Representing Multiple Perspectives of Self-as-Teacher:
School Integrated Teacher Education and Self-Study

By Tim Hopper & Kathy Sanford

Introduction

This paper describes a process of self-study that has developed between two teacher educators, their student teachers, and their school-based colleagues. The impetus for the research comes from a three-year action research project investigating the organization of and the instruction in an school integrated teacher education course aimed at preparing student teachers to become teachers (Sanford & Hopper, 2002). We see teacher education as a process that is generated through relationships with students and teachers who engage in self-reflection on knowledge acquired over time from multiple contexts and roles and from readings of professional texts on teaching. This paper represents a "reflective turn" (Schön, 1991) on the research project, offered through three accounts: that of the university instructors, the student teachers, and the schoolteachers involved in the project (Hopper & Sanford, 2000; Sanford & Hopper, 2000; Sanford & Hopper, 2001).

To understand this notion of teacher education we have found Cochran-Smith's (1999) review helpful. She suggests that the paradigmatic debate in educa-

Tim Hopper is a professor in the School of Physical Education and Kathy Sanford is a professor in Curriculum and Instruction, both with the Faculty of Education at the University of Victoria, Victoria, British Columbia, Canada.

tion has influenced research in teacher education over the last two decades. From a positivist perspective, much of the current understanding of teacher education has been built on the conception that knowing more leads to more effective practice. This type of knowledge-for-practice conception of teaching has contributed to the professional status of teacher education. The problem is that this formalized knowledge is distant from the practical knowledge of learning to teach, and as such feeds the teaching-as-telling default style of higher education (Finkel, 2000).

In the last decade a second body of literature has built on the first by offering new insights into teaching knowledge with the conception of teaching as what Cochran-Smith and Lytle (1999) have termed "knowledge-in-practice". This body of knowledge has developed largely from a naturalistic mode of inquiry. Developing from the work of Schön (1983; 1987; 1991), research in this area has focused upon teacher knowledge in action, "as it is expressed or embedded in the artistry of practice, in teachers' reflections on practice, in teachers' practical inquiries, and/or in teachers' narrative accounts of practice" (Cochran-Smith, p. 202). The term knowledge-in-practice has been used to conceptualize a variety of research perspectives in this area, such as pedagogical content knowledge (Shulman, 1987), practical knowledge (Russell, 1987; Russell & Munby, 1991) and personal practical knowledge (Clandinin & Connelly, 1987). These studies have focused upon exploring how teachers invent knowledge-in-action and how they learn to make knowledge explicit through deliberation and reflection. This body of knowledge recognizes the complexity of being a teacher, but how does such a body of knowledge get taught to student teachers?

A third body of knowledge on teacher learning is based on a collective, action research model for teacher learning (Altrichter, Psch, & Somekh, 1993; Carr & Kemis, 1986; Elliott, 1991; Hopper, 1997). This body of knowledge focuses upon teacher learning as knowledge-of-practice Cochran-Smith (1999). As such, the knowledge-of practice conception does not separate formal and practical knowledge. In knowledge-of-practice, the assumption is that through inquiry, teachers across their professional careers make problematic their own knowledge and practice as well as the knowledge and practice of others. Practice is more than practical. The knowledge that teachers need to teach well is more than what emanates from systematic inquiries. Knowledge-of-practice is constructed collectively within local and broader communities. In this view of teacher learning, teacher knowledge is not separate from the knower, but is constructed within his or her intellectual, social and cultural contexts of teaching. Such a body of knowledge relies on a context of teaching, where the problems of under-resourced situations, diverse student populations and lives beyond the classroom are interwoven within the demands for student learning.

In this paper we present three accounts that offer a collective, action research knowledge-of-teaching that have generated a form of professional development evolving from a post-modern perspective on pedagogy. As Lather (1991) defines,

post-modern pedagogy focuses upon a "transformation of consciousness that takes place in the intersection of three agencies — the teacher, the student, and the knowledge they together produce" (p. 15). For teaching this consciousness can best be realized within a relational place where these three agencies come together, namely the school. A post-modern perspective critiques the certainty that is promised by the grand narratives of modernist perspectives; instead it offers what Gergen (1991) has described as a "sense of validity from a particular community of interpretation" (p. 104). Such a community in a school is constructed and reconstructed by the teachers' biographies and intents within the constraints of the surrounding culture and socio-economic milieu.

Finally, this research paper draws on the concept of self-study (Bullough & Pinnegar, 2001; Hamilton & Pinnegar, 2000; Pinnegar, 1993). We are concerned with the interaction of the self-as-teacher, in a context, over time, with others who also have an expressed commitment to the education of students. Self-study, informed and influenced by voices and experiences of others in the context of a community, has the potential for powerful and ultimately far-reaching effect. As noted by Samaras (2002), within a school context a community can be created where university instructor and student teachers as novices in that context take up a peripheral stance in relation to the teacher's responsibility for the students' learning. In such a stance student teachers must negotiate and renegotiate their entrance into the community (Lave & Wenger, 1991). Such a process of negotiation creates a space for self-study in relation to an ever-changing context and creates a stimulus for construction and reconstruction of knowledge for teaching. This understanding of learning creates a different sense of knowledge-of-teaching that has led to the development of this integrated campus/field-based course. As Lave (1993) suggests, the understanding of practice, in this case teaching practice, becomes socially situated in the activity of the school.

