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While recent years have seen a research interest in the concept of teacher identity, still less is known about the interplay between teacher-researcher identity. This issue is important for the fields of applied linguistics and teacher education because it sheds light on teacher-scholars’ identity realizations. In this study, I examine the interrelations of teacher and researcher identity across different contexts and spaces. Namely, I analyze the trajectories of one teacher as he moved through countries and educational experiences. Data sources included semi-structured interviews, artifacts, and email correspondence. Beginning with the assumption that identity is a complex, dynamic, multidimensional, negotiated, and co-constructed process, I generated and analyzed data through holistic coding (Saldaña, 2016). I found that the participant demonstrated perception of his professional identity as a teacher in terms of duty. I discuss the points of transition, where the participant’s identities were re-shaped. My findings contribute to the conversation about the dichotomous view of teaching and researching. Keywords: Professional Identity (Re)Construction, Teacher Identity, Researcher Identity, Instrumental Case Study

Introduction

My goal in conducting this study was to explore the multiple professional identities, namely teacher and researcher identity. I did so through investigating Tom’s (my participant’s) path from teaching to conducting research. In particular, I discuss his own views of teaching as a profession and his experiences with learning how to teach. What also became vivid to me was his training in research and emerging ontologies, followed by his self-perceptions of who he is as a researcher. The lesson that Tom taught me was this: “[talking about teaching and research] One always informs the other.” Many novice teachers experience similar career trajectories, which is why the phenomenon of teacher-researcher identity needs scrutiny. My work provides a thread missing in the dialogue over shaping professional identities and addresses issues present in the processes of moving fluidly between these identities.

Identity, as an analytic framework employed towards understanding teachers’ development has currently become a research topic in teacher education (e.g., Trent, 2015) as well as in applied linguistics (e.g., Jurasaite-Harbison & Rex, 2005). Although identity development is most certainly an individual process, it is deeply socially situated, creating opportunities for multiple meanings and positionings to emerge (Girod & Pardales, 2002). Specifically, this conceptualization fits teachers, as they move between contexts and take on many different roles and statuses (from teacher to life coach, to parent, to friend, to researcher, etc.). To be consistent as such with sociocultural approaches to second language acquisition (SLA), I use the term (re)construction to highlight the concept of identity always being in motion. Given the importance of shaping young minds, as teachers engage with the new educational practices on a daily basis, it is important to study how they ask themselves questions pertaining to their professional identities, including a researcher identity. Answers to
such questions have the potential to inform pedagogical practices in second language learning and teaching contexts as well as the field of teacher education.

There is a noticeable lack of comparative studies about the professional identities of teachers in a global setting. Thus far, only a few studies have looked at both aspects, i.e., language teaching and doing research. In the field of applied linguistics, novice researchers often come from a teaching background. Even though they constitute a major population, their experiences are rarely researched. The goal of this instrumental case study (Stake, 1995, 2005) is to fill the gap in the literature by shedding light on the complexities of professional identity (re)construction within the contexts of teaching and researching. In this study, I project teaching and researching as two consecutive career paths on one teacher’s trajectory.

Past Research on Identity Issues

Growing interests in the ways teachers (re)construct their professional identities have raised teacher identity to the status of a new independent area within teacher education (Trent, 2015). Yet, research to date seems to have underscored the role of temporality, relationality and transformation in the identity work (Clarke, 2008; Pennington & Richards, 2016). Attempts to depict researcher identity also seem scarce, focusing mostly on novice researchers and their relationships with their mentors (e.g., Donato, Tucker, & Hendry, 2015). Notwithstanding, I synthesize research of the professional identities discussed in this paper into three broad areas, namely (a) contextual relationship between teacher’s identities and social interactions, (b) negotiating identities through practice, and (c) multifaceted identities as products of self-image. These areas serve as signposts in the following discussion on past identity research.

Identity in Context of Social Interactions

To unpack teacher identity, its complex nature needs to be recognized. Cheung (2015) describes it as a dynamically evolving, multifaceted, subject to both internal pressures from teachers’ emotions and external pressures from work environment, job circumstances, or life experiences. Identity cannot thrive outside of a given community but can be hindered by such community. It can be both a process and product (dual view), the former understood as the ongoing interaction and the latter as the outcome of the influences every teacher incurs (Cheung, 2015). Identities are always exposed to environmental factors which shape them ever so often.

There is a connection between teachers’ sociocultural identities and their practices. Such identities are negotiated and changed over time as well as rooted in personal histories highly dependent on interactions with colleagues and students from a given institutional context (Duff & Uchida, 1997). Therefore, it is also worth looking at teacher identity development longitudinally. Identity is being co-constructed by both students and teachers through dialogic interactions that occur over extended periods of time. In fact, identity formation often happens within the particularities of a given community of practice (CoP) (Wenger, 1998). Within Wenger’s (1998) CoP as well as discursive construction of CoP, there is evidence of belonging, engagement, and a shared discourse repertoire (Clarke, 2008). These are useful lenses to investigate my participant’s trajectory as they situate him within the sociocultural approaches to SLA with a focus on practices, interactions and gradual changes.

