Who Should Perish, You or Your Students?

Dilemmas of Research in Teacher Education

By Clare Kosnik & Clive Beck

Early in our involvement in preservice teacher education at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto (OISE/UT) we recognized the importance of doing research on our own practice. We saw this as necessary partly to improve our practice and partly to further our status and careers in the academy. We found that preservice teacher education, on the model we were following, was so time consuming that if we were to do much research we had to do it in the context of our work. Also, we naturally wanted to know whether and in what ways our model was effective and how it could be improved. Further, because we saw some merit in the model of teacher education we were developing, we wanted to have a basis in research as we recommended it to others.

Rather quickly, however, we encountered a number of problems. We realized that our research was not as prestigious as "objective" research, and we wondered about our chances of getting research funding. Also, we sensed that by spending so much

Clare Kosnik is an assistant professor and coordinator of a preservice cohort program and Clive Beck is a professor, both in the Department of Curriculum, Teaching, and Learning of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education at the University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

time with our students and in schools, as this kind of "self-study" required, we were cutting ourselves off from our more "academic" colleagues. Also, questions were raised about the appropriateness or "ethics" of doing research on our own students and publishing abroad the views of our associate teachers. In this article, in the context of considering how teacher educators can avoid "perishing" in the academy, we describe our experiences, discuss some of the underlying issues, and consider possible implications for teacher education research and administration.

The Shape of "Self-Study" in Teacher Education

Kenneth Zeichner, in his Division K vice-presidential address at the 1998 American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, spoke enthusiastically about the fact that "more and more of the research about teacher education is being conducted by those who actually do the work of teacher education." Indeed, he claimed that "the birth of the self-study in teacher education movement around 1990, has been probably the single most significant development ever in the field of teacher education research" (Zeichner, 1998, p. 19). He went on to present examples of teacher educators who have "interrogated their practice in ways that exposed gaps between what they thought they were doing and how their students experienced their teaching" (p. 40). He concluded: "While it is not necessary or even desirable for all who do research about teacher education to be actively involved as practitioners of teacher education, all research in teacher education needs to be sensitive to the personal and social complexities of the work" (p. 41).

The term "self-study" may suggest self-indulgent and sentimental reflection or what is sometimes disparagingly called "navel-gazing"; however, Zeichner uses the term simply to refer to the study of teacher education by the practitioners themselves, with emphasis on feedback from students. As such it is neither self-indulgent nor unduly sentimental, but a serious attempt to understand one's teaching with a view to improving it. It is akin to "action research" in teaching in general, which John Elliott has described in connection with his own teaching in schools: It "took the form of a self-reflexive experimental process in which the teacher monitored his or her interaction with students in determining what constituted educationally worthwhile curriculum experiences" (Elliott, 1997, pp. 17-19). "Practices took on the status of hypotheses to be tested. So we collected empirical data about their effects, and used it [sic] as evidence in which to ground our theorizing with each other" (Elliott, 1991, pp. 7-8). There are parallels also with the use of "critical incidents" to assess one's assumptions about teaching, as described by Judith Newman. The reactions of students and other events in the classroom "let us see with new eyes some aspect of what we do." All teachers operate with "a set of beliefs about learning and teaching," and the systematic examination of critical incidents often serves to reveal "a surprising gap between what we said we believed about teaching and learning (our espoused beliefs) and what our actions were conveying" (1990, pp. 17-18).

In our own work with an elementary preservice teacher cohort, self-study has enabled us to monitor and improve many aspects of our program. For example, we have looked at how students change over the course of the year in their expectations, attitudes and skills—even identifying "stages of development" of students during their preservice education. This has led us to modify the kinds of classes we have at the beginning of the year and adjust other aspects of the program to suit the needs of the preservice teachers at particular points in the program. More specifically, we have studied in detail the effects of the action research component of the program on their capacity to understand and perform the complex role of the teacher. This in turn has led to modification of the way we introduce action research and the kinds of help we give students in their ongoing work on the projects.

We also have studied how our teaching practices have changed in recent years. This has given us greater awareness of what we are doing as teachers and placed us in a better position to help each other, write about our work and achieve ongoing renewal of our practice. Further, we have conducted in-depth interviews with some of our associate (or cooperating) teachers, identifying and learning from their views about the action research process, the relationship between the university and the practicum schools and, in general, the role of associate teachers in preservice teacher education. Finally, we have done a follow-up study of some of our graduates. We did this to get their impressions as they "look back" on the program and to assess the extent to which the effects of the program continue beyond the preservice year.