The integrated course design was influenced by the findings of the action research project and subsequent self-study for university instructors within the educational community created by student teachers and schoolteachers. From the stimulus of an integrated campus/field-based course this paper presents the researchers' perspectives informed by insights from their role as university instructors, from student teachers at the beginning of their pre-service program and from experienced schoolteachers.

Research Project

The three-year project adopted a practical action research process that followed Kemmis and McTaggart's (1982) criteria with a focus upon "(1) the improvement of practice; (2) the improvement…of the understanding of the practice by its practitioners; and (3) the improvement of the situation in which the practice takes place" (p. 84). One researcher acted as a critical friend and co-instructor to the other researcher, who was the designated course instructor. Data was collected from

participant observations in classes and in schools, selective interviews with the student teachers, teachers and the instructor over the three years of the study. In addition, student teacher journals and electronic discussion forums, as well as digital images and video clips of experiences in schools, were collected, coded and analyzed using the NUD*IST NVivo software program. Data was collected from an inner-city elementary school in a middle-to-low economic area with approximately 300 students.

Using an inductive approach to data analysis as described by Miles and Huberman (1984) and Spradley (1980), data was coded during each of several readings using nodes and tree structures as generated by the Nvivo software program (Bazeley & Richards, 2000). Nodes represented meaningful memos identifying significant passages in the data, and trees created semantic relationships between nodes. This data was further refined using graphic organizers such as matrices and models. A key feature of the NVivo program is that it allows images to be coded with text, creating visual representations of insights being generated by the text. The focus of the research was to create case studies on the integrated teacher education course as it was repeated over a three-year period (Merriam, 1991).

Three Accounts within a Study of Self-as-Teacher

The first account represents the story leading up to the action research project and the subsequent development of the integrated course. The project attempted to develop what Cochran-Smith (1999) has termed knowledge-of-teaching by relocating teacher education courses in the space between the school culture and the university culture, a space that shifted from one place to other. This shifting created multiple perspectives for student teachers, principals, teacher and university instructors as they experienced the roles of student, teacher, teacher-assistant, mentor, observer and teacher educator within the boundaries of a teacher education course. The second account offers data from the study that shows a shift from student teacher mindset to a sense of self-as-teacher. The final account captures the shift in schoolteachers' perspectives as the integrated course caused them to re-evaluate their understanding of self-as-teacher. These accounts connect to Clandinin's (1995) intent to create a sense of teacher educator as living reflectively outside the story of expert, to live within a collaborative story for teacher education.

Teacher Educator's Account of Self-as-Teacher

Evolving the Key Components of the Course

In 1994, I began coordinating a course that included the education students' first practicum experience. In my previous two years' experience in teaching the course, I had had many concerns regarding the separation between the campus experience and the school-based practicum experience. Over the next several years, I made attempts to integrate the two experiences in a meaningful way for the

students. More consistent efforts were made to develop connections with the school personnel who were hosting these fledgling student teachers, through phone calls and personal visits. Partly as a result of these connections and partly because of my continuing belief in the need for integrated experiences, the course content evolved. The curriculum of the course began to develop in response to the students' own needs and interests, incorporating assignments that required the students to research, collaboratively plan and teach, explicitly recognize their learning through observing and acting, and share their knowledge in public forums.

As I continually examined the course experiences and possibilities, I also incorporated more opportunities for active reflection on the part of the students themselves, through dialogue journals, class listservs, and self-evaluation, and attempted to connect the reflective element of activities with the participatory element. I often found it difficult to sell the idea of reflection to the students, in the face of dismissal from teachers in schools who did not reflect or see value in reflection. I found this dismissal troubling, but wanted to encourage reflection that students engaged in willingly, rather than impose reflective assignments.

Another critical development of this course was the move from a graded course to a pass/fail course. This direction enabled students to consider reflection as a meaningful aspect of learning rather than one intended to help improve their grade. It enabled me to gain ongoing feedback from the students about all aspects of the course and to incorporate that feedback into my own understandings of their development as teachers and into ongoing changes to the course structure and content.

As the course evolved, I came to recognize the need for the students to see themselves as change agents, as teacher researchers, and as learners if there was going to be any chance of their seeing teaching as an intellectual pursuit rather than a training ground. The evolution of this course and field experience continued as I collaborated with other university instructors, but it was two critical incidents that enabled the further growth of this course and of my development as a teacher educator. The first was an invitation from a teacher acting as a school liaison between his staff and the university personnel. He suggested that I bring my class of university students to his school and teach the course at the school site. This move to a school-learning site was viewed positively by the student teachers, and it facilitated guest speakers from the school to address them throughout the term. It also enabled the university students to develop a sense of comfort in a school setting, and to feel as if they were moving toward their goal of becoming a teacher. This change of learning sites worked very well, and I wanted to involve more schools in these experiences.