Alongside his teacher identity, Tom’s (the participant’s) identity as a researcher has been one of the foci of my project. Researchers’ identities often seem fragmented either due to publications, institutional and peer support at university, or their professional life cycles. Engagement in research is often intertwined with practical concerns, such as policy-related challenges of conducting research (Xu, 2014). In fact, Tom’s path empowers teachers to strive
for professional excellence through learning about research. However, one question remains: how can a researcher be defined? Giampapa (2011) characterizes a researcher as a socially located person with “histories, social and linguistic forms of capital […], particularly in relation to participants and the communities in which they are embedded” (p. 133). Also, researchers are often molded through discourses in their disciplines and institutions and as such they constantly need to look for new ways to be let in and earn their informants’ trust.

**Negotiating Identities in Praxis**

Meanwhile, I am particularly interested in the points of transition in forming his professional identities. Identities can be classified as mutable and constantly undergoing transformations over space and time. In a similar fashion, notions of teacher identity relate to specific characteristics of language teaching and can evolve. The whole cycle of (re)constructing identity is two-fold and includes turning knowledge into practice as well as practice into knowledge (Pennington & Richards, 2016). So, having enough knowledge is a compulsory component of becoming a professional teacher. However, the relationship between different dimensions of teacher identity or multiple identities emerging from new practices (such as conducting research) is still often underrepresented in research.

Additionally, engaging in new activities, such as entering the teaching arena or taking graduate courses, can lead to changes in one’s identity (Taylor, 2017). Some studies looked at the negotiation between teacher and researcher identity in the context of action research. For example, Edwards and Burns’s (2016) participants tended to succeed at construing a strong sense of selves, taking into consideration their workplace power relations. More importantly, they clarified plans to undertake research upon program completion.

**Evolving Self-Image**

Not many studies seem to have taken interest in their informants’ self-image, which I define as the way one perceives themselves, for the purpose of this study. However, this concept emerged as important for my study. For example, informants in Wu, Palmer and Field (2011) exhibited only a weak sense of professional identity, likely because teaching was not their main profession, but a secondary job. In brief, a recurrent lack of personal involvement with the job may lead to identity crisis (Wu et al., 2011). In a similar manner, the process of learning to conduct research, hence concurrently taking on researcher identity, might force participants to reflect on their values and goals. By doing so, they develop new perceptions of themselves and their identities (Girod & Pardales, 2002). Thus, it is imperative to always assess the status of one’s identity in motion, as a dynamically evolving construct.

**Theoretical Lenses Behind this Study**

I derive the conceptual framework for this study from multiple sources emphasizing the complexity of identity as a phenomenon. I use the term *identity* rather than *subjectivities* because it is widely used and recognized within sociocultural approaches to SLA. The views on identity mentioned below do not formulate a single, coherent lens to theorize professional identity. Instead, they provide a set of features commonly applied in various theoretical frameworks. Thus, in this paper, I draw on (a) Wenger’s social theory of learning, (b) Giampapa’s conviction of identities being multiple and interconnected, and (c) Trent’s take on identity formation. In particular, I draw on these three theoretical approaches collectively to consider various ways my participant (re)constructed his professional identities.
The work on social theory of learning advanced by Wenger (1998) posits that we are always learning. Our professional identities derive from memberships to particular groups and activities we participate in to develop such memberships. According to Wenger, “the process by which newcomers become included in the communities of practice,” called “legitimate peripheral participation,” can be problematic for those teachers whose induction happens via certification rather than apprenticeship in teaching or research (Wenger, 1998, p. 100). Wenger (1998) delineates four dimensions of learning, viz., practice (learning through doing), community (skills that create a membership of a given community), learning as identity (learning as becoming), and meaning (work experienced as situated learning).

In relation to social theory of learning, Giampapa (2016) states that individuals are inevitably interlinked with what they research and how they do it. That is to say, we may become one with our research agendas as well as ontologies we bring into them. In turn, multiple identities position them as researchers in specific ways. Therefore, their multiple points of reflexivity become a result of a dynamic process of being and becoming researchers. That process is constantly negotiated and managed through doing research (Giampapa, 2016). It is also worth mentioning that the complex layering of multiple identities creates points of tension between professional and personal realms. According to Giampapa (2016), research is both collaborative and co-produced (p. 299). Therefore, in this study, I follow an understanding that my participant will co-form his stories with me, the researcher, in a collaborative manner.

I have taken the final source of my conceptual framework from Trent (2015), who documented the accounts of language teachers who have transitioned to the role of teacher educators. In his study, Trent draws mainly on Wenger’s (1998) approach discussed above but integrates it into a framework for the investigation of identity formation. As noted in Donato et al. (2015), Trent’s concept captures crucial poststructuralist views of identity, includes time and space as potential sites of conflict and delineates discourse as the platform for what we do and what we set to accomplish. Trent (2015) identifies three features of identity. In other words, our identity seems to be shaped through participation in a joint activity (engagement), where we identify with a large group (alignment) and anticipate our present and future positions in that group (imagination). The abovementioned strengthen the notion that we must critically examine the CoP from which our participants learn. Trent’s (2015) integrated model of identity encompasses the internal (personal evaluations of self) and external factors (legitimizing perceptions of self, considering environmental influences such as institutional expectations) as constitutive of one’s identity. As such, this frame of reference helps me understand how, at different boundary crossing points, my participant (re)constructs his multiple identities and the ways in which he has come to realize the development of his professional identities.