Of course, like any "thoughtful practitioner," we observe our students constantly, learn from them and adjust our practice accordingly. It is difficult to draw a line between everyday observation and what might be called "formal research"; however, we believe there is an interactive relationship between explicit research and thoughtful practice. As we engage systematically in research on our practice we gain insights and develop habits and skills which make us more observant and thoughtful even when doing "ordinary" teaching.

To achieve the above ends we have gathered "data" as follows. We have, with permission, systematically collected copies of our students' essays, action research reports and other assignments. Noteworthy among these are the students' "reflection papers" on the goals of schooling and their expectations for teacher education, and an in-class assignment done three times throughout the year with students discussing these same topics in small groups and recording their conclusions on chart paper. (On the whole we have found reflection papers and in-class assignments more effective than journals in promoting reflectiveness in students and eliciting their views.) We have interviewed all the students at least once during the year about their views of teaching and the teacher education program. We have asked students to fill out a questionnaire once before the program begins and on three other occasions during the year, and conducted in-depth interviews on the same topics with a small sub-set of the class. We have had "debriefing" seminars

with the students (about 8-10 to a group) after their return from practice teaching to determine what challenges arose during the practicum, how they dealt with them and how it has affected their view of the teaching/learning process. We have kept our own personal journals. And we have tape-recorded our interviews with associate teachers and had them transcribed. Much of this data gathering has been in the context of pursuing specific research questions. On this basis, with of course related reading and theorizing, we have been able to write a number of conference papers, book chapters, papers for refereed journals, and lectures for more general sharing of ideas and experiences.

We hope this brief overview of our own practice of self-study helps remove some of the mystery from the notion of self-study in teacher education. In a way it is quite an "ordinary" activity. As Ruth S. Hubbard and Brenda M. Power say about teacher research in general, "research strategies can fit into your classroom routines" and "many of the records you keep as part of...evaluative strategies may be useful without any revision" (1993, pp. 9 & 12). Research of this kind requires dedication and perseverance; but it is feasible for any teacher educator and can bring many rewards, including those of understanding one's students better, being able to help them more, acquiring deeper collegial relationships, having a sense of accomplishment, being in a better position to explain and defend what one does as a teacher educator and, of course, having a research program as a basis for writing formal papers.

Is "Self-Study" Real Research?

Before going further we need to address, at least briefly, the question of the academic legitimacy of self-study of professional practice. There is no point discussing how to do it, listing its advantages and promoting it at an institutional level if, academically, it is untenable. This of course is too large a topic to be dealt with adequately here, but we wish to present an outline of the type of justification we believe can be provided.

As noted above, we see self-study of teacher education practice as a type of "action research" (or "reflective practice"), about which much has been written. Action research, like self-study of practice, is conducted in an action setting, typically by the practitioners themselves, with a view to understanding and improving practice. In the case of *educational* action research, feedback from students is usually a major source of data. And like self-study of practice, action research moves in a "spiral" of reflection and observation, modification of practice, further reflection and observation, and further modification of practice (Elliott, 1991; Wells, 1994).

Kurt Lewin, a key figure in the early theory of action research, argued that research in the context of practice is essential because human behaviour is typically purposive and so can usually only be studied in an action setting. He saw "good social theory as inevitably practical" (Noffke, 1997, p. 5). On this view, there is no

question of social scientists in laboratories or other controlled contexts establishing the general principles of human behavior and simply applying them to practice. Much research must take place in the practical settings themselves. This was the point emphasized by Donald Schön when he criticized the conception of professional practice as "instrumental problem solving made rigorous by the application of scientific theory and technique" generated by pure scientists (1983, p. 21). He argued that "experimenting" and "hypothesis testing" conducted by practitioners themselves is crucial, and every bit as rigorous and original as pure research:

> In the on-the-spot experimenting characteristic of reflection-in-action, the *logic* of hypothesis testing is essentially the same as it is in the research context. If a carpenter asks himself, What makes this structure stable? and begins to experiment to find out—trying one device, now another—he is basically in the same business as the research scientist. (p. 147)

Our only quibble with Schön would be over his tendency to restrict use of the term "research" to inquiry in the laboratory; we believe the logic of his argument requires that many reflective practitioners also be described as researchers, which is the usage more commonly followed by action research theorists.

