. Julie stated that "it's important to take a step back and really ask ourselves . . . the benefits of the worksheets we're using. This is powerful." (2/11/2014). The inclusion of language identifying herself as a teacher was noted in some posts but was not consistent throughout.

Julie's questionnaire showed evidence of emerging pedagogical beliefs, even though the questionnaire was completed two months after completion of the online book club and after a field-based teaching experience. First, Julie's responses showed that her participation in the online book club influenced her teaching with her practicum student. For example, in response to the question "Did the book you read as part of the online group influence how you taught your student this semester?", she stated "Yes. I feel that choosing books that were interesting to [student name] made a HUGE difference! She was engaged during read alouds and also when it was time for her to read, she was engaged with the books."

It should be noted that the practicum was for a guided reading lesson (with a writing component) written in response to previous literacy assessments, so the practicum student could not choose their own book, but Julie knew from a reading interest survey completed previously in the semester what types of books her student would be interested in reading and chose a book based on this assessment. Second, Julie responded to the question about whether any of the books read for the online book group would influence her future teaching with a list of things she planned to do. She wanted to (a) have book clubs in her future classroom, (b) take book recommendations from her students, (c) give the class time to read a book of their choice, (d) assess students' learning by hearing their "group talks", (e) instill a love for reading in her students, and (f) model being a "life reader." All of these were big ideas from the book she read for her online book club previously in the semester.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Julie's case study illustrates how her participation in an online book club using a professional trade book influenced her emerging pedagogical beliefs. Julie engaged in discussions weekly with her group in ways that helped her make meaning of the text through critical analysis and showed evidence of emerging pedagogical beliefs in her discussion posts. Analysis of her questionnaire responses also showed evidence of emerging pedagogical beliefs about literacy teaching and learning. This evidence from her participation supports the following claims about the potential benefits of incorporating an online book club into a preservice teacher education course.

- **Online discussions provide opportunities for efferent and aesthetic transactions with text.** Julie's participation showed that she was literally comprehending the text, making connections to her personal life and experiences, beginning to see herself in the role of teacher, and doing so with emotion (Rosenblatt, 1978; 1994). She was also making connections with her fellow group members and beginning to connect with the author as a fellow teacher.

- **Online discussions provide opportunities for learning from others and from yourself.** Julie's participation also showed that she was learning from her discussions with others in her group (Moreillon, Hunt, & Ewing, 2009). There was evidence that she was logging in, looking at what other people were writing, and responding on a different day. Having this opportunity will hopefully reinforce that teachers do not teach alone and can learn from sharing their experiences with each other, including experiences reading text. Even though analysis showed that there was minimal back and forth discussion in Julie's group, it seemed that her participation in the discussion was beneficial to her developing knowledge of the content and pedagogy discussed in her book. There are a few possible reasons for this. One, writing a reading response is different that verbalizing or just thinking about a reader response. Research shows that the act of writing provides opportunities for evaluating and synthesizing thoughts and is an act of learning itself (Langer & Applebee, 1987). Also, in this setting, the potential for an audience (the other members of the discussion group) gave Julie the opportunity to think about what she might say to them and how she might get her thoughts across to them as readers. So, even if a person in her group did not actually reply to her post, just thinking about a potential reader seemed to influence Julie's written reader responses. There was evidence that group members were reading each other's posts, even if no formal reply was posted. Also, it could be that participating in the online reading group discussions gave Julie a way to document her own evolving thinking as she was reading her text.
- **Online discussions provide opportunities to learn about pedagogy that can influence lesson planning and interactions with students.** Julie indicated that her participation in the online book club influenced her teaching of her student and she believes what she learned will influence her future teaching and gave many specific ideas to incorporate her learning into her future classroom (Anderson et al., 2011; Labbo & Reinking, 1999; Larson, 2008).