Method

The following broad research question guided this study: In what ways does the participant (re)construct his professional identities first as a teacher and then as a researcher? To gain thorough insights into the phenomenon researched and to understand the relationship between these two identities, I employed an instrumental case study. This methodological tool empowers me to examine identities in motion (Stake, 1995, 2005), because it allows me to seek out both what is common and what is particular about the case. In this project, I define case as the participant’s shift in professional identities. The case is bound by the activities that my participant went through in his shifting trajectory. I look to particularize and not to generalize, as my obligation is to understand this one chosen case.
Focal Participant and Study Context

Tom was a male North American in his third year of a doctoral program. Prior to his PhD training, he was a language teacher in the United States and abroad (East Asia, to be precise). His main area of interest was language assessment. Tom’s academic experiences ideally matched the profile I was interested in, namely first teacher then researcher.

At the time of data collection, Tom was a doctoral student enrolled in a doctoral program at a large midwestern university in the United States. Upon receiving my institution’s IRB approval, I approached Tom via email and obtained his consent to participate. I adopted a strategic (purposeful) approach to sampling (Duff, 2014). I also selected this participant because of his previous teaching experiences and his role as a researcher. Tom was actively conducting research when I decided to include him in this study. He agreed to participate without compensation. He chose his pseudonym as Tom, which I use henceforth. I depicted his voice through frequent examples, in a form of both summary accounts and direct quotations (see Excerpts 1-5 below).

Materials and Data Collection

Previous studies on professional identities claim that teachers’ verbalization of their experiences provides a deep insight into their identity construction processes, since many of them use interviews as the main data source (e.g., Clarke, 2008; Edwards & Burns, 2016; Trent, 2015). Thus, my primary data source is an in-depth semi-structured interview (based on those in Jurasaite-Harbison & Rex, 2005; Xu, 2014). I decided to conduct a semi-structured interview in order to gain an in-depth understanding of Tom’s experiences with (re)constructing his identities. Interview questions (Appendix A) reflected my focus on dual identity, from teacher to researcher. I designed the interview protocol to capture Tom’s reflections on his journey to professoriate and academia as well as any challenges he might have encountered on that journey. I also encouraged Tom to reflect on any predetermined notions he might have held about teaching and researching, respectively. I started by getting to know him better as a language teacher, asking about his educational, linguistic, cultural, and national backgrounds. I then asked more specifics about his teaching experiences and how he felt about them. I proceeded with questions related to his research practices and his experiences as a graduate researcher. He provided me with a rich and thick description of his experiences (Duff, 2014; Friedman, 2012). I conducted the interview in an empty classroom to guarantee privacy and to facilitate Tom feeling comfortable sharing his thoughts. I audio-recorded the interview (about 1.5 hour of audio files in total).

My follow-up strategy included email correspondence. After transcribing Tom’s interview, I realized that some of the information he had provided me with needed further clarification. I needed Tom to elaborate on, confirm or disconfirm some of the information from his interview. Hence, I sent out a question sheet tailored to Tom and asked him to respond via email. I did this to better understand his stories and present them in a meaningful way.

In addition, I collected artifacts as secondary data (Friedman, 2012). Saldana (2016) states that artifacts are “social products” and therefore need to be examined critically as they depict the ideologies, values and interests of their authors and embody whom they are (p. 61). They consisted of Tom’s academic and teaching statements and a sample research paper. The academic statement, which he had submitted upon entering his program, allowed me to determine his initial research interests. The teaching philosophy, written during Tom’s program as a course assignment, grounded his views on language teaching, and the exemplary research paper submitted with the application confirmed Tom’s research agenda and academic direction.
Data Analysis

I carried out most of the rigorous and in-depth data analysis after I had just completed the data collection, but my actual process of data analysis began when I started gathering data. As is common in qualitative research, I actively engaged in on-going decision making and reflection activities through writing reflective memos and weekly reviewing my notes. I also simultaneously polished my typed notes, transcribed the interview and wrote summaries of each new research activity (after every event that resulted in data collection). Tom sent me his artifacts via email as Word files. I continued our email correspondence until I finished my first draft.

I imported all data sources into MAXQDA 2018, a data analysis software. I worked on classifying and filing all the data. First, I pre-coded the data by highlighting, bolding, annotating, underlining and color-coding significant and rich quotes that stroke me from my participant’s interview and the submitted documents (Figure 1).

