

Key Notes in Teacher Education: CATE Invited Addresses 2004-2008

Edited by

Alice Pitt

Canadian Research in Teacher Education: A Polygraph Series /
La recherche canadienne sur la formation des enseignants: une collection de
polygraphies

Volume 1

*Published by
Une publication de*

Canadian Association for Teacher Education (CATE) /
Association canadienne de formation d'enseignement (ACFE)

Published by the Canadian Association for Teacher Education (CATE) / Association canadienne de formation d'enseignement (ACFE), Ottawa, Canada, www.csse.ca/cate
CATE/ACFE is a constituent member of the Canadian Society for the Study of Education (CSSE) / Société canadienne pour l'étude de l'éducation (SCÉÉ), Ottawa, Canada, www.csse.ca

Copyright © 2009 by Authors

The copyright for each piece in this collection stays with the respective author. The authors assign a non-exclusive right to publication to the Canadian Association for Teacher Education and a non-exclusive license to educational and non-profit institutions and to individuals to use their piece in this publication for personal use and in courses of instruction provided that the pieces are used in full and this copyright statement is reproduced. Any other usage is prohibited without the expressed permission of the author.

**Canadian Research in Teacher Education:
A Polygraph Series /**
**La recherche canadienne sur la formation des enseignants:
une collection de polygraphies**

Published by /
Une publication de

**Canadian Association for Teacher Education (CATE) /
Association canadienne de formation d'enseignement (ACFE)**
www.csse.ca/cate

VOLUME 1: *Key Notes in Teacher Education: CATE Invited Addresses 2004-2008*,
edited by Alice Pitt, published 2009

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>Table of Contents</i>	v
<i>Introduction to the Series</i>	vii
<i>Introduction aux séries</i>	viii
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	xi
Introduction	
<i>Key Notes in Teacher Education</i>	1
Alice Pitt	
CATE / ACFE Keynote Address 2004	5
<i>Introduction to the 2004 Address</i>	7
<i>Note d'introduction à la conférence de 2004</i>	8
<i>Narrative Understandings of Lives in Schools</i>	11
D. Jean Clandinin	
CATE / ACFE Keynote Address 2005	21
<i>Introduction to the 2005 Address</i>	23
<i>Note d'introduction à la conférence de 2005</i>	23
<i>Is Teacher Education Reform Possible?</i>	25
Tom Russell	
CATE / ACFE Keynote Address 2006	37
<i>Introduction to the 2006 Address</i>	39
<i>Note d'introduction à la conférence de 2006</i>	39
<i>Teacher Education as Uneven Development: Toward a Psychology of Uncertainty</i>	41
Deborah P. Britzman	

CATE / ACFE Keynote Address 2007	51
<i>Introduction to the 2007 Address</i>	<i>53</i>
<i>Note d'introduction à la conférence de 2007.....</i>	<i>54</i>
 <i>The Best Lack All Conviction, While the Worst Are Full of Passionate Intensity</i>	 <i>55</i>
<i>Peter P. Grimmett</i>	
 CATE / ACFE Keynote Address 2008	 79
<i>Introduction to the 2008 Address</i>	<i>81</i>
<i>Note d'introduction à la conférence de 2008</i>	<i>81</i>
 <i>Between Judgment and Constraint: Reconsidering Autonomy in Professional Life</i>	 <i>83</i>
<i>Anne M. Phelan</i>	

Introduction to the Series

We are very pleased to be able to write an introduction to a publication series that is dedicated to research and scholarship on teacher education within the Canadian context: *Canadian Research in Teacher Education: A Polygraph Series*. The conceptualization and realization of the Series is part of a number of initiatives by the Canadian Association for Teacher Education (CATE) over the last four years to create a stronger organizational support and enriched opportunities for educational researchers with interest in teacher education in Canada. The following initiatives represent the steps to developing a Pan-Canadian perspective on teacher education:

- invited keynote addresses at CATE's annual conferences;
- a panel series on teacher education practices as part of CATE's annual conference program since 2007;
- CATE pre-conference events focused on key topics of interest to members 2006, 2007 and 2009;
- on-going development of the CATE website launched in 2004 (www.csse.ca/cate);
- a focus on creating opportunities for francophone researchers in Canada interested in research and scholarship in teacher education in Canada;
- graduate thesis and dissertation awards based on recognizing Canadian graduate students whose studies have contributed to teacher education literature;
- book showcase at CATE's annual conference celebrating Canadian publications on teacher education.