When I approached another school liaison to visit his school, he was very welcoming but wanted to know why we would want to change locations. He asked, "Why would it make a difference if you were conducting your class in a room at the university or at my school?" This question challenged me to consider my purposes

in teaching this class and to consider how to best use a school site for teaching about teaching. This reflection was the impetus for the evolution of this course development to a formalized research project that has engaged us for the past four years that has focused on the following questions: (1) How does an integrated field/campus-based course develop?, and (2) How does an integrated field/campus-based course affect student teachers' learning?

Integrated Teacher Education Course: Key Components

We developed the integrated course around Vygotskian social constructivist tenets (Richardson, 1997; Samaras & Shelly, 1998; Samaras, 2002). Briefly, these tenets focus upon situated learning, socially shared cognition, mediated joint activity, and the study of culture and the influence of social context on learning. These tenets were addressed at the school site and through the activities and assignments completed by the student teachers (see Sanford & Hopper, 2000).

The following are key components and data sources within this teacher education course: (1) reflective journals; (2) student and instructor conversations with school teachers and administrators; (3) electronic e-mail listserv; (4) peer and school teacher involvement in course planning, re-planning, teaching and evaluation; and (5) use of digital video and digital images to capture situations and experiences for future reflection and conversation.

A key characteristic of the integrated course was the credit/non-credit assignments. These assignments, set at a high professional standard, had to be completed at a satisfactory level for the student teacher to progress. It is our experience that such assignments, based on inquiry, and tailored to the needs of the student teachers, create an incredibly rich learning situation. A quote from a student teacher in Sanford and Hopper (2002) highlights this point:

> When I found out this course was pass/fail, I thought, "I work hard I want a reward," but then it kind of makes you think about who you are. I went, "Wait a minute, I don't need extrinsic motivation to do this, I am really enjoying this class." I really learnt a lot. I self-reflected on things that I might not have thought about before, the other side of issues. To me that is the reason why you are here and that is why you should be learning, not for a mark…I never fathomed a world without grading…I then thought, "Yeah this is possible."

This quote suggests how the pass/fail nature of the course created a space for the type of critically reflective approach to learning that we wished to examine and nurture in the course.

A major focus of the course was to enable the student teachers to create a sense of teacher for themselves, to envision themselves in the role and to develop an understanding of how it felt to be a teacher. Over the three-years, four phases of development were recognized as critical to the success of the integrated course.

1. The first phase was to create a comfortable, social environment where

the student teachers felt safe to share ideas, concerns and fears. The course enabled student teachers to feel like teachers by teaching content they knew well. And observations in the school helped them see, without stress, classroom environments as prospective teachers.

2. The second phase was to get them focused on growing from a student mindset where they did courses for grades, to a teacher mindset where they took responsibility for their own and others' learning. As the course was shifted to school sites, knowledge-of-teaching developed related to experiences with children.

3. The third phase was to enable the student teachers to operate within the complex system of a classroom, within a school, within a socio-economic area. A key characteristic of this phase was that they questioned their middle-class, "successful student" assumptions. The interview extract below highlights the complexity that caused student teachers to realize what teaching, in some school contexts, had to include.

> Teacher: In this school we sometimes join the principal in picking up condoms and needles from the playground before school starts.
>
> Teacher: Student teachers meet kids that don't get up every morning having had a breakfast, put on clean socks and clean underwear. They come to school with a tremendous amount of baggage…family violence and drug abuse, kids that do not come from the same world as they did.

4. The final phase represented a celebration of the learning. For the student teachers, learning developed through experiences with practicing teachers, in school locations and through their personal reflections. Student teachers recognized what they had learned and publicly represented their knowledge in final projects shared at the school. In the final year of the project, supported by thoughtful analysis of data from the previous years of the project, the university instructor was able to share responsibility of teacher education with school-based colleagues, allowing the voices of experienced teachers to be heard as they led the teacher education class. This enabled the recognition and celebration of the teachers' learning along with the student teachers.

Student Teachers' Voices Forming an Evolving Account of Self-as-Teacher within the Course

Learning as a recursive process: The inclusion of the school experiences within the university course created a recursive process for the students whereby the school context caused a "make you think" or cognizant effect that inspired and stimulated the student teachers into a sense of dissonance with their previous assumptions. The school experiences inspired student teachers to recognize their

desire to be a teacher; as one student said, "I love going to the schools and being there with the kids…These events are what drives me to be a teacher." The cognizant effect also caused a confused state, which was then shared and mediated by peers, course instructor and teachers situated within the school culture. Through reflective tasks (including journal and listserv) student teachers recognized how they were becoming teachers and looked for more experiences within the school to support their learning. This process cycled throughout the course with visits to classrooms followed by a course meeting, then reflection by the student teachers. A key focus of the course was to enable the student teachers to create a foundational sense of themselves as teachers.