It seemed that the design of the online book club including choice of relevant professional text, choice in how much to read each week, potential readers for discussion posts and replies, and opportunities to share thoughts after reading the same piece of text, fulfilled its purpose, at least for Julie: to create an opportunity for inquiry into beliefs about teaching and learning.

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

Oftentimes there is not enough class time for as much class discussion as we might like to incorporate into our university classes. Also, like Burbank et al. (2010), we understand the benefit of preservice teacher participation in a book club. However, an online book club provided more opportunities for our preservice teachers to engage in learning outside of the classroom and provided more time in class for other endeavors. This type of opportunity may also allow preservice teachers to read professional trade books that may not traditionally be a part of college course texts while modeling a type of online platform that they might use with their future students (Stover, Yearta, & Harris, 2016). Our decision to use Edmodo rather than the university Course Management System provided potential for a discussion that could be accessed even after the course was over. Other online platforms, such as blogs, are an option for instructors who are interested in moving book club discussions online.

Choosing texts to incorporate in an online book club may provide opportunities to include texts that connect broad educational learning across coursework, such as we tried to do by choosing books with big ideas relating to reading, writing, and language. This

might also be an avenue to incorporate teacher practitioner trade books, books that are easier reading than typical college textbooks, or books that a classroom teacher would read as part of their personal learning (Wei et al., 2009).

For future online books clubs, we are considering a few changes in design. For example, we will consider the rubric we used and may include a requirement to have a minimum number of replies. We may require initial posts on one day and replies a few days later. These changes may encourage more replies and more back and forth discussion. We will also consider allowing our preservice teachers to talk for a few minutes in class about their books rather than having the discussions completely online, making it more of a blended experience. This may potentially influence the online discussion.

Influencing teachers' beliefs about teaching and learning is challenging, and we never really know whether we are successful or not. But, participation in an online book club using professional literature seems to be a potential way to help preservice teachers learn about their content and the pedagogy involved in teaching (Schmidt & Kennedy, 1990). It may provide them with the opportunity to use technology that could be used in a future classroom and experience being a student in a similar environment (Spaulding, 2013). It may also provide them with a purposeful way to engage in authentic learning through reading professional text and collaboration with colleagues (in this case fellow preservice teachers) as part of their professional journey to become a master teacher (Snow et al., 2005). In fact, practicing teachers might also consider reading professional text using an online book club as a part of their ongoing professional learning.

.

REFERENCES

Anderson, S. E., Groulx, J. G., & Maninger, R. M. (2011). Relationship among preservice teachers' technology-related abilities, beliefs, and intentions to use technology in their future classrooms. *Journal of Educational Computing Research, 45*(3), 321-338.

Bromley K., Faughnan, M., Ham, S., Miller, M., Armstrong, T., Crandall, C., . . . Marrone, N. (2014). Literature circles go digital. *The Reading Teacher, 68*(3), 229-236.

Burbank, M. D., Kauchak, D., & Bates, A. J. (2010). Book clubs as professional development opportunities for preservice teacher candidates and practicing teachers: An exploratory study. *The New Educator, 6*, 56-73.

Carico, K. M., Logan, D., & Labbo, L. D. (2004). A generation in Cyberspace: Engaging readers through online discussions. *Language Arts*, *81*(4), 293–302.

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications.

Daniels, H. (1994). *Literature circles: Voice and choice in the student-centered classroom.* York, ME: Stenhouse Publishers.

Day, D., & Kroon, S. (2010). "Online literature circles rock!" Organizing online literature circles in a middle school classroom. *Middle School Journal, 42*(2), 18-28.

Eeds, M., & Wells, D. (1989). Grand conversations: An exploration of meaning construction in literature study groups. *Research in the Teaching of English, 23*(1), 4-29.

Fang, A. (1996). A review of research on teacher beliefs and practices. *Educational Research, 38*(1), 47-65.

Fletcher, R. (1996). *A writer's notebook: Unlocking the writer within you.* New York, NY: Harper Trophy.