Subsequently, I implemented holistic coding (Saldaña, 2016) as a method in my first cycle of coding. To notice issues within the case, I looked at the data as a whole rather than analyzing them line by line (as visible in Figure 1). I divided the texts into broader descriptive codes and then reread the corpus a few more times to see its bigger picture. After that, I began grouping the codes into categories, as my second cycle of coding. According to Saldaña (2016), this was based on similarly coded data, therefore can be categorized as pattern coding. It allowed me to more clearly organize the data and also attribute them preliminary meanings. I used the pattern coding approach to see how major the themes may potentially develop from my categories. Finally, I gathered all themes that emerged from the abovementioned procedures. Saldaña (2016) points out that a theme brings identity directly to one’s “patterned experience” (p. 199). Based on those themes, I constructed the headings in this paper’s Findings section. In my analysis, I paid particular attention to how these themes are similar, different and what binds them together. Theming appears to be a common strategy for the analysis of interviews (Saldaña, 2016). This process resulted in a complete data chart (exemplar findings are presented in Figure 2) for Tom that contained the richest data points I derived from all sources (i.e., interviews, artifacts and email correspondence). That chart served as a well-organized document with appropriate categories and possible relationships between data corpus and I
used it as a major stepping stone for writing my interpretations. In the end, I eliminated themes that did not match my research question and focused on those that did (Table 1). At last, in my interpretations of the findings I drew on the conceptual framework utilized in this project.

Table 1. Themes created from second cycle of coding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Teaching beginnings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Perceptions of teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Research beginnings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Changes in identities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After having written a draft of this instrumental case study, I asked Tom to examine it for “accuracy and palatability” (Stake, 1995, p. 115). In this member check, I encouraged him to provide an honest feedback or alternative interpretations, but also made clear that his involvement in reviewing the draft was voluntary. After having read the draft, Tom did not suggest any changes.

**Researcher Reflexivity**

Our identities as researchers are dynamically negotiated, managed and even resisted across time and space (Giampapa, 2016). I recognize that my multiple identities are socially
constructed as well and as embedded in the conventions of my field (i.e., second language acquisition). However, I analyzed participant’s experiences, with the use of researcher’s notes, logs and nuanced reports (Duff, 2014), with the awareness that within qualitative in-depth interviews identities can be both constructed by and required of the researcher by the participant. In my analysis, I paid particular attention to the individual needs of Tom. However, by viewing interviews as a co-construction of the informants and the researcher (Stake, 1995), I recognize that the accounts remain subjective and fluid.

I acknowledge that working within a qualitative approach, as a researcher, I am the main instrument in gathering data. Therefore, a brief look at my academic and teaching background deserves attention. I am an experienced teacher of English with more than 13 years of teaching experience in both ESL and EFL contexts in different countries. I learned English in an EFL context (in Poland) and most of my learning experiences were largely based on the grammar-translation method. Yet, what makes me different from many teachers of English are my unique educational, cultural, and linguistic experiences in Poland, England, China and the U.S. As a doctoral student, I have been exploring and claim expertise on such topics as intercultural language learning and teaching, identities and ideologies in SLA, intercultural communication, and sociocultural approaches to SLA, all largely influenced by critical theories. Throughout this research process, whether engaged in data collection, analysis or writing, I have made efforts to listen to what my participant had to say instead of imposing my own theories and preconceptions. For instance, in devising the interview questions (Appendix A), I made it clear that they were open-ended and broad to capture what Tom was willing to say. By the same token, in interacting with Tom, I attended to his concerns, ideas, and experiences. In data analysis and writing, I was cautious about not letting my own representations get in the way of descriptions. However, I acknowledge that the stories I tell are ultimately my reconstructions of Tom’s voice and pertain to theoretical frameworks I am familiar with.

Findings

In this section, with regard to my broadly formulated research question, I report themes that emerged from my coding procedures. I begin with presenting Tom’s perceptions of professional identities, followed by his unique features and experiences of learning how to teach. Next, I discuss the points of transition, where informant’s identities were re-shaped through the most relevant examples of encounters. Through this, I focus on depicting identity as a dynamic and multifaceted process, as it appeared to occur in Tom’s stories. The findings are my interpretation of how Tom (re)constructed his professional identities. Nonetheless, the ontological premise is that his stories, while being self-representations, concurrently reflect his actual experiences.

Teacher on a Mission

Tom seemed to have perceived teaching as a form of responsibility. He started out in East Asia and then proceeded in the U.S. Therefore, context played a crucial role in understanding his views on teaching. For Tom, beginning teaching was a whole new dimension of learning, learning about himself, about the new surroundings he found himself in and about what it meant to be responsible for somebody else’s learning progress.

Interestingly, Tom saw teaching as a mission. He claimed it was something teachers were required to do well for their own moral standards and for the students’ sake:
Excerpt 1:

I felt strongly that there are things you need to do as a teacher in order to do it well. There are things that should be prioritized, you know. I feel like there’s definitely a craft to teaching and even though it’s really hard to compare things side-by-side but there’s good teaching and bad teaching and I kind of have a duty to do it well because [...] there’s a lot riding on it.

In his teaching philosophy, Tom also mentioned how important learner needs and interactions were to him. He expressed a strong belief that “teaching goes beyond a textbook,” and lessons ought to be “vivid to attract students’ attention.” He saw teaching as a sort of responsibility, a vocation even. To Tom, being a teacher meant being a caregiver who was under obligation to do the job well, as there were others who relied on his performance. By calling teaching a “craft,” he portrayed it as arduous work, but meaningful, nonetheless. He clearly did not want to let anyone down, including himself (“[…] there’s a lot riding on it”).