This commitment by the CATE Executive members for pan-Canadian scholarly engagement in teacher education in the Canadian context coincides with the Series of Working Conferences on Research on Teacher Education in Canada (see www.umanitoba.ca/education/TERResearch). This series has been bringing together scholars from across Canada to discuss and work on issues related to teacher education in Canada. We take the constant and relatively high level of participation in the Working Conference as indication that the time is just right for the introduction of scholarly publication series dedicated to research and scholarship in teacher education in the Canadian context. In 2008 the Executive Board of CATE decided to create a book series published by CATE with the purpose of supporting teacher education practices and research in teacher education in and across Canada. The Series is to have several features:

1. The publication is a themed book series rather than a journal, creating a series that would allow a focused contribution to the Canadian teacher education discourse and teacher education practice.
2. The books will be polygraphs ('polygraph' = many writings) rather than monographs, to allow a range of scholars to contribute to the same theme.
3. The series of volumes will be available in electronic form on the CATE website (www.csse.ca/cate), allowing easy access and the quick publication of this scholarship in teacher education in the Canadian context.

This first volume of the series *Canadian Research in Teacher Education: A Polygraph Series* makes available all the invited keynote addresses given from 2004 to 2008 as part of CATE's annual conference program at the Canadian Society for the Study of Education. All five of these keynote speakers are internationally renowned teacher education scholars, recognized for their critical insights that have shaped teacher education across the world. This volume represents a celebration of their

contributions to the teacher education literature. These keynote addresses offer a very good beginning of what we hope will become a series of important contributions to the discourse on and practice of teacher education in Canada.

May 2009

Thomas Falkenberg
President, CATE / ACFE

Tim Hopper
Past President, CATE / ACFE

Introduction à la série

Nous sommes ravis d'écrire une introduction à la série de publications dédiées à la recherche et aux textes savants sur la formation des enseignants dans le contexte canadien : *Canadian Research in Teacher Education: A Polygraph Series / La recherche canadienne sur la formation des enseignants : une collection de polygraphies*. La conceptualisation et la réalisation de cette série font partie d'un certain nombre d'initiatives lancées par l'Association canadienne pour la formation des enseignants (ACFE) au cours des quatre dernières années dans le but de créer un meilleur support organisationnel et des possibilités améliorées de recherches en éducation touchant la formation des enseignants au Canada. Les initiatives suivantes montrent les actions menées jusqu'ici par l'association pour favoriser le développement d'une perspective pancanadienne sur la formation des enseignants :

- conférenciers invités aux conférences annuelles de l'ACFE;
- une série de panels sur les pratiques de formation des enseignants faisant partie du programme du congrès annuel de l'ACFE depuis 2007;
- événements préconférence de l'ACFE axés sur des thèmes clés d'intérêt pour les membres (2006, 2007 et 2009) ;
- élaboration continue du site web de l'ACFE lancé en 2004 (www.csse.ca/cate);
- attention à la création d'opportunités pour les chercheurs francophones du Canada qui s'intéressent à la formation des enseignants au Canada ;
- prix pour des thèses et des mémoires, reconnaissant l'apport des étudiants de deuxième et de troisième cycles dans le développement de la recherche sur la formation des enseignants;
- exposition de livres lors de la conférence annuelle de l'ACFE célébrant les publications canadiennes sur la formation des enseignants.

L'engagement pris par les membres exécutifs de l'ACFE pour une implication académique pancanadienne dans la formation des enseignants au sein du contexte canadien, coïncide avec une série de rencontres de travail pour la recherche sur la formation des enseignants au Canada (voir www.umanitoba.ca/education/TEResearch). Cette série a réuni des académiciens de partout au pays

afin d'œuvrer et de discuter ensemble de questions reliées à la formation des enseignants au Canada. Nous considérons le niveau de participation élevé et constant à ces rencontres comme une indication que le moment est propice à la création d'une série de publications académiques dédiées à la recherche sur la formation des enseignants dans le contexte canadien. En 2008, le conseil d'administration de l'ACFE a pris la décision de créer une série de publications ayant pour but de soutenir les pratiques et la recherche en formation des enseignants, d'un océan à l'autre du Canada. Cette série comporte plusieurs caractéristiques :

1. Cette publication est une série de volumes thématiques plutôt qu'une revue scientifique, ce qui permet de faire des contributions ciblées aux discours de la formation des enseignants au Canada de même qu'aux pratiques de formation des enseignants.
2. Les livres seront sous forme de polygraphies (polygraphies = nombreux auteurs) plutôt que sous forme de monographies afin de permettre l'apport d'une variété de contributeurs sur un thème ciblé.
3. La série de volumes sera disponible sur le site web de l'ACFE (www.csse.ca/cate), ce qui permettra un accès facile aux recherches sur la formation des enseignants dans le contexte canadien.