In the first year of the project the focus was to develop theoretical support for how a field-based teacher education course would improve learning to teach. Social interaction was used to develop pre-service learning in group assignments, listserv discussion and class discussions. The school culture was used as a way of stimulating inquiry into the practices of teachers.

Building on social constructivist tenets, the course developed a supportive, comfortable and reflective environment. It became obvious that the school context had a cognizant effect on student teachers, causing them to think differently. Some student teachers were quick to make judgments and close down reflection, blaming bad teachers for situations they found uncomfortable. However, many of them were able to mediate their own experiences and the shared experiences of their peers, creating a growing sense of becoming teachers. The activities in the course enabled the creation of a situated-integrated learning environment where student teachers learned to broaden their views of the teaching profession. Course discussions provided them with understanding of the vast contextual/local knowledge held by their peers. Teachers in the school saw the course as worthwhile because student teachers experienced the reality of teaching, though some teachers were more welcoming of student teachers in their classrooms than were others.

The social nature of the course with the stimulus of the school environment encouraged student teachers to question long-held assumptions and fears about teaching. The Vygotskian framework gave theoretical support to an alternative form of teacher education. This alternative asked student teachers to learn from the experience to be found in schools, course readings and each other as they developed a collectively informed understanding of teaching. This understanding moved them away from simplistic notions of how to be a teacher, causing them to question unchallenged assumptions they held about teaching classes of children with similar education experiences and socio-economic backgrounds to themselves. The reality of managing a class of children produced a fear in many student teachers. In the second year of the study a more explicit focus was given to classroom management as a phenomenon intertwined with the whole classroom context.

The following extracts from student teachers' journals in the second year of the study inform us of the accounts of self-as-teacher that developed from the first year

of the study. As one student teacher said about the course, "You further your own understanding of yourself and what you are going to end up like," which all the student teachers in different ways came to recognize and articulate in their reflective writings and discussions. They were able to make connections in their learning; as another student teacher commented, "I see a lot more how the pieces (classroom management, and evaluation, etc.) play together and that the whole course brought that in with all the types of assignments that we are doing with everything we did … it just jump-started my brain into thinking. It was really exciting." Another student teacher said about the course, "This is linking ideas and you remember it." A third student teacher reported, "I have never before had a class where I felt that I would keep what I had learned … even when I was just lying in bed and thinking, I was learning more even though the class was over."

However, some student teachers did not share this understanding, as the following extracts highlight. One student teacher's comment, "I didn't really understand why we were at the school that much," suggested that connections and possibilities were not as readily recognized by her; and the comment, "I put in a lot of work and I like to be rewarded with a grade," suggests that this student teacher still held a stronger connection to "student" thinking than "teacher" thinking. These disconfirming threads encouraged further developments to try to include all prospective teachers into the sense of knowledge-of-teaching being generated by many others in the course. Agreeing with Lave and Wenger (1991, p. 115), we believed that "learning and a sense of identity are inseparable"; so to help more student teachers learn about teacher identity, a plan was made to include more of the teacher voices in year three of the course.

Controlling the class: In the second year of the study the major concern for student teachers was still classroom management, in particular "controlling" the class. As Kagan (1992) states, "student teachers enter the classroom with a critical lack of knowledge about pupils" (p. 42) and are over-concerned with classroom management issues. Initially entries in journals and on the listserv focused on the fear of controlling a class, but as the visits to schools occurred, the student teachers started sharing what they had seen. For example in year 2 of the study Andrea wrote on the listserv:

> I think the most valuable thing I learned in classroom management was learning how and when to vary the class activities. We have all had teachers (especially since we have all attended university) that spent the whole class lecturing and getting students to take notes and we know how boring this is. In the elementary school I was observing, the teacher was continually switching activities (about every fifteen minutes or so) to accommodate the short attention spans of the students and their inability to sit still for long periods of time.

Similarly Cathy commented,

> It may seem overly simple, but one of the best and most effective techniques for classroom management that I found when observing was counting. It gave the students a chance to become quiet. . . . One teacher counted so quietly I could hardly hear him and the students were SO quiet by the time he was finished. Another one was standing beside the student who was off-task. One teacher just put her hand on his shoulder (he was wriggling and talking during her "lecture") and he became very quiet.

Early on in the listserv discussion several student teachers voiced the opinion that disobedient students should be removed from the class; however, as the student teachers visited classrooms, a more connected and complex insight to dealing with management developed, as highlighted in one of Caroline's entries:

> I would only use kicking students out of the room as a last resort…it's a desperate act that stops the undesirable behavior for only a short period of time. If every teacher reacts the same way, these kids are going to spend a considerable amount of their school career in the hallways, learning nothing and nurturing defiance. Do we really want that? Plus, getting kicked out of class is only a deterrent for those who are normally well behaved and dislike breaking rules. The more rebellious see it as a perverse honour. For example, one Grade 9 student who got kicked out of class yesterday received high-fives from his friends as he left the class. As with many of you, I believe in setting some firm rules of conduct for students…like Andrea I would identify the ringleaders…I would then make an appointment to speak to each one of the initiators individually to see what was going on with them. Work out what kinds of activities they like best in my class and try to incorporate more of that in return for better behaviour.