The excerpt cited above positioned Tom as a responsible, caring and duty-driven individual. Wenger’s (1998) social theory of learning portrays learning as a process simultaneous to that of identity development. Tom was discovering who he was through learning about what teaching entailed, as expressed multiple times during our interview. Even though Tom was not trained to teach, he learned what it entailed through practice. In Tom’s case, his professional identity was being continuously molded (Cheung, 2015; Edwards & Burns, 2016) by his realizations about the nature of teaching and in praxis (by interactions with his students): “The more I worked with my students, the more I understood what it meant to mentor them.” In keeping with Trent’s (2015) delineation of the CoP elements - engagement, alignment, and imagination - Tom utilized reflexive pedagogical practices (engagement) to stay responsible for his students (alignment) and therefore was able to notice significant moments that helped him clarify what he wanted teaching to become for him (imagination). Linking Tom’s perceptions of a good teacher with how he perceived identity construction, in both his academic statement and the interview, it became quite apparent that the way he discerned teaching as a profession had a lot to do with his own teacher identity. Had he lost motivation to teach, it would have likely affected his teacher identity (Edwards & Burns, 2016). Instead, Tom decided to pursue interpersonal and intercultural connections with his students (“I tried to see where they were coming from.”), by treating his job like a responsibility and hence approaching it with an attitude of respect and seriousness (Duff & Uchida, 1997). In sum, teachers’ self-perceptions are influenced by the way they teach and as a result affect their professional identities (Pennington & Richards, 2016). In Tom’s case, it was indeed a two-way process (giving and taking), evident in his perception of teaching as a duty and depicted in Excerpt 1.

To sum up, Tom represented a teacher who was willing to take responsibility for his students’ education. Identity as “a site of a struggle,” as indicated by Tom during the interview, seemed to have been a significant part of his reality.

“Being thrown into it”

Tom’s trajectory resulted in identity characteristics special to only him. His change of outlook on teaching in general (over time and space) seemed to have had a prominent effect on his self-image as a teacher. Tom’s unique feature related to his teaching career having been accidental and with no didactic preparation. During our interview, he talked a lot about having received no actual training and “being thrown into the system.” His path to transition was long.
and highly dependent on context. He then arrived at a point of discovery where his outlook on teaching changed dramatically. That shift was also context-related.

Tom stated that his journey with teaching had begun by accident (Excerpt 2), without any prior plan to pursue teaching professionally. His undergraduate degree was not related to education (Fine Arts), therefore, it armored him with no teaching training. As he was working odd jobs part-time in a few different places, he decided that getting a study abroad experience was long overdue. In our conversation, he revealed to me that he had been feeling as if he had “abandoned [his own] language learning in college,” so going to Asia seemed like a solid plan to him.

Excerpt 2:

So, I went to [a country in East Asia] and taught in a private academy that taught kids aged about 4 or 5 through, say, 12 or 13 and so, basically, I became a teacher by sort of being thrown into it with very little training or preparation. It was very scary at first and I found it challenging.

This experience of teaching kids in a foreign land seemed to have been foundational to the development of Tom’s teacher identity. On a professional level, “being thrown” into teaching forced him to adapt flexibly to the conditions he encountered. On a personal level, he had to grow up fast in the new reality.

Subsequently, Tom’s attitude towards teaching changed notably once he returned to the U.S. and started teaching as an instructor of ESL in his master’s program. Once again, he needed to adjust swiftly to the new surroundings and recalled being shocked by the varieties of proficiency levels international students brought into the classroom. Making sure he was meeting everyone’s needs was a new challenge. This taught him that being a teacher meant being flexible, as expressed in Excerpt 3.

Excerpt 3:

So, here in the States, I taught […] some really low levels, honestly. Sometimes we’d get students who could barely write their own name, barely get by just with survival English, all the way through students who are well into their bachelor’s degree in their home countries, have pretty strong English abilities and were here for like academic writing or pre-academic warm-up […] So, a full range. I had to learn how to navigate it all.

This comment shows how different the two teaching experiences were for Tom, how much they depended on a given context, and the extent to which they affected Tom’s further teaching practices. He learned to negotiate what it meant for him to teach. Similar to Edwards and Burns’ (2016) description of teachers constantly re-negotiating and legitimizing new identities in any professional encounter, Tom’s teaching philosophy suggested his teaching identity to be dynamic (Trent, 2015) and temporally fluid (Duff & Uchida, 1997). “Now, […] I understand that what I do matters.” It also supports the idea that identity is sensitive to environmental influences, i.e., context matters (Cheung, 2015). Tom seemed to have navigated through different contexts quite well, but his path was not clear of frustrations, as depicted in the above excerpts.
Identities Re-Shaped

Upon a close examination of my data, I realized that one theme has been prevalent in all data sources, namely identity (re)construction. It was not about erasing previous identities while creating new ones, but rather drawing upon previous experiences to enrich new ones. Tom moved from being a teacher to doing research. Therefore, in this section, I separate his research ventures (which came after his teaching career was put on hold) from his self-image (which he revealed to me at the time of data collection).