Grisham, D. L., & Wolsey, T. D. (2006). Recentering the middle school classroom as a vibrant learning community: Students, literacy, and technology intersect. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 49*(8), 648–660.

Johnston, P. H. (2004). *Choice words.* Portland, ME: Stenhouse Publishers.

Labbo, L. D., & Reinking, D. (1999). Negotiating the multiple realities of technology in literacy research and instruction. *Reading Research Quarterly, 34*(4), 478-492.

Langer, J. A., & Applebee, A. N. (1987). *How writing shapes thinking: A study of teaching and learning.* NCTE Research Report No. 22. National Council of Teachers of English.

Larson, L. C. (2008). Electronic reading workshop: Beyond books with new literacies and instructional technologies. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 52*(2), 121-131.

Learning Forward. (2011). *Standards for professional learning*. Oxford, OH: MetLife Foundation.

Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Miller, D. (2009). *The book whisperer.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Moreillon, J., Hunt, J., & Ewing, S. (2009). Learning and teaching in WANDA wiki wonderland: Literature circles in the digital commons. *Teacher Librarian, 37*(2), 23-28.

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

Nishino, T. (2012). Modeling teacher beliefs and practices in context: A multi-methods approach. *The Modern Language Journal, 96*, 380-399.

O'Brien, K., & Norton, R. (1991). Beliefs, practices, and constraints: Influences on teacher decision-making processes. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 18*(1), 29-38.

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

Priestley, M., Biesta, G., & Robinson, S. (2015). *Teacher agency: An ecological approach.* London: Bloomsbury.

Rizopoulos, L. A., & McCarthy, P. (2009). Using online threaded discussions: Best practices for the digital learner. *Journal of Educational Technology Systems, 37*(4), 373-383.

Rosenblatt, L. M. (1978). *The reader, the text, the poem: The transactional theory of the literary work.* Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press.

Rosenblatt, L. M. (1994). The transactional theory of reading and writing. In R. B. Ruddell, & N. J. Unrau (Eds.), *Theoretical models and processes of reading* (5th ed., pp. 1363-1398). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Schmidt, W. H., & Kennedy, M. M. (1990). *Teachers' and teacher candidates' beliefs about subject matter and about teaching responsibilities.* Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement. Retrieved from http://ezproxy.twu.edu:2279/contentdelivery/servlet/ERICServlet?accnol_ED320902

Shavelson, R. J., & Stern, P. (1981). Research on teachers' pedagogical thoughts, judgments, decisions, and behavior. *Review of Educational Research, 51*(4), 455-498.

Smith, J., & Robertson, M. (2017/2018). Influence of online book clubs on pre-service teacher beliefs and practices. *The Reading Professor, 40*(2), 38-44. Retrieved from https://www.pltesig.org/uploads/1/3/2/4/13243280/135591_professors_of_literacy_winter_2017-_spring_2018__19_.pdf

Snow, C. E., Griffin, P., & Burns, M. S. (2005). *Knowledge to support the teaching of reading: Preparing teachers for a changing world.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Spaulding, M. (2013). Preservice and in-service teachers' perceptions toward technology benefits and integration. *Journal of Learning in Higher Education, 9*(1), 67-78.

Stover, K., Yearta, L., & Harris, C. (2016). Experiential learning for preservice teachers: Digital book clubs with third graders. *Journal of Digital Learning in Teacher Education, 32(*1), 3-4.

Swanborn, P. (2010). *Case study research: What, why and how?* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wei, R. C., Darling-Hammond, L., Andree, A., Richardson, N., & Orphanos, S. (2009). *Professional learning in the learning profession: A status report on teacher development in the United States and abroad.* Dallas, TX: National Staff Development Council.

Wolsey, T. D. (2004). Literature discussion in cyberspace: Young adolescents using threaded discussion groups to talk about books. *Reading Online,* 1-2.