Le premier volume de la série *La recherche canadienne sur la formation des enseignants : une collection de polygraphies*, rend disponibles toutes les grandes conférences prononcées dans le cadre du programme de conférences annuelles de l'AFCE au sein de la Société canadienne pour l'étude de l'enseignement, entre 2004 et 2008. Les cinq conférenciers principaux sont des académiciens oeuvrant en formation des enseignants, renommés à l'échelle internationale reconnus pour leur regard critique et qui ont contribué à façonner la formation des enseignants dans le monde entier. Ce volume représente un hommage aux contributions qu'ils ont apportées à la littérature sur la formation des enseignants. Ces conférences constituent un excellent point de départ à ce qui, nous l'espérons, deviendra une contribution importante aux discours et aux pratiques en matière de formation des enseignants au Canada.

Mai 2009

Thomas Falkenberg
Président, CATE/ACFE

Tim Hopper
Ancien président, CATE/ACFE

Acknowledgements

The editor thanks the Canadian Association for Teacher Education for creating and supporting this series in recognition of the need to circulate and celebrate the fine research and scholarship that focuses on Canadian teacher education. I would also like to thank Mary Harrison and Lorin Schwarz, doctoral students in Education at York University, for their contribution to the editing process and Annick Torfs and Julie Desjardin for the translation from English to French.

Introduction: Key Notes in Teacher Education

Alice Pitt
York University

It is perhaps fitting that several of the keynote addresses brought together as the inaugural edition of the Canadian Association of Teacher Education's Polygraph series place the concept of natality at the centre of their deliberations. Natality refers to birth and beginning, and as one of the members of CATE's executive who is excited about the possibility of extending and elaborating the conversations about teacher education in Canada that occur at our annual meetings, I am delighted that the birth of our series testifies to the presence of a strong and dynamic tradition of thinking hard about teacher education. For, as Hannah Arendt reminds us, we are all born into an old world.

Nowhere does her observation ring as truer than in the world of teacher education, which, it seems, can only ever be posed as an interminable problem of lack. The persistence of identifying teacher education (and particularly the beginning of one's teacher education) as a problem produces a never-ending parade of solutions, reform agendas and policy products. In the essays that comprise this polygraph, there is more at stake. Keynote addresses invite 'state of the art' meditations and reflections gleaned from having spent a long time and concentrated effort on a topic. Our authors are not beginners. Jean Clandinin, Tom Russell, Deborah Britzman, Peter Grimmett, and Anne Phelan have all made and continue to make substantial and innovative interventions into our capacity to grapple with and think about what is vexing and pervasively difficult about teacher education. That teacher education, however difficult, is worthy of the very best of our attention will be clear to readers as they encounter new ideas within the familiar idiom of each author's theoretical voice.

Everyone is familiar with the joke that begins, how many (fill in blank) does it take to change a lightbulb? There are even websites devoted to such jokes, but I could only find one that referred to teachers, and I did not find it very funny. Playing around with the structure of the joke in relation to the essays gathered here, I am tempted to ask my own version of the question: How many teacher educators does it take to make one new teacher? Russell and Britzman suggest a response that gets at the underlying anxiety within teacher education: None, because the beginner comes to teacher education already made. Russell finds the roots of this familiar dilemma in 'the apprenticeship of observation' that notoriously distinguishes learning to teach from other professional educations. He argues that the assumptions pre-service students have consciously and unconsciously accumulated over their very long apprenticeship observing other teachers and figuring out what teachers want from them cannot be ignored. He writes, "If we are to preach active learning methods and constructivist perspectives, then we must challenge candidates' existing assumptions explicitly, and we must be explicit about how and why we are creating active learning experiences from which they can build their own skills and understandings of such methods."