Becoming Researcher

Tom came to the field of research trained, as opposed to his teaching career. His identity as a researcher had started forming before he entered his doctoral program. That was mainly due to his master’s program and a crucial role it played in developing his academic interests as well as showing him the fundamentals of research, which was clear from his academic statement. His identity as a researcher seemed to have been in the making through various academic practices he mentioned during the interview, such as collaborating on a research project with his colleagues or supervising PhD level teaching assistants. Since Tom had held a full-time teaching position prior to his doctoral experience, he had been surrounded by individuals who either already held a PhD or were in the process of getting one. Seeing first-hand what it entailed, must have fostered his understanding of the ins and outs of doing research. When I asked Tom directly what motivated his decision to become a researcher, he said:

Excerpt 4:

A big part of it was, […] as I went through my master’s program and started getting exposed to research and a lot of that came through getting exposed to language testing and getting more involved in that area, you know. I became more interested intellectually. It’s just, you know, there’s lots of challenges and problems to solve and it’s engaging and interesting, fun to work on.

This response not only delineates Tom’s early interests in research but specifically in language assessment, which he continued to explore in his doctoral program. His academic statement, submitted upon entering the program, was also very specific about pursuing his interests in language assessment. His motivation was “intellectual.” He saw this path as “fun to work on.” He was clearly intrigued by multiple problems and challenges in the field. His motivation was strong and enduring. This time, Tom was not afraid to face the unknown and began his journey with research somewhat ready for what was yet to come.

Also, Xu (2014) stated that “a stable research interest could be seen as an entry sign of competence as researchers” (p. 254). The question then is whether research interest itself is sufficient to consider oneself a researcher. In Tom’s case, consistent drive might have been what enabled him to establish a successful researcher identity (as he already had academic publications in reputable journals at the time I was collecting data for this study). In keeping with the idea that one’s identity is inevitably affected by the environment and construed in a process of situated learning (Duff & Uchida, 1997), Tom’s previous exposure to academic research and researchers clearly motivated him to pursue his PhD (see Excerpt 4) and therefore contributed to his professional identity (re)construction. In his statement of purpose, he had already declared he was going to hone in on language assessment with the use of quantitative tools. His path toward becoming a researcher seemed clear-cut and determined from the
beginning, partially due to his thorough preparation for the doctoral program. In this case, previous endeavors seem to have prepared him well to take on a new emerging identity. Given that the stress of embracing a new reality might result in identity confusion (as was the case when Tom struggled to teach for the first time), his previous work experience eased the way into the research process.

Moreover, Tom’s interview as well as the research paper and academic statement he shared, illustrated how his chosen methodology (quantitative methods) defined him as a researcher. I asked him directly how he understood quantitative approaches to his field of inquiry. He answered as follows:

**Excerpt 5:**

I think what happens in quantitative research, certain approaches to it, it’s all about narrowing it down to one variable and you don’t need a whole milieu of theory […]. You just need some justification for looking at it and an understanding of what it should cause or shouldn’t cause and then be able to interpret that. So, a lot of quantitative research can seem really narrow and to that extent it can also seem to have a kind of low applicability to a classroom, for example, but could still be theoretically rich enough […] to support the study.

Tom’s words showed me the depth of his understanding of research as well as portrayed him as a conscientious researcher. Aligned with Giampapa’s (2011) suggestion that we are inextricably linked with what and how we do research, Tom seemed to have positioned himself as a reflexive researcher and one that understood the multiplicity of identities. His epistemological and ontological preferences were unambiguous (he never considered practicing qualitative research methods, as I gathered during our interview) and transparent (he was reflexive in the way he unpacked the nature of quantitative methodology, as seen in Excerpt 5). Since research identity has been said to mold and sustain over time (Edwards & Burns, 2016), the transitions on academic paths become even more pivotal. Tom was aware of when and how he came to position himself as a researcher. What is more, Tom echoed Donato et al.’s (2015) claim that building “collegial relationships” during doctoral study is one way to develop the needed ability to “communicate and work with others […] in an academically and humanly manner” (p. 225), an elaboration of Wenger’s (1998) situated learning theory. Tom admitted that his work with university colleagues helped to shape who he was as a researcher. His words indicated that he had understood the value of collaborative relations early in the process of forming his professional identity.

In a nutshell, Tom experienced the re-shaping of his identities. He recognized the importance of training to become a mindful researcher. He seemed pretty set on carrying on with the quantitative research in his doctoral work and beyond it, just like he had stated in his pre-doctoral artifacts. His journey seemed to have exemplified a dynamic re-shaping process as well as relevant ways in which he approached research and their gravity on researcher identity formation.

**Who Am I Now?**

Tom did not depict any dichotomy in the way he described his teacher and researcher identity (re)construction processes, which supports Taylor’s (2017) appeal to debunk perceiving teacher and researcher identities as binary terms. Tom’s experiences seemed to have portrayed identity re-shaping as a dynamic multifaceted development (Cheung, 2015), leading
to a formation of two whole entities rather than one fragmented (Xu, 2014) or hybridized identity. Tom moved between teacher and researcher identities in fluid ways, which were not free of obstacles, nonetheless.

