

Throughout the new document, changes and edits are indicated in purple. I also indicated an entire paragraph in purple if the edit resulted in a substantial change or reorganization of the text. If I only moved text, I indicated that in green. There are also a few comments in the document indicating key changes. Please ignore the name on the comment. Our computer technician puts names he chooses!

Thank you to the reviewers for their very helpful feedback!

There were comments from only one reviewer on round 2. They are addressed as described here:

REVIEWER COMMENT	Author ACTION
<p>The authors indicate, on p. 3, that “An approach to raising the quality of education based on standardization of any type supposes an identifiable, fixed, static knowledge and context. Specifically, in teacher education, it implies that we can identify a set of “best practices” that “work,” irrespective of the time, place or group composition” (p. 3). The authors here need to specify publications and authors who have advocated or assumed this approach. Bausmith & Barry (2011) make this assumption in their argument for providing “an (online) library of video lessons, based on the research literature and taught by expert teachers, to be studied and discussed within PLCs [Professional Learning Communities] as a way to enhance teachers’ PCK [Pedagogical Content Knowledge]” (as critiqued in Van Driel & Berry, 2012, p. 26). The authors may find Van Driel & Berry’s (2012) analysis of this approach useful in their own work and publication. As Van Driel & Berry pointed out, the research literature “has demonstrated the complex nature of PCK as a form of teachers’ professional knowledge that is highly topic, person, and situation specific (for overviews see, e.f. Abell, 2007; Kind, 2009; Van Driel & Berry, 20120)” (p. 26). Furthermore, “PCK development is a complex process that is highly specific to the context, situation, and person. This implies that professional development programs aimed at the development of teachers’ PCK should be organized in ways that closely align to teachers’ professional practice, including opportunities to enact certain (innovative) instructional strategies and materials and to reflect, individually and collectively, on their experiences” (p. 27).</p>	<p>Mostly added to the introduction. I agree that comments on the development of PCK here are appropriate, as well as a reference to how this issue looks for in-service teacher development. Reading both VanDriel & Berry and Bausmith & Barry, I believe there is a distinction to be made between in-service and pre-service contexts. While the same ideas apply, I think the point we would like to make is slightly different in that we are preparing new teachers to enter the profession. In that sense, the video examples cited in Bausmith & Barry are not unlike any other materials presented in teacher education classes. We are trying to focus more on the issue of how we “teach” habits of inquiry rather than how PCK is formed.</p>

<p>The authors make an argument for the validity of different venues for promoting “different depths of inquiry into distinct aspects of teaching and learning to teach” (p. 8). In their exposition of different venues and their value, they explore only one—private conversations. It may be helpful to note where other venues have worked well in fostering other kinds of inquiry.</p>	<p>Since we did not systematically categorize the other venues, I reorganized the text so that general comments or comments about any other venues came first, directly after figure 1, and all comments relating to the private conversations came in a separate section. I also added a section about future research ideas to address this issue</p>
<p>On p. 10, the authors provide a diagram of intersecting continua. The physical layout of the continua, however, indicate that #4 should be labeled “Exploratory, <u>collaborative wondering</u>” since it occurs in the upper right hand corner, next to Collaborative and Wondering, instead of “Exploratory, <u>individual wondering</u>. Likewise, #5 should be labeled “Exploratory, <u>individual wondering</u>” instead of “Exploratory, <u>collaborative wondering</u>” since its placement in the matrix indicates that it is closest to “Wondering” and “Individual.”</p>	<p>Corrected, thank you! In fact, this motivated a re-numbering of the categories into what, we thought, was a more logical progression. This resulted in a renumbering of the tables.</p>
<p>On p. 12, the authors note that “Private conversations seemed to open up the possibility of inquiry about anything, and covered the full range from fact-finding to wondering, from information-gathering to questions about ethical and moral issues in the classrooms” (p. 12). Does this really cover the full range of inquiry that teachers engage in? I hope they can expand this a bit to consider other considerations necessary for teacher education.</p>	<p>This is a reference to levels of reflectivity specified by Van Manen. I tried to expand this idea with a quote and our opinion of the importance of this level of reflectivity. Beyond that, I don’t think we can expand based on the data from a qualitative study such as this one to statements that are more widely applicable to any teacher education setting. I also added this as a limitation of the study.</p>

<p>When the authors state that “these teachers were able to go beyond more superficial “fact-finding” levels of inquiry to the deepest level of inquiry concerning moral implications of education and teaching” (p. 12), it would be helpful if they provide more explicit analysis of how this occurred in the examples they provide.</p>	<p>This was also the intention of adding the material from Van Manen. In the text, the examples are given as moral or ethical issues they are discussing. I wasn’t sure what to do here. Do I need to better defend our interpretation of the data?</p>
<p>Finally, the authors note that they “hope that by looking for and identifying inquiry in the preservice experiences [they] create, as well as by working to model [their] own stances on the types and levels of inquiry in which [they] encourage pre-service teachers to engage, [they] can become better attuned to ways of promoting deeper levels of inquiry in [their] program” (p. 23). As a reader, I don’t know enough about the preservice experiences they create to be able to evaluate this. It would be helpful if more information were given to enable readers to get a fuller understanding of what this entails.</p>	<p>We expanded this and added a footnote on p.5</p>