The reason why there must be original research in practical settings is because general principles simply cannot contain enough information to give the insight and direction practitioners need. This shortcoming of general principles is stressed by contemporary schools of thought such as postmodernism and poststructuralism, which draw attention to the changing, local and culture-bound nature of knowledge. But the same point was made much earlier by thinkers such as Hegel and Dewey who stressed that "bare abstractions" do not suffice and knowledge is necessarily "transient" and "concrete." Hegel stated that "[e]verything finite, instead of being stable and ultimate, is rather changeable and transient...; [b]are abstractions or formal thoughts are...no business of philosophy, which has to deal only with concrete thoughts" (1892, pp. 150 and 152). And Dewey said that "all principles by themselves are abstract.... [E]verything depends upon the interpretation given them as they are put into practice" (1938, p. 20). "Only by wrestling with the conditions of the problem at first hand, seeking and finding his [sic] own way out, does (the individual) think" (1916, p. 188).

Those of us who are immersed in teacher education practice are in a strong position to do research on our practice. And we have heightened motivation to do it rigorously because of its potential pay-off for ourselves and our students. As Hubbard and Power say with respect to educational action research in general:

> Because of our presence over time in our research sites, we teachers bring a depth of awareness to our data that outside researchers cannot begin to match. We know our schools, our students, our colleagues, and our learning agendas. Our research is grounded in this rich resource base. (1993, p. xiv)

Problems We Face:

Three Stories

Self-study of teacher education practice may be a legitimate kind of research, for the reasons given; but at an institutional level it is still quite problematic. In this section we describe three incidents from our own experience. We hope these stories will help illustrate the problems of doing research on our own practice and also point up the deeper issues underlying these problems. The first story bears especially on the issue of integrity in teacher education, our responsibility to continually improve our practice; the second relates to differing conceptions of teaching and researching and the connection (or otherwise) between them; and the third illustrates the problem of trying to give students and teachers a "voice" within current institutional constraints.

The background of the stories is our one-year post-baccalaureate elementary teacher education program, in which a small team of faculty work with a cohort of about 60 students, attempting to achieve a high degree of reflectiveness, collaboration, and community. The framework of the program is action research; in the course of the year, students are required to complete an extensive action research project in the area of language arts. We have been restructuring the program around the philosophy and practice of action research for the past four years. To facilitate the action research and increase collegiality and community in the program we have strong ties with a small number of practice teaching schools and develop a close relationship with the associate teachers in those schools. We are attempting increasingly to involve the associate teachers in the action research projects and move gradually toward a version of "professional development schools" in which preservice teachers and associate teachers grow together. From our involvement with the preservice teachers we have seen a high level of apprehension about the action research during the first part of the year; and through interviews and surveys we have discovered that some of this anxiety arises from the students' initial expectations for the B.Ed. program: doing research was not part of their conceptualization of teacher education. One piece of research Clare was particularly interested in was exploring more fully the students' expectations for the program and monitoring how these change during the year, with a view to finding ways to make the action research more accessible and the program in general more effective.

Story Number One

At OISE/UT there is a yearly competition for internal "Small Scale" research funding. Faculty members submit requests for funds up to $2,000; most of those who apply for the funding are successful. Part of the purpose of the Small Scale grants is to enable faculty to begin a program of research that could lead to large scale funding by a national funding agency such as the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC) which has considerable status

within our institution. In order to conduct the piece of research noted above, but with a view to large scale SSHRC funding at a later stage, Clare applied for a Small Scale grant. Her proposal, under the general title "What are Preservice Teachers' Beliefs about Teacher Education?" stated, in part:

> In this study I want to examine preservice teachers' beliefs about teacher education with specific reference to the particular OISE/UT Bachelor of Education (B.Ed.) program of which I am coordinator. Through analysis of the data collected I hope to understand more fully the students' initial expectations for the program, chart the changes in their beliefs and identify critical incidents that challenged, affirmed or changed their beliefs.

The proposal had two strands: the first option, open to all students, invited them to complete questionnaires four times during the program. Included in the submission was a copy of the first questionnaire to be completed by students before the first week of term. Questions ranged from "How many hours do you anticipate being in class?" to "What types of assignments do you anticipate completing?" In the cover letter students were advised to ignore any question they felt uncomfortable responding to. The second strand, more in-depth, would involve five students who would complete the questionnaire and also be interviewed by Clare four times during the year. (Any student could volunteer and she would choose the five, trying to balance gender, age and background experience.) The interview questions, also included in the proposal, addressed issues such as "How have you prepared yourself to be a teacher?" and "How would you evaluate your experience in your undergraduate degree program?" The budget included funds to have the interviews taped and transcribed.