As Caroline's quote highlights, the student teachers started to develop a sense of relationship in their constructions of management from their observations in the schools, and as with Caroline, started to think through the role of a teacher.

Identifying with teachers: In the third year of the project the student teachers spent twelve days out of fourteen in classrooms. In these visits, student teachers observed, worked with, and talked to teachers. During year three of the course four teachers came to speak to student teachers about their personal teaching journeys and their understanding of teaching curriculum. The teachers modeled how reflective they were of their practices and how they understood their practice in relation to their own biographies. Teachers and the principal were asked to become actively involved in the course by teaching the student teachers. These professionals described their experiences of becoming a teacher and how they implemented curriculum. In turn, the course instructor taught the teachers' elementary classes. This partnership relationship generated a sense of collegiality that situated the knowledge of teaching within a culture, and caused the student teachers to identify more with the teachers they observed and to question their own previously untested assumptions. For example, the power of a principal telling student teachers that when he started teaching, "I wouldn't hire me. I was horrible . . . I was always going

'to power' with kids," allowed the student teachers to admit their own fears of being a bad teacher. As he explained, "You don't own a problem, especially if you do not build it up. In my second year of teaching I went to a PD session and realized I needed to change. I used to think I needed to be harder and punish more, then I realized I was owning the problem and making it worse." The student teachers came to see management as an issue of respect with students, not a threat to them. Other teachers also told their stories of becoming teachers, as shared in the next section of this paper.

The common pattern from these experiences, witnessed during teacher presentations, was the passion for teaching. As one student teacher voiced for the group, "During my experience at the school I was inspired by the amount of passion that the teachers had for the children." Or as another student teacher wrote to the teachers at the school, "I have already gained so much experience from these past three days at the school. It is very motivating to see so many wonderful teachers, teachers who are so passionate about their work. I hope one day, I will be like those teachers." The positive response from the student teachers energized the teachers and administrators in the school. They commented on how preparing and then talking to student teachers about teaching caused them to clarify their own intents and to reflect on how they had learned, and that it had inspired them to achieve even more. As the principal said, "It is a thrill talking to student teachers because they bring such a new perspective to the school. They admire teachers who just teach as normal…they ask such good questions."

Over the three years of conducting the course within the schools, a sense of trust and open dialogue had developed between the course instructor, researcher and school staff. This relationship encouraged a questioning stance rather than a judgmental stance, which is often formed by outsiders entering a new culture. Within reflective journals, course listserv and class discussions, student teachers were encouraged to examine themselves for reasons why they found fault in what they observed and to notice detail. They learned to ask questions that allowed teachers to explain what was happening. These questions released them from their naïve and unrealistic sense of what teaching was about. For example, one teacher gave a talk on assessment, focusing on the idea that teachers' decisions about curriculum, instruction, and assessment are integrally linked. To highlight this he told the class the following story of two students who were best friends, Jake and Steve; both got high marks on social studies tests, except that Jake was often absent from class at certain times of the year to work on his father's farm. When Jake was absent he got a zero on the test. When Jake was absent Steve only got an average mark on the test. At the end of the year when the totals for tests was added up, Steve was seen as the academic and recommended for the honors program; Jake was not. As the teacher said, "Tests should be used to assess what a student knows about the curriculum, not assess to control behavior." This view caused student teachers to question previously unchallenged notions of assessment; as one student teacher

said, "It opened my eyes to assessment issues that were so ingrained in my mind that I never would have challenged them if he had not nudged me in the right direction." At the end of the course when the students were asked what influence they thought the course and field experience had on them, a recurring response was to question their assumptions about assessment, highlighting the impact, told within a context, of the teacher's story.

Teachers' Accounts of Evolving Sense of Self-as-Teacher from the Stimulus of the Integrated Course

Perception of disruption: In the first year of the integrated course one principal had to convince the school staff of the idea of working with the student teachers in the integrated course. As he said, "There was a culture in the building where we didn't take student teachers." The principal sold the idea to the teachers, suggesting that the honorarium paid for taking student teachers could be used to fund conference attendance for the teachers. The teachers agreed to the idea, but as one teacher commented, "a lot of us were worried that the student teachers were going to be obtrusive and disruptive." However, the reality was that with the care and support from the principal the student teachers were a minimal disruption, and for many teachers they were seen as an asset. In an interview the principal made an interesting observation about his staff. As he explained, "If they are the teachers who are trying to control everything, then having student teachers obviously will be annoying. But a teacher that has a more reaction type of teaching that works with the moods of the class, basically that will work." More-structured teachers said, "I need to know exactly when they are coming so I am sure that I have the right lesson prepared." Other teachers just adapted when student teachers were in their classrooms. Teachers were reluctant to not take a student teacher because the principal would ask why. As he said, not having a student teacher was like saying, "I am not very good in the classroom, and I feel uncomfortable with student teachers coming in." One of the teachers commented that he felt his colleagues blamed management difficulties on "the types of kids that they have, therefore they had a defence mechanism built in." He felt reluctant teachers had an excuse if student teachers saw an unruly class. Within this tension, then, the integrated teacher education course was developed.