Britzman speculates on the difficulties of this pedagogical work. Her study of the implications of 'growing up in education' places 'the fact of dependence' at the very centre of development: "...let us suppose that there is no such thing as development, unless, of course, we can begin to conceptualize real and fantasied relationships, institutions, practices, culture, other minds, and education." Like Russell, she objects to the tendency to regard our students in teacher education as

unaffected by their own education. Where Russell takes this quandary in the direction of deepening teacher educators' understandings of and knowledge about the experience of learning to teach, Britzman places her emphasis on the quandaries of development itself, which she describes as a persistent force of conflict rather than a progression from conflict to resolution. What are the consequences, she wonders, of assuming "that development in teacher education is unaffected by the social fact of having to be educated?"

My little joke aside, most of us who work in Canadian faculties or schools of education *are* involved in the practice of teacher education, and many of us identify ourselves as teacher educators even if this is not our primary identification as either a teacher or a scholar. There is a significant body of research that goes by the name "teacher education," and readers of this volume will encounter several aspects of its geography here. Like Russell, the editor believes that more of us who *do* teacher education need to become more active participants in the study of teacher education. One consequence of finding our scholarly preoccupations elsewhere, Russell suggests, is that teacher educators' persistent and repetitious calls for teacher education reform too easily seek to reform everything in a program but the teacher educator's own classroom. A second consequence that follows from this is the persistence of teacher education pedagogies that are themselves made from the teacher educator's unstudied 'apprenticeship of observation'. The fact of having to be educated accumulates another layer when knowledge made from one's own development as a practitioner becomes the grounds for the education of others. Perhaps, Russell concludes, we do not yet know "what learning to teach really involves."

We will not easily acquire this knowledge for many reasons, but at the heart of the matter, for Russell, lies the problem that so many of us, and here I assume he is talking about both teacher educators and their students, "have *little experience of learning from experience.*" Britzman agrees, but her exploration of the psychological dynamics of development carries a warning, "Somehow the having of experience dulls our thinking. Somehow, the uncertainty that is our beginning has become predictable and routine. And somehow, we have forgotten our human condition as strangers." Developing a taste for learning from experience is neither straightforward nor guaranteed by intention. If we cannot tolerate uncertainty, Britzman suggests, we ward it off and fail to truly enter into our experience, let alone learn from it.

The strange work of entering the world as strangers to it are themes explored by Clandinin and Phelan, and their studies of learning remind us in different but no less compelling ways just how the fact of dependence, the problem of knowing ourselves, and our responsibility for others haunt both the doing and the study of education and the teaching profession. The themes explored by Britzman are further illuminated by Clandinin as she reflects on her biography of becoming a curriculum theorist and an educational researcher. Her orientation to the study of teachers' 'personal practical knowledge' and their development within a 'professional knowledge landscape' continues to generate convincing humanistic narratives of what it means to teach and study teaching. At the same time, her recent work turns narrative inquiry, as a method for deepening our understanding of teaching and teachers' knowledge, back onto itself in order to contemplate a research method's own narrative of development.

The focus of her address highlights the belatedness of knowing as she returns to early data to discover in them kernels of experience lurking below the surface. At the time, these kernels remained unassimilable to her preoccupation with illuminating one teacher's knowledge in a social climate that was not particularly hospitable to finding complexity and thoughtfulness in teachers' work. Yet these kernels, where the tensions of difference between pedagogical design and children's lives coalesced, made their presence felt and influenced the development of narrative inquiry as a relational methodology that steps into lives already underway and that requires both attentiveness to tension and inventive ways to ensure the expression of multiple perspectives. Recall Britzman's notion of

development as conflict as a quality of our human condition. Clandinin's story of uneven development reveals another aspect of conflict in development: conflict emerges as a quality of our capacity to enlarge what we care to know in spite of our own intentions. Clandinin writes,

As I looked back over these more than twenty years as a curriculum researcher I realize that I am just now being able to engage in some of the most pressing curriculum research, research that attends to those moments of interaction among the four curriculum commonplaces as they intersect in the lives of the children, teachers, administrators and families in our Canadian schools.