The request for Small Scale funding, assessed by a committee at the departmental level, was denied. Clare in her naïveté assumed that the problem must have been her inability to write the proposal "correctly"; to learn more about proposal writing she made an appointment with the chair of the committee. When they met he informed her that the project was rejected because the committee felt it was not appropriate to do research on one's own students. Completing the questionnaires or participating in the interviews would make the students vulnerable. He suggested that if she wanted to do research on action research in teacher education she should use another population, a group of students completely removed from her program. She told him that not all programs involve action research and those which do may not pursue it in the depth required of her students. Her goal was to study her program and increase her understanding of her work. Further, she noted the labor intensive nature of preservice teacher education and said she would simply not have time to work with another group of students. The committee chair kept returning to the issue of the vulnerability of students. He suggested that in future she should ensure that all data are anonymous and unavailable to her until after the students graduate. (From Clare's point of view this may work in a strictly positivistic study but in self-

study and qualitative research it is inappropriate.) Clare assured him that safeguards were in place to protect students; for example, some assignments are pass/fail and for those which are graded there is a pre-established grading rubric.

The committee chair then turned his attention to the budget, focusing on the funds requested for transcribing tapes. He believed this was a luxury, that money should not be approved for such a frill. Clare responded that this was her data source and argued that one cannot analyze interview responses without a hard copy of the text. He felt that listening to the tapes a few times should be sufficient. His lack of understanding of qualitative research was apparent.

As they continued, their discussion turned to the ethical review which he claimed had not been done. Clare knew it had been completed, a step which required two faculty members to approve the project. As they went through the file they discovered that the ethical review was missing, and it turned out that one of the secretaries had misplaced it when preparing the documentation for the committee. Once it was located, the issue became one of paradigm clash: positivistic versus qualitative research. The committee chair subscribed to the former world; self-study, relational teaching, participant observation, and collaboration between faculty and students were not part of his practice or personal goals. In the meeting with him Clare felt as if she were speaking in a foreign language; many of the terms seemed to be unfamiliar to him and the concepts behind the terms were equally baffling to him. Eventually, the project was approved and the funds made available. To give the committee chair credit, at no point in the discussion or in the aftermath was he confrontational or condescending.

The experience left Clare shaken. If a small scale project intent on improving practice could not be approved in her local department without strong lobbying on her part, what chance would she have of obtaining large scale funds for similar research? She also began to worry about the integrity of the BEd program in general, in which she was heavily invested as a program coordinator. If there was strong resistance to self-study as a way to improve, renew, and modify programs, what were the goals of the institution? She felt that "we," "the institution," should model our belief that teachers need to be teacher-researchers, constantly investigating their work and improving their practice; otherwise our rhetoric about thoughtful practice, action research and school renewal would be hollow.

Story Number Two

A second incident involved Clare in an elaborate year-long pursuit of funds for another research project focusing on our program. The University of Toronto has a fund to support the research efforts of new faculty. Given Clare's previous and ongoing work in preservice teacher education and the centrality of action research to the program, she requested funds to do a large scale project on student teachers and associate teachers doing collaborative action research. The question driving the project was: "What are the effects on curriculum and on professional development

when preservice teachers and associate teachers act together as researchers?" The project is an effort to see whether preservice teachers and associate teachers can collaborate effectively in action research and, if so, how this will affect the school and the teacher education program. During the past fourteen months the proposal has been scrutinized by the university's Ethical Review Committee and turned back six times (many other qualitative researchers are having similar problems with the review committee). Each time the committee members have reviewed the submission they have requested further clarification, detail, and documentation. For example, Clare has been asked to give the exact purpose of each observation episode in the classroom, and an exact tally of the time each preservice teacher and associate teacher would spend on the project.

As Clare recently read through the extensive correspondence between herself and the committee, a few themes emerged regarding researching with her students and on her program: students are placed in a dangerous position when they are part of a research study; students may feel pressured into becoming involved in a research project initiated by their professor; open-ended data gathering could be hazardous to students; and of foremost concern must be the legal implications of doing research with students. As she has responded to each request for additional documentation, the intent of the study seems to have been lost. Her goal, to increase her understanding of the process of student teachers and associate teachers working together and ultimately to enhance that process, seems almost inconsequential.