By the way of illustration, Tom’s self-image (or self-perception) as a researcher was constantly reinforced by his own comparisons. Throughout our interview, he mentioned multiple times teaching a language not being “rocket science” or “nuclear physics.” By saying that, he contrasted it with research, which he perceived as “rigorous” and “challenging on a practical level.” In terms of teacher and researcher identities interaction, it became clear to me that he put more emphasis and efforts into becoming a good researcher than he did into being a good teacher. He even indicated that, at the point of this study, he saw himself exclusively as a researcher. When asked what kind of career he might be looking for after graduation, he decisively said: “[…] research will be a major driver.” His fixed choice for the future had already been reflected in his academic statement, where he wrote: “Upon obtaining a PhD, I anticipate immediately pursuing one of two paths: working as a full-time language testing professional […], or becoming an academic in Second Language Studies, Applied Linguistics, and/or TESL program.” These words appear to be indicative of the fact that his researcher identity engulfed his teacher identity. Even more so, it seemed to have been a thought-through and meticulously planned process.

Even though Tom’s doctoral training appeared to have been shaping his professional identities in multiple ways (Donato et al., 2015), he did not forgo teaching entirely. He remained aware of the fact that he might have to draw on his obtained teaching experiences in designing his future research, as he said himself. He indicated that keeping up with teaching innovations will likely have been a part of his research practices, thus he did not want to lose touch with what seemed important for the classroom. By reassessing his relationship to teaching, Tom exposed himself to the identity of a researcher (Jurasaite-Harbison & Rex, 2005). Tom’s transition appeared to have happened at the boundary of teaching and researching (Donato et al., 2015) and brought about a major change in his life. He perceived it as a positive, and in a way inevitable, shift, one that made both identities (of a teacher and researcher) attainable to explore new ways of existing in academia, while making room for more professional identities yet to come.

To recap, Tom seemed to have imagined his future alignments by identifying and clearly stating his career goals. This links with Trent’s (2015) concept of imagining one’s identity in the future through imagining their positioning at present. Tom had to negotiate his new roles as a researcher and through doing so discovered new dimensions to teaching. Not only did he reflect on his professional intentions and values but also realized that experiencing professional identity shifts might determine such intentions for him.

**Discussion**

In sum, I use Tom’s pathway in this instrumental case study to trace his journey from teaching to conducting research and thereupon shed new light on issues of professional identity (re)formation in the fields of applied linguistics and SLA. My hope is that by discussing Tom’s trajectory, I was able to gain a deeper insight into how professional identities of “teacher” and “researcher” could be shaped, modified and enacted across contextual boundaries.

With regard to Tom learning how to teach through actually doing it, responsible practice helped him grow. Girod and Pardales (2002) classify this approach to teaching as a “reflective practitioner.” When one of the participants in their study realized he could also produce knowledge for his students instead of merely sharing if from the textbook in a dry manner, it was a breakthrough moment for his perceptions of teaching. In turn, that moment entirely revolutionized his teaching. Equally, Tom’s realization of holding responsibility for
his students’ learning (as indicated during the interview) helped him locate more problems in his own pedagogy and made him realize he owed it to his students to be more cognizant of his teaching techniques.

Additionally, considering my finding of Tom’s identity dynamic evolution hinging on context, Wu et al. (2011) observed a “teaching by learning” phenomenon in their study focusing on teaching Chinese. Their participants did not have much experience, nor did they see themselves as knowledgeable, just like Tom. Instead, they co-constructed their craft through interactions with students and more experienced colleagues. Tom also mentioned to me having closely observed his more experienced colleagues, especially in the U.S. He drew on their practices to establish his own, which in turn helped him re-invent himself as a teacher. This corresponds with Donato et al.’s (2015) idea of identity always moving across major life boundaries. Tom saw that in order to move forward professionally, he needed to “give in to change,” as expressed in the interview. He decided to accept it and that was the transition moment from which his identity re-construction began. His wanderings through life boundaries made him a more conscious teacher and led him to critical self-discoveries.

Also, when it comes to Tom “being thrown into it,” Duff and Uchida (1997) frame the phenomenon of “becoming someone” as challenging one’s own sociocultural conceptions and identities. In Tom’s case, his move to East Asia affected his identity transformation over space and time. In fact, also Trent (2015) draws our attention to the process of constructing teacher’s identity in a foreign country. His study points out that identity in such circumstances, i.e., the unknown, always forms through negotiation of meaning within a given social configuration. That seems to have been Tom’s approach, precisely. He claimed, in our interview and the follow-up emails, to have stayed open to learning about the context he was in and saw this openness as a necessity, as he endeavored to enlighten himself on what teaching was all about.

Tom’s trajectory depicted dynamism and change as its main features. The identities that he brought into his teaching were at conflict with those that emerged from it (Cheung, 2015; Edwards & Burns, 2016). Different school settings invited Tom to rethink his approach and who he was as a young professional. As predicted by Wenger’s (1998) notion of legitimate peripheral participation, Tom was bound to struggle without a well-rounded teaching preparation. This is problematic because professional training is assumed to occur before one’s work begins. Research shows that different teaching contexts assume particular roles for teachers, which at times might clash with their picture of self. As Pennington and Richards (2016) rightfully observed, teaching in a new country or a new type of a course “always requires adjustments and offers opportunities for identity negotiation in response to context” (p. 9). Also, Clarke’s (2008) conclusions similarly indicate that the process of learning to teach should entail developing teacher identity rather than merely acquiring a set of skills and techniques. That way such process would indicate both formation and transformation of an individual.