Where Clandinin brings her own beginning into conversation with her current preoccupations, describing the plurality of lives that make education, Phelan opens her address with a deeper reach into education's history of refusing to implicate itself in its own preference for procedural and technical responses to difficulty and in a belief in development that assigns eruptions of conflict to professional failure. The story of one young teacher's suicide in 1928 prompts Phelan to contemplate anew the tensions between the attractions of teaching and the persistent disappointments of "loneliness, isolation, [and] difficult and inhospitable communities." Her address draws upon interviews with novice teachers that draw out their contradictory sense of professional autonomy in relation to internal and external constraints on knowing and acting upon one's judgment. Arendt's critique of "freedom as an escape from the dictates of others" and her counter view that freedom emerges in "the company of those others who are equal enough to allow communication but sufficiently distinct to make conversation worthwhile" opens Phelan to new interpretations of her participants' struggles with authority and constraint.

For one teacher, doubt and ambivalence reveal a lively mind that, in Russell's terms, is not afraid to learn from experience, but Phelan wonders about the extent to which she might be or become, in Britzman's terms, diminished by the uncertainty of making her voice heard rather than managed both internally and externally. The tensions within teachers are every bit as important as the tensions in classrooms that Clandinin now finds herself able to identify and learn from. The promise of natality, of bringing something new to a world that is always on the verge of wearing out, Britzman and Phelan agree, is fragile and easily undermined by the newcomer's tendency to be overtaken by her own sense of belatedness in a social context not given to noticing. However, Phelan concludes that "[t]hese teachers' reflections...keep alive a memory of an agonistic public sphere, enabling us to see as significant practices and spaces that might otherwise be overlooked."

The four addresses I have been discussing to this point stay close to the intimate worlds of teaching, learning, and the curious education of education. In these worlds, the force of the familiar, the weight of the past, and the unbearable burden of conflict or tension permeate our experience of education. They permeate as well our efforts to understand what it is to teach and learn from teaching, to help others learn to teach and learn from that experience, and, ultimately, to turn towards rather than away from what the newcomer, whether the new teacher, teacher educator, or child, wants those already there to pay attention to. Peter Grimmett draws our attention away from conflict and tension within teacher education and its research to the equally volatile horizon of policy debates that form an often-invisible yet influential backdrop. In this address, the 'wearing out of the old world' takes on apocalyptic overtones.

William Butler Yeats' *The Second Coming* announces a beginning, a horrific beginning that will not save us from human destructiveness. Grimmett uses the poem as a metaphor to describe sixty years of university-based teacher education and its relation to public governance of compulsory education. He identifies research and public policy as "intertwining gyres in teacher education" that influence practice in teacher education and add another dimension to the research literature

addressed by Russell. In each of three somewhat overlapping phases, teacher education has been constructed as a problem. It appears first as a problem of training, then as a problem of learning, and finally, as a problem of policy. The parallel policy phases begin with calls for government control over teacher education. The first shift is expressed by an insistence that teacher education be regulated from within the university by virtue of institutional governance. Our current phase places policy control over teacher education within two competing frames: professional self-regulation and de-regulation.

For Grimmert, as for Russell, university culture is no innocent bystander as debates about the nature and role of teacher education swirl about. A different set of tensions from that discussed so far animates the question of whether or not placing initial teacher preparation within the university has succeeded in improving either the status of the profession or its knowledge base. Britzman's observation that teachers tend to despise their teacher education becomes more politically urgent with Grimmert's comment that "...we live in a world that praises Education but seems to despise teachers and educators."

Russell's call for teacher educators to participate in research in teacher education and in the study of their own practice is but one part of what Grimmert understands as a viable response to the threat, already realized in England, that teacher education will be reduced to "a political definition...closely linked to a prescriptive view of the school curriculum." The apprenticeship of observation, which threatens to foreclose the teacher's and the teacher educator's possibilities of beginning anew and the fragile freedom made with others, extends even further when we take into account the notion that all those who have had to be educated conceal their hatred of development under the cloak of 'the public trust'. Grimmert argues that we have a responsibility, indeed a 'moral obligation', "to prepare teachers rigorously for today's world and an equally strong obligation to provide the conditions that permit continuing research and policy development." He finds promise in the Association of Canadian Deans of Education Accord on Initial Teacher Education and its capacity to provoke the development of "a strong framework of normative principles for initial teacher education." He argues that the Accord 'commits' those of us involved in university-based teacher education "to translate the... principles into desirable outcomes that can be debated and assessed." By claiming responsibility for teacher education and by accepting that teacher education programs also need the plurality of others—in this case, 'stakeholders'—we stand a chance of helping teachers become "wise and poised public intellectuals deeply committed to and advocates of education both as a field of rigorous academic study and as a public trust..."