The review process illustrates the clash between positivistic and qualitative traditions; however, there are deeper issues at play. The committee members have appeared to suspect Clare's motives. Repeatedly, they have wanted rephrasing of letters or other documents to ensure that students do not feel coerced (their language) into becoming involved. She had included a brief paragraph stating the benefits to students of their involvement; this had to be deleted because the committee felt statements of this nature were meant to persuade rather than inform. The tone of the correspondence suggests that the members of the committee conceptualize the relationship between professor and students as highly adversarial. But in fact Clare's work with her students reflects her belief that teacher education (and teaching in general) must be approached from a collaborative position; teaching is a relational act. Her problem usually is that too many students want to work with her; they find collaboration between professor and student on research projects to be highly rewarding. She and her students transform the relationship from professor and student to colleagues as the year progresses.

The committee seems to be working from a definition of teaching that is simplistically defined as transmission of knowledge. Their conception of research is equally confined: research involves pursuing a pre-set and narrowly-defined question, there is no room for open-ended inquiry. Her notions of modelling being a teacher-researcher and developing an inquiry community seem alien to the committee. Her belief that teaching and researching should become intertwined is

central to her work with preservice teachers; one without the other is inadequate. But in a grant proposal, how can one include one's entire philosophy of education while outlining research methods? And if she could present her philosophy of teaching, would the committee even begin to understand what she is seeking to achieve with her students? We doubt it. The words on the page would not bring to life the power of the class community we develop by working collaboratively with our students.

The need to protect students is completely valid. Safeguards must be in place to ensure that students' needs and rights are respected. In our program, although very collaborative, we are mindful of the power differential between faculty and students. The processes we put in place are visible, articulated yet flexible. The ethics committee, however, seem to be using a highly legalistic approach to university policy. For example, their request that Clare inform students in the cover letter that the tapes made during interviews could be subpoenaed in the case of a dispute seems extreme and overly rule-oriented. The inclusion of all the required legal information has resulted in a cover letter two pages (single-spaced!) in length, and strongly implies that participation in the project will be an enormous undertaking. The prescribed, formalistic, legalistic, distant tone of the documentation gives the impression that collaborative inquiry, rather than being the work of all teachers and professors, is completely removed from the world of teaching.

The process of applying for the grant has been unnerving and time-consuming; however, it truly represents the challenges faced by those trying to do alternative forms of research, if one considers qualitative action or self-study research an alternative form. Clare has now invested so much time in trying to have the project approved she will continue to meet the demands of the review committee. In hindsight though she wishes she had not even begun the process. What seemed a reasonable, worthwhile project capable of increasing understanding of the action research process has met with such a wall of resistance that she wonders, once again, about the goals of an institution which would create and support an ethical review committee with such a narrow vision. (It should be noted that OISE/UT's administration have achieved some success recently in broadening this committee's conception of legitimate research.)

Story Number Three

In recent years while doing research on teachers' views in the context of his graduate teaching, Clive asked teachers if he might keep a copy of essays they had written for his courses. He prepared a release form which gave him permission to quote from teachers' essays in articles, books, or conference presentations, either using their name or not depending on the sensitivity of the material. If a teacher's name was used, there would be no mention of the name of the school or school board or any school student or colleague. An attempt would be made to contact the teachers and send them a copy of the material for approval before publication. The

teachers had the choice of either letting Clive decide what counted as "sensitive material" in case they could not be contacted or, alternatively, being quoted anonymously. Virtually all the teachers returned the form and, of about one hundred doing so, only one checked the box requiring general anonymity. In talking to the teachers they expressed excitement at the prospect of having their views included in published discussions about the role of the teacher and school renewal.

Now there are a couple of problems here. Most of the teachers were part-time and many were finishing up; it might prove difficult to contact them in two or three years' time if and when Clive wished to quote them. In that case, it would be up to him to decide what constituted "sensitive material." Further, while names of schools and school boards would not be mentioned in a quotation, it would often be possible for someone who knew the teacher to figure this out. Neither of these matters, however, was of significant concern to the great majority of the teachers. To them the overriding consideration was that they might be quoted, by name, in a professional publication or presentation and have their insights publicly acknowledged and utilized. This was in line with the experience they had had in the classes of professor and teachers learning together and their having a "voice" in the educational debate.

When Clive applied recently for Small Scale funding (under the scheme noted in Story Number One) to interview associate teachers about our preservice program, he included in his proposal a release form similar to the one described above. Because the project was carried over from a previous year and had been reviewed by another ethics committee, it did not receive all the attention accorded Clare's proposal; however, the university ethics committee (referred to in Story Number Two) rejected the release form, saying that a participant's real name should not be used unless they had been contacted, had read the report in question, and had given their consent. Having consulted with some of his colleagues about the attitude of the committee regarding use of participants' real names and considering the difficulties which might often be encountered in contacting teachers at the time of publication, and being pressured for time, Clive decided not to pursue the matter further and included in his release form the clause: "in any reports of this study your name would not be used."