Finally, I turn to who Tom seems to be right now (or at the time of my data collection), in terms of professional identity construction. Tom’s example contradicts the experiences of participants in Xu (2014), who struggled to maintain enough motivation and caved under institutional pressure. As a result, they were not able to perceive research as a valid professional activity. Tom succeeded at creating a positive image of himself as a researcher (according to his artifacts), and therefore might have appeared as a good researcher. He was clear in his plans and worked hard to accomplish his goals. Thus, his self-image as a researcher at the time of this study was constructed firmly and seemed well-established.

To recapitulate, in this study I interviewed one teacher (Tom) who also practiced research. The goal of this instrumental case study was to explore ways in which the participant (re)constructed his professional identities. I approached this goal from a perspective of a point of transition (shift) that happened in his life. In doing so, I focused on his identities first as a
teacher and then a researcher at different times in his career. In addition to contributing to the body of identity research, my study problematizes the phenomenon of identity (re)construction in heterogenous contexts and spaces.

The participant seemed to have realized that a single identity cannot suffice if one considers himself a thoughtful and enlightened individual. Identities also prove to be situated in a given context and therefore re-shaped through that context. One’s environment has the potential to affect the way an individual perceives himself, too. Tom’s trajectory changed from random approaches to his professional life (Donato et al., 2015) to more specific and solidified goals for his future career.

In addition, through this study’s findings, I was trying to bring into focus certain characteristics of identity (re)construction, to wit, the fact that we should always look at identity as a multifaceted concept and that hybridized versions of both identities (teacher and researcher) are not always synchronous. My participant displayed clear transitions from one identity to another, with a fair share of obstacles that in turn became what strengthened his self-image. Still, the process of building one’s identity seems to be shaped by foundational forces (personal, institutional, social), one’s own changing perceptions and thus growth, motivation to learn new ropes and finally ontological and epistemological stances. That being said, the two identities investigated in this study informed and shaped one another not without tension between what was and what is. The most visible struggle was evident in Tom’s learning to teach. These struggles, however, did not hinder Tom’s fluid re-shaping of his professional identities.

Implications

Considering my findings, taking into consideration specific contexts through reflection, likely enlightens how pedagogy and identity intersect (Pennington & Richards, 2016) and how change is affected. In a similar vein, my discoveries inform language learning theory by perceiving scholarly identity as multiple and fluid, instead of set and unchangeable, highlighting the pluralistic nature of identity. Tom’s experiences illustrate the power of transition (change), be it on a personal or professional stratum, and how such transition may enrich one’s identity shaping mechanism. This, however, would only be possible with flexibility to re-shape and re-negotiate becoming identities and to make room for new ones. What’s more, my findings also assist in dismantling the conviction that teaching and research cannot co-exist. Tom’s identity (re)construction proves such a dichotomous view simply wrong, by showing the complex nature of identities. The personal and professional tensions at the crossroads of Tom’s career confirmed that teachers are capable of doing research as much as researchers of teaching. Further, the sociocultural perspective, which I use with in this study, recognizes the importance of social interaction in identity construction (Taylor, 2017). The fact that one starts teaching does not automatically imply their teacher identity will emerge and same goes for research. As Tom’s experiences have shown, both identities can be formulated in one person, but not at the same time and in the same way.

Limitations

The fact that I am an insider might have also limited this study trustworthiness. Novice researchers are generally discouraged from conducting research in their own backyard. I have worked at the same university and shared graduate experiences with the participant, which might have complicated my data analysis process. For instance, when conducting the interview, I had to constantly remind myself that my focus was on the Tom’s experiences with identity re-shaping and not my own, no matter how similar or dissimilar they might have been. Also, I
recognize that my decision to not follow up with the participant in a second interview might be seen as this case study’s limitation. Time constraints and availability, however, prevented me from conducting a second interview. A follow-up interview could potentially further enlighten common perceptions of multiple professional identities. Stake (1995) claims that multiple data sources, however, make a study credible and transferable. Thus, using the interview and artifacts I was able to establish credibility of this instrumental case study.

Next Steps

All in all, based on my participant’s stories, I claim that future research in this area should continue to investigate new ways of (re)constructing professional identities. Ideally, this should be done with a longitudinal approach in order to identify long-term impacts of identity (re)construction. On an institutional level, it may be helpful for faculty members who mentor graduate students to be trained with a focus on identity theories or to take an active interest in professional identity literature. I agree with Xu (2014) that research teams of students and faculty members should be made regular working mechanisms to facilitate the diversity novice researchers bring.
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**Appendix**

**Interview Questions**

1. Describe your typical day.
2. How did you become a teacher?
3. What is your previous teaching experience?
4. What inspired your professional change? To pursue a PhD?
5. How would you describe your beliefs about teaching before coming to the program? What has changed?
6. How would you reflect on your teaching experiences?
7. What uncomfortable situations did you encounter in teaching? How did you resolve them?
8. When and how did you start doing research? Why?
9. How do you see a relationship between teaching and researching?
10. Are there any critical incidents/people that influenced your research practice?
11. What made you persist with doing research?
12. What are the attitudes of people around you towards your research practice?
13. What challenges did you meet in research?
14. Do you see yourself as a teacher or a researcher?
15. What are your future career plans?
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