Teacher educators are already passionate about education. This collection of CATE keynote addresses can be read as a course of study for considering the pressing issues and questions facing university-based teacher education with a keen grasp of that which is inherently difficult about the work. If, as teacher educators, we can understand development as conflict, acquire an ear for the quiet rumble of tensions, and become curious about how to recognize learning and not learning from experience, we might discover new ways to think about and learn from teacher education as a theory and a practice that is relational, interdependent, and subject to belatedness. Each of these addresses entered into conversations already taking place, and each animated further debate and thought when it was delivered at various universities hosting our annual Congress of the Humanities and Social Sciences. By gathering them together, they speak to and sometimes against each other and allow us all to enter their thoughts anew. Let the conversation also begin anew.

CATE/ACFE Keynote Address 2004

Narrative Understandings of Lives in School

D. Jean Clandinin
(University of Alberta)

presented at

University of Manitoba
29 May 2004

Introduction to the 2004 Address

Jean Clandinin's address begins with a return to the earliest moments of the research program that charted the emergence of narrative inquiry in Canadian curriculum studies. Thinking back through her own autobiography as a researcher and teacher educator, she speaks to the complexity involved in any conversation about education—and not least in the issues surrounding education research and scholarship in curriculum theory. She describes the curriculum commonplaces as a way to think about curriculum from four intersecting vantage points: teacher, learner, subject matter, and milieu. The development of two concepts, personal practical knowledge and the professional knowledge landscape, form the underpinnings of narrative understanding of teacher knowledge. Returning to her field notes from the first classroom where she worked alongside a primary school teacher in a diverse urban school more than twenty years ago, Clandinin draws attention to felt tensions in her research when the focus remained fixed on understanding the teacher's knowledge. Left aside were her observations and concerns about the children's lives as they met with the unfolding of the teacher's planned and lived curriculum.

More recently, Clandinin and her research group have delved into “the ways in which teachers' and children's lives intersect, into the ways that children shape teachers' stories to live by, their knowledge and their contexts at the same time as teachers' stories are shaped by children's stories.” Attending to the complexity of the intersections that shape curricular moments introduces new methodological challenges, four of which she describes in this address: an awareness of narrative inquiry as relational inquiry; recognition of narrative inquiry as participatory intervention in lives that neither begin nor end with the research schedule; the strain of becoming and staying attentive to important “moments and places of tension”; and, finally, the development of an appreciation for a broader sense of the various kinds of “field texts that would allow us to attend closely to children's, families' and teachers' stories to live by.” Several examples show the use of children's storybooks, report cards and photography to bring underlying tensions between various stories to live by into relief where they may be taken up, taken in and used as the grounds to “compose lives in schools” that are affected but not obliterated by dominant narratives. Addressing methodological challenges can transform a story about clashes between teachers' and children's curricular understandings into new insights “about the lived curriculum in our schools where diverse children's and families' lives are shaped.”

D. Jean Clandinin is Professor and Director of the Centre for Research for Teacher Education and Development at the University of Alberta. A former teacher, counsellor, and psychologist, she is author or co-author of 8 books. Four books and many chapters and articles were published with Michael Connelly. Their latest book, *Narrative Inquiry*, was published in 2000. She also authored two other books: the first based on her doctoral research and the second based on research from an experimental teacher education program. A 2006 book co-authored with seven former students, *Composing Diverse Identities: Narrative Inquiries into the Intertwined Lives of Children and Teachers*, drew on several years of research with children and teachers in urban schools. This book has been awarded the 2008 AERA Narrative Research Special Interest Group Outstanding Book award and the 2009 AERA Division B Outstanding Book Award. She edited the *Handbook of Narrative Inquiry: Mapping a methodology* (Sage, 2007). She is past Vice President of Division B (Curriculum Studies) of the American Educational Research Association (AERA) and is the 1993 winner of AERA's Early Career Award. She is the 1999 winner of the Canadian Education Association Whitworth Award for

educational research. She was awarded AERA's Division B Lifetime Achievement Award in 2002. She is a 2001 winner of the Kaplan Research Achievement Award, a 2004 Killam Scholar, and the 2008 Larry Beauchamp Award from the University of Alberta. Currently she is working on three major projects: a multi-site narrative inquiry into the intersection of children's, families' and teachers' stories of school; a narrative reflective practice project with physicians in training; and a narrative inquiry into the experiences of youth who leave school early.