Of course in some ways the committee's position seems reasonable. It is preferable for people to have an opportunity to see what is attributed to them before it is put in print. Where a major piece of work is involved it is essential; and if the quotation is not major, and clearing it before publication is not possible, what is lost by not giving the name of the author? The only problem is that most of the teachers asked about this did not agree. They were very keen to have their name attached to their work; and in the event that they could not be contacted before publication, they would rather have their true name used than a pseudonym. Possibly they would have a chance later to see it, and proudly dwell on it. Many would have reacted negatively to the clause "in any reports...your name would not be used" and to the common

academic convention of quoting "subjects" without saying who they are. (Recently, when Clive informed an associate teacher he was about to interview that her remarks would only be quoted anonymously, she said: "So you want to use our ideas without giving us credit!" He had to apologize to her for the university's policy.) Once again we see the tendency toward a safe, narrow legalism, without considering the desires of the people involved or envisaging collaborative, collegial relationships between professors and students or between university faculty and their teacher colleagues. Possibly the committee was right in its ruling. But the ruling had its origins not in the realities and sensitivities of practitioner self-study—"the personal and social complexities of the work," to use Zeichner's (1998, p. 41) phrase—but in traditional notions of arm's length research where one would barely know one's subjects, let alone see the importance of acknowledging them by name.

Analysis of the Issues and Dilemmas

There is operating here, even on the ethics committee, a general bias against certain types of teaching, teacher-student relationship, and research. Some aspects of what we consider essential are forbidden; other aspects are made so difficult they are effectively prevented. In either case, the committees do not see a problem since what is prevented is not viewed as important. Their understanding of good teaching and research—and the connection (or lack thereof) between the two—is different from ours.

The traditional ethical concerns—confidentiality, vulnerability, coercion—and the traditional research concerns—objectivity, control of variables—are certainly legitimate, but they are being pursued in stereotypical ways which are often self-defeating. An arm's length relationship is insisted on when students and teachers want a collaborative relationship. Distance and control are mandated when proximity and open-endedness would result in more fruitful inquiry. The measures prescribed to prevent vulnerability in fact hinder interaction, cooperation, and mutual respect. Teachers are forced to remain anonymous when they want their voices to be heard. Meanwhile, common cases of coercion, exploitation, and unproductive research are routinely overlooked.

There are risks in any enterprise. We could be sued as easily for giving our preservice students an ineffective transmission experience as for giving them a stimulating interactive one; as easily for neglecting their emotions and social propensities as for engaging them. The committees are selective in the risks they highlight. The traditional convention of keeping "subjects'" comments anonymous is as questionable ethically, academically, and personally as the reasonable attribution of views. What right do we have to use people's opinions without giving them credit? In other domains we deliberately *avoid* anonymity in order to keep people honest. What if our "subjects" care more about the integrity of the research process and the development of close links between the university and the teaching

profession than about occasionally being slightly misrepresented? In most research decisions there are trade-offs. In order to make sound decisions, we need to put all relevant goals and values on the table and weigh them against one another, rather than relying on a few simplistic, absolute rules.

In general we feel the committees fail to get "the big picture." They have an inadequate sense of the broad goals of education, the nature of the teacher education enterprise, and the research approaches that are effective. They simply import to the education context research methods from other disciplines and popular myths about the nature of teaching. They are unaware of major contemporary movements in educational thought and do not see that an approach to research must be in sync with the educational goals and processes one is attempting to promote. Of course, each group of researchers will argue for their particular approach to education. But the committees are trying to apply certain rules across the board, when in fact there are no simple rules or general formulas. We would like to sketch a very different view of teaching and teacher education and explain why it requires a different approach to research.

Teachers do not just transmit subject matter; they develop learning contexts and activities. They must be researchers, observing in their classrooms, modifying the curriculum to fit their diverse students, and assessing the effects of these modifications. They have to get to know their students very well and establish collaborative relationships between themselves and the students and among the students. This is not just *laissez-faire* education; we believe in strong academic goals for schooling. But straight transmission is no way to achieve even academic goals, let alone the other goals of schooling essential in today's world. Activities are needed that engage the students rather than alienating them, and the class in turn has to become a community to support these activities and also meet the students' non-academic needs.