Re-evaluating teaching: In the second year of the study the majority of the teachers indicated they were comfortable with the visits from the student teachers. However, not all student teachers were sensitive to the classroom. As one teacher commented, reflecting from the first year of the project to the next, "we have had some student teachers in here that sat at the back of the classroom and goofed off and it was terrible, but this group was really good." As the student teachers were taught to observe and be less judgemental, they thought of themselves more as teachers; with this attitude the teachers were able to open up and share more with

the student teachers. As a teacher said, "I said to a number of student teachers, 'for some of these children the only person in this entire world that will truly care for them is their teacher, and they need that because their parents have too much of their own garbage to worry about'." These insights allowed student teachers to see students within a frame of their lives, not just objects to be taught. Though a resistance to the student teachers' presence still existed with some of the staff members, the student teachers were generally seen as a benefit to the overall school culture. One teacher commented,

> Student teachers help you be current on things happening at the university. It makes me re-evaluate, constantly re-evaluate my own teaching, because sometimes we get so focused on what we are doing that we forget what we are doing;… so when you have somebody watching you are more focused, what you are doing becomes very important.

In the third year of the research project, staff members were invited to teach the student teachers, and four teachers responded to the offer, telling their stories about becoming a teacher and how that had influenced their styles of teaching. Giving the control of the university class over to the teachers showed a new role being negotiated by the university instructor, as a sense of trust had grown between the university instructor and teachers in the school. The teachers' voices offered historically situated knowledge about teaching that allowed student teachers to re-evaluate how teaching was a concept with personal, professional and contextual meaning. As a researcher, Tim recalled how the events following a story told by a teacher to the student teachers showed a re-evaluation of teaching knowledge:

> This teacher told of his memory of his grade 5 teacher who he, as a failing student, admired and who was his inspiration to be a teacher, a teacher who was able to change plans effortlessly to reflect the mood of the students. I had experienced first-hand the difficulty of teaching his particular class of grade five students, and was able to support his claim that flexibility was important. During the afternoon, the student teachers heard the teacher describe a particular activity that was happening in his class, and share his joy for the amazing expressive work that was being completed. The project involved the grade five students learning about poetic imagery, expression, flow, and narrative through song lyrics of a ballad, which they interpreted through visuals, words, and spoken language. They then used the internet to research the "facts" of the story/ballad presented in the lyrics. Following that, the students listened to the song and used paint, with their fingers, to express visually the emotionality of the song.
>
> The project worked wonderfully in the morning, but when the student teachers visited to observe in the afternoon, the students refused to continue. They had had enough of the activity and wanted to pack it up. Disappointed and chagrined, the teacher decided to discontinue the activity and assumed that the student teachers would interpret the interaction as a failure on his part. However, talking to me about the event the student teachers described with pleasure how they were able to see the teacher's strong, flexible classroom management skills,

> dealing effectively with the situation. The teacher, in a later conversation with me, expressed his disappointment; but as I shared the student teacher's excitement his perception changed. He was able to come to see his actions as the best solution to the students' needs; he had unconsciously demonstrated how his inspirational grade five teacher lived on in his own practice.

This example points to some of many instances where teachers, working in the integrated course, came to recognize their own strengths in their classrooms and then were able to refer explicitly to these in future discussions with student teachers. The articulation of teachers' professional knowledge rooted in their autobiographical experience of being taught, clarified aspects of teaching for the student teachers, but enabled the teachers to develop a much clearer sense of their own professional knowledge. Teachers were able to recognize the sources of their previously unarticulated teaching practices, i.e., previous experience, personal beliefs and values, societal assumptions, intuition. As they articulated their own professional knowledge, they were able to respond to questions that enabled further questions to be asked regarding teaching practices; they re-evaluated their own sense of teaching.

Concluding Reflections

This use of multiple voices from teachers in the positions of mentors, teacher educators and future colleagues generated a form of professional development. As a school principal commented, "it caused 'teacherly conversations' not normally shared amongst teachers." These conversations were brought to the surface by the eagerness and interest of student teachers. The student teachers created a space for teachers to articulate and share their knowledge, a form of knowledge so powerful that it educated those who wanted to hear it as it structured the thoughts of those who spoke it.