In teacher education we have to model this approach to teaching, including the role of teacher-as-researcher. As Zeichner says, "This disciplined and systematic inquiry into one's own teaching practice...provides a model for prospective teachers and teachers of the kind of inquiry that more and more teacher educators are hoping their students employ" (1998, p. 41). We cannot advocate one approach and practice another: the student teachers will not take us seriously and will not learn "how to do it." After their many years of "apprenticeship of observation" (Lortie, 1975, pp. 61-65) in the school and university system, talk is not enough; they need strong modelling of a different approach, and first hand experience. This is why action research is so crucial in a teacher education program. It is not just a nice extra; it gets to the essence of effective teaching. Student teachers have to learn how to do research in *their* classroom, how to observe, modify, individualize, and assess. And as we do research on our practice we must as far as possible involve our students, both to let them see the research process from within and to get their feedback. It is inconceivable that we could improve our practice significantly without constant input from the students experiencing the program.

Enter the associate teachers. They too have to model this approach to teaching if they are to help the preservice teachers develop their understandings and skills. The preservice teachers' firsthand experience of the approach has to be extended beyond the teacher education class and into the practicum setting. The associate teachers must engage in action research on their practice and establish classrooms characterized by inquiry, collaboration, and community. To assist the associate teachers in this, the faculty have to develop a close relationship with them, visiting them in their school and meeting with them often, modelling respect for teachers and collaboration with them. Associate teachers have to become an integral part of the teacher education program, invited into discussions of what we are doing and why. They must be treated as professionals, researchers, and participants in the dialogue about teaching and teacher education.

On this view of teaching, teacher education, and teacher education research, then, it is disastrous for the field to put roadblocks in the way of self-study of teacher education practice. Such research is an essential piece in a whole approach to teaching and learning at many levels. And collaboration, community and close interaction between professors, preservice teachers and associate teachers are essential to such research. Ways must be found to allow for these features in teacher education research otherwise the whole enterprise will be jeopardized.

The Need for an Institutional Stance

Ironically, we see the research and ethics committees as placing us in a moral bind. We feel we have a moral obligation to our students, to providing the best possible program for them; and a key way to achieve this is through constant research on our practice with a view to improving it; however, this is precisely what we are being discouraged from doing. But the moral dilemma is more complex than that. One option would be to continue to engage in self-study but simply not call it research; we could gather "data" on our program, advising the students it is only for program development purposes, not research, and specific findings would not be published. However, that would be placing our careers seriously at risk, for we could not publish as "research" the research we are actually doing, and there would be little time left over to go and do "objective" research in other settings. In order to survive in the academy, then, we are under pressure to be less reflective about our practice and spend less time on it so we can do research elsewhere. Whether or not we will take this step is not clear. We have seen many teacher educators over the years put their students before their careers and become marginalized in the university. (Equally we see many teachers in the school system sacrificing personal advancement for their students.) While individuals may go either way when faced with this dilemma, however, we think it entirely inappropriate for universities to keep placing many of their ablest and most conscientious teacher educators in this bind. Moreover, we believe that doing so in the long-run places even the institutions themselves at risk.

Institutions of teacher education have to become clear about this situation and take a stand. (And, fortunately for us, this is what the faculty and administration at OISE/UT are increasingly attempting to do). There are many contemporary writers saying that an approach to education such as the one outlined earlier—collaborative, interactive, individualized, communal—is the only way for schools to go. Without such an approach, today's school students will not be engaged, will not learn and will not become life-long learners (Cohn & Kottkamp, 1993; Darling-Hammond, 1997; Meier, 1995; Wood, 1992). What we have tried to show is that there are implications here for teacher education and the institutions which offer it. Institutions must decide whether or not they agree with this analysis and, if so, provide support for their teacher educators through a clear statement of goals and clear guidelines with respect to research support, promotion, tenure, merit pay and the like. It is not fair to make individual professors take these issues into their own hands and try to manage through constant lobbying and improvisation. On the other hand, if the institutions do not agree with this approach to education and teacher education they should make that explicit so teacher educators who have this point of view know they are on their own. To keep them in the dark about these matters is highly dubious from an ethical point of view.

Administering a teacher education institution is not just a technical task: institutions cannot just apply a few simple rules about what counts as research and what is ethical and let the substance look after itself. One cannot have "good administration" in the abstract. Certain rules and procedures favour certain substantive goals. Current approaches to research approval and support often steer teacher education away from the very kinds of educational practice we publicly espouse. We need to make explicit our philosophy of education and goals for teacher education, and in that context develop criteria, rules, and procedures with respect to research and other aspects of institutional life.

If teacher educators were not also academics, many of these problems would not arise. They could write books and articles about their professional practice and become noted for the reflectiveness and quality of their practice. But as academics, teacher educators are evaluated at every point in terms of their *research* involvement and publishing, in particular, the extent of their research funding and the number of articles published in refereed journals. In the end this is largely what it comes down to. Faculty who are known to neglect their teaching and supervision and alienate their students but who win research contracts and produce refereed articles are invariably highly rewarded in the university. Even books do not count for much unless they have a strong research content. Accordingly, if teacher education institutions want education to go in a certain direction, they have to ensure that the research dimension of teacher education counts as research in the fullest sense. Otherwise all but the most conscientious and self-sacrificing faculty members will be guided away from sound teacher education practice.

Beyond the institution itself, teacher education researchers need support in

other settings. In the larger university context, a strong faculty of education voice must be heard supporting forms of research relevant to teacher education. A similar stance needs to be taken with external funding agencies. We learned recently that, for several years, the committee that assigns provincial government "transfer" research funding to OISE/UT has automatically rejected proposals involving self-study of practice. We ourselves two years ago spent a great deal of time preparing a proposal to that committee for research on our program. We were not informed either before or after the competition that such a proposal had no chance of success. In the past, the attitude of faculties of education has often been that outside "experts," whether from the wider university or external bodies, know more than we do about research methods and we should largely accept their guidance. It has been assumed that there are certain general criteria of good research and these experts know best what they are. But since in fact there is not just one type of good research, and many of these experts are biased toward types of research which can undermine good teaching and teacher education, faculties of education should engage in strong advocacy of different research paradigms rather than showing such deference.

In conclusion, with respect to the dilemmas of whether we should "publish or perish" and just who should perish, it is not just any kind of publishing that counts but publication of what is perceived to be "genuine" research. What constitutes genuine research is a matter of debate. But it is not idle debate since much hinges on the conclusions reached. Some views of research will prevent teacher educators from doing research on their practice, thus requiring them to neglect their programs and, ultimately, their students. The students, then, will "perish"; however, the faculty may also perish because we will have to go to an unfamiliar setting to do our research. In that setting we will have less motivation and less time and opportunity to do research with understanding and rigour. In the terms discussed in an earlier section, we will be less able to produce generalizable educational theory. We will tend to do research by numbers, mimicking the work of "objective" researchers, and generate fewer and less adequate publications. Further, our institutions will not do well either, since no matter how many refereed articles we turn out we will be known to have inferior teacher education programs, which is dangerous in an age of accountability, periodic program reviews and declining enrollments. All this in support of a paradigm of research, teaching and teacher education which, in our view, is misguided in the first place.

References

Allen, C. (1989). The primacy of *phronesis*: A proposal for avoiding the frustrating tendencies in our conceptions of rationality. *Journal of Religion*, 69, 3, 359-374.

Cohn, M. & Kottkamp, R. (1993). *Teachers: The missing voice in education*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1997). *The right to learn*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education*. New York: Collier.

Dewey, J. (1920/1948). *Reconstruction in philosophy* (Enlarged Edition). Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education*. New York: Macmillan.

Elliott, J. (1997). School-based curriculum development and action research in the United Kingdom. In S. Hollingsworth (Ed.), *International action research* (pp. 17-28). London, UK: Falmer Press.

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

Hegel, G.F.W. (1892). *The logic of Hegel* (2nd Edition) (transl. W. Wallace). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Hubbard, R.S. & Power, B.M. (1993). *The art of classroom inquiry*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Lortie, D. (1975). *Schoolteacher*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Meier, D. (1995). *The power of their ideas*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Newman, J. (1990). *Finding our own way: Teachers exploring their assumptions*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Noffke, S. (1997). Themes and tensions in U.S. action research: Towards historical analysis. In S. Hollingsworth (Ed.), *International action research* (pp. 2-16). London, UK: Falmer Press.

Schön, D. (1983). *The reflective practitioner*. New York: Basic Books.

Wells, G. (Ed.) (1994). *Changing schools from within: Creating communities of inquiry*. Toronto/Portsmouth, NH: OISE Press/Heinemann.

Wood, G. (1992). *Schools that work*. New York: Plume/Penguin.

Zeichner, K. (1998). The new scholarship in teacher education. AERA Division K Vice-Presidential Address (Revised Version). Presented at the AERA Annual Meeting, San Diego, CA.