We noted that as the integrated course developed, student teachers' journals and listserv entries were far less negative in judgments made of teachers. As noted by Lave and Wenger (1991), student teachers' legitimate peripheral participation in a school culture enables them to learn to see situations as teachers within a culture, rather than as outsiders. Discipline problems were still a concern but not a problem: they were a part of helping students grow, not indicators of success and failure of the teachers. This course represents a radical move from more traditional, content-based learning that student teachers expressed as their general experience in university education. With a rigorous pass/fail standard in the course, many of the student teachers reported feeling that they worked more, learned more and felt more confident of their learning than with other classes in the university. Some student teachers even said that until this course they had never realized what "real" learning was about; they remarked, "this was learning for life." Consistent with the finds of Samaras (2002) and Bullough and Gitlin (2001), this situated learning allowed student teachers to develop a personal sense of their teacher identity without the constraints of a traditional university

grading system. Student teachers were able to construct their beginning teacher identites with authentic experiences as adults in teacher roles through legitimate peripheral participation in school culture (Lave & Wenger, 1991).

Connecting to the Scholarly Landscape

LaBoskey (2001) identifies self-study research as collaborative research that builds a process of accountability in which ideas and theories are continually under review by all participants, where multiple voices share a passion for a more educative environment. This ongoing research clearly demonstrates these aspects of self-study. The research has led us to develop similar models in other institutions, as we seek to reproduce the relationships of learning highlighted by the integration of schools with university classes. We note that both student teachers and practicing teachers often view with scepticism university courses that attempt to prepare students to become effective teachers. As teacher educators we are aware of the gulf that can exist between the two types of experience and between institutions vying for pre-eminence in offering knowledge to fledgling teachers. Our challenge as teacher educators, course instructors, and researchers has been to examine our own assumptions about the value of the knowledge we offer and the ways in which we offer this knowledge to student teachers. Through this research project and through ongoing teaching and research experiences, we have sought opportunities to review our practices, assumptions, and values as teacher educators in an attempt to broaden the pool of resources and understandings from which student teachers might draw, valuing, like Carr (1989) and Cochran-Smith and Lytle (1999), the personal, professional, and contextual knowledge of teaching provided by multiple perspectives within a school context.

School integrated teacher education courses contrast with many current teacher education programs based in a positivist tradition, where discrete courses are offered, fragmented between departments, with little or no connection to field-based experiences (Grimmett, 1998; McWilliam, 1994; Zeichner, 1999). As Wideen, Mayer-Smith and Moon (1998) report, in the mid-1980s a progressivist tradition inserted a wedge of innovative practices into existing positivistic programs, shifting the emphasis away from what beginning teachers should know and how they should best be trained, to a focus on attempting to understand what they actually do know and how that knowledge is acquired. We feel that this project has tried to build from that lead.

The win-win situation that the school integrated course creates for student teachers, teachers, administrators and teacher educators makes sense. The teacher education literature is littered with tales of successful partnerships between schools and universities, with university courses sometimes totally relocated within schools; however, these innovations are the exception rather than the norm (Clarke and Hubball, 2001; Grimmett, 1998; Rolheiser, 1999; Rovegno, 1991; Samaras & Shelly, 1998; Wiseman, Cooner, & Knight, 1999). Such innovative programs often

become 'balkanized' within the traditional structures of teacher education (Wideen et al., 1998). As Clandinin (1995) warns:

> University teachers who break from the sacred theory-practice story by relocating themselves outside the story of expert…are taking professional risks…As university teachers begin to live and tell competing stories, founded on different epistemologies, these accounts become threatening to other university teachers, teachers and student teachers (p. 30).

Such a threat can lead to a reaffirming of traditional structures (Russell, 2001). However, we believe that the evolution of teacher education must develop and shift to enable integration and depth of understanding between school and university cultures to inform teacher education.

References

Altrichter, H., Psch, P., & Somekh, B. (1993). Teachers investigate their work: An introduction to the methods of action research. London and New York: Routledge.

Bazeley, P., & Richards, L. (2000). The NVivo Qualitative Project Book. London, UK: Sage.

Bullough, R., & Gitlin, A. (2001). Becoming a student: Linking knowledge production and practice of teaching (Second ed.). New York: Routledge Falmer.

Bullough, R., & Pinnegar, S. (2001). Guidelines for quality in autobiographical forms of self-study research. Educational Researcher, 30(3), 13-21.

Carr, W. (1989). Introduction: Understanding quality in teaching. In W. Carr (Ed.), Quality in teaching: Arguments for reflective profession (pp. 1-18). London, New York and Philadelphia: The Falmer Press.

Carr, W., & Kemis, S. (1986). Becoming critical: Knowing through action research. Lewes, UK: Falmer Press.

Clandinin, D., & Connelly, F. (1987). Teachers' personal knowledge: What counts as 'personal' in studies of the personal. Journal of Curriculum studies, 35(6), 28-36.

Clandinin, J. (1995). Still learning to teach. In T. Russell & F. Korthagen (Eds.), Teachers who teach teachers (pp. 25-31). London, UK: The Falmer Press.

Clarke, A., & Hubball, H. (2001). Physical education courses as immersion in an elementary school setting. Avante, 7(3), 11-27.

Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. (1999). Relationship of knowledge and practice: Teacher learning in communities. In A. Iran-Nejad & P. Pearson (Eds.), Review of research in education (pp. 249-305). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Elliott, J. (1991). Action research for educational change. Philadelphia: Open University Press.

Finkel, D. (2000). Teaching with your mouth shut. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.

Gergen, K. (1991). The saturated self. New York: Basic Books.

Grimmett, P. (1998). Reconceptualizing the practice of teacher preparation: on not throwing out the concurrent model with the reform bathwater. Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 44(3), 251-267.

Hamilton, M., & Pinnegar, S. (2000). On the threshold of a new century: Trustworthiness, integrity, and self-Study in teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 51(3), 234-40.

Hopper, T. (1997). Learning to respond: supervising novice physical educators in an action research project. Sport, Education and Society, 2(2), 163-180.

Hopper, T., & Sanford, K. (2000). On site: the praxis of situating teacher preparation at a school. Paper presented at the WESTCAST 2000, Regina.

Kagan, D. (1992). Professional growth among preservice and beginning teachers. Review of Educational Research, 62(2), 129-169.

Kemmis, S., & McTaggart, R. (1982). The action research reader. Geelong, Victoria, Australia: Deakin University Press.

LaBoskey, V. (2001). The role of self-study in research on teaching: Multiple perspectives, common purposes through the lens of self-study-Talk, S-STEP SIG newsletter (pp. 8). Http://www.ku.edu/~sstep/newsletter092001.htm.

Lather, P. (1991). Getting smart: Feminist research and pedagogy with/in the postmodern. New York: Routledge.

Lave, J. (1993). The practice of learning. In S. Chaiklin & J. Lave (Eds.), Understanding practice: Perspectives on activity and context (pp. 3-34). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation. New York: Cambridge University Press.

McWilliam, E. (1994). In broken images: Feminist tales for a different teacher education. New York and London: Teachers College, Columbia University.

Merriam, S. (1991). Case study research in education: A qualitative approach. Oxford, UK: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Miles, M., & Huberman, A. (1984). Qualitative data analysis: A sourcebook of new methods. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage publications.

Pinnegar, S. (1993). Beginning Again: Making Sense and Learning the Terrain (Meeting Paper). Atlanta, GA: American Educational Research Association.

Richardson, V. (Ed.). (1997). Constructivist teacher education. Washington, DC: Falmer Press.

Rolheiser, C. (1999). Redesigning teacher education: The delicate, demanding dance of "Ready, Fire, Aim". In M. Wideen & P. Lemma (Eds.), Ground level changing reform in teacher education (pp. 119-148). Calgary, Alberta, Canada: Detselig Enterprises Ltd.

Rovegno, I. (1991). A participant-observation study of knowledge restructuring in a field-based elementary physical education methods course. Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 62, 205-212.

Russell, T. (1987). Research, practical knowledge, and the conduct of teacher education. Educational Theory, 37, 369-375.

Russell, T. (2001). Radical program change in preservice teacher education: What and how we learn from personal and institutional experience (Meeting Paper). Seattle, WA: American Educational Research Association.

Russell, T., & Munby, H. (1991). Reframing: The role of experience in developing teachers' professional knowledge. In D. Schon (Ed.), The reflective turn: Case studies in and on educational practice (pp. 164-187). New York and London: Teachers College, Columbia University.

Samaras, A., & Shelly, G. (1998). Scaffolds in the field: Vygotskian interpretation in a teacher education program. Teaching and Teacher Education, 14(7), 715-733.

Samaras, A. (2002). Self-study for teacher education. New York: Peter Lang.

Sanford, K., & Hopper, T. (2000). Situating an initial teacher preparation course in a school: Vygotskian social constructivism in learning how to teach (Meeting Paper). Edmonton: Canadian Society for the Study of Education, University of Alberta.

Sanford, K., & Hopper, T. (2001). Field-based teacher education: Situating an initial teacher preparation course within the school context (Meeting Paper). Seattle, WA: American Educational Research Association.

Sanford, K., & Hopper, T. (2002, April 1-6). Collective case study of a field-based teacher education course: A three-year action research project. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Schön, D. (1983). The reflective practitioner. London, UK: Temple Smith.

Schön, D. (1987). Educating the reflective practitioner: Toward a new design for teaching and learning in the professions. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schön, D. (1991). Introduction. In D. Schon (Ed.), The reflective turn: Case studies in and on educational practice (pp. 1-11). New York and London: Teachers College, Columbia University.

Shulman, L. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. Harvard Educational Review, 51, 1-22.

Spradley, J. (1980). Participant observer. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Wideen, M., Mayer-Smith, J., & Moon, B. (1998). A critical analysis of the research on learning to teach: Making the case for an ecological perspective on inquiry. Review of Educational Research, 68(2).

Wiseman, D. L., Cooner, D. D., & Knight, S. L. (1999). Becoming a teacher in a field-based setting: An introduction to education and classrooms. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Zeichner, K. (1999). The new scholarship in teacher education. Educational Researcher, 28(9), 4-15.