Within the field of education, Dr. Clandinin's research has had a profound impact upon the related areas of teacher knowledge, teacher education and narrative inquiry. In an article published in top-ranked *Review of Research in Education* (1994), she was identified as one of three leading researchers in the world in the area of teacher knowledge, along with Schön of MIT and Shulman of Stanford. Her research on teachers' personal practical knowledge has altered our understanding of the role that teachers play in curriculum making in their classrooms and of the need for incorporating this knowledge into teacher education programs. She has been instrumental in the development of narrative inquiry as an alternative methodology for conducting research in the social sciences.

Note d'introduction à la conférence de 2004

La conférence de Jean Clandinin commence par un retour aux premiers moments d'un programme de recherche qui a donné lieu à l'émergence de l'approche narrative pour étudier le curriculum. En réfléchissant à sa propre expérience en tant que chercheure et formatrice d'enseignants, elle parle de la complexité qui règne au cœur de toutes les conversations sur l'éducation et en particulier des discussions relatives à la recherche et à l'étude de la théorie du curriculum. Elle envisage l'étude des curricula en considérant ce qu'elle qualifie de quatre lieux communs, à savoir : l'enseignant, l'élève, le sujet et le milieu. L'élaboration de deux concepts, le savoir personnel pratique et le savoir professionnel, forment les piliers d'une compréhension narrative du savoir de l'enseignant. Revenant à ses notes de terrain recueillies dans le contexte de la première classe où elle a travaillé avec une enseignante du primaire dans une école urbaine marquée par la diversité, il y a de cela plus de vingt ans, Jean Clandinin attire l'attention sur les tensions ressenties dans le cadre de sa recherche lorsque le chercheur restreint son attention sur des indices relatifs au savoir de l'enseignant. Elle constate, en revoyant ses notes de terrain que ses observations ne prennent pas en compte le vécu des enfants à mesure qu'ils réagissent au déroulement du curriculum planifié et vécu par l'enseignant.

Plus récemment, Jean Clandinin et son équipe de recherche se sont intéressées à la manière dont la vie des enseignants et celle des élèves se recourent, et à la façon dont les enfants influencent les histoires des enseignants, leurs savoirs et leurs contextes, de la même manière que les histoires des enseignants influencent celles des enfants. Examiner la complexité des intersections qui structurent les moments du curriculum introduit de nouveaux défis sur le plan méthodologique, notamment celui de reconnaître que l'approche narrative est une approche relationnelle et qu'elle est aussi une intervention participative dans la vie des individus qui elle, ne commence ni ne finit avec le calendrier de recherche ; celui aussi de reconnaître la nécessité de rester attentif aux importants «moments et lieux de tension»; et enfin, la nécessité de développer une attention plus large aux divers types de

«textes qui permettraient de suivre de plus près les histoires inspirantes des enfants, de leurs familles et des enseignants.» L'auteur montre que l'utilisation de livres d'histoires pour enfants, de bulletins scolaires et de photos est susceptible de révéler des tensions sous-jacentes entre les différentes histoires qui peuvent être utilisées comme base pour «reconstituer le vécu dans les écoles». Tenir compte des défis méthodologiques peut conduire à transformer une histoire sur les conflits entre les conceptions des enfants et celles des enseignants à propos du curriculum en une nouvelle compréhension du «curriculum vécu dans les écoles où la vie des enfants, de leurs familles et des enfants se trouve modelée.

Dre Jean Clandinin est professeure et directrice du Centre de recherche sur la formation et le développement des enseignants à l'Université d'Alberta. Elle a été enseignante, conseillère et psychologue. Elle est a signé ou cosigné 8 livres. Quatre de ces livres ainsi que de nombreux articles et chapitres ont été écrits en collaboration avec Michael Connelly. Leur dernier livre, *Narrative Inquiry*, a été publié en 2000. Elle a aussi écrit deux autres livres, le premier basé sur sa recherche doctorale et le second, sur la recherche menée dans le cadre d'un programme expérimental de formation des enseignants. Un livre écrit en 2006 en collaboration avec sept anciens étudiants, *Composing Diverse Identities: Narrative Inquiries into the Interwoven Lives of Children and Teachers*, s'appuie sur plusieurs années de recherche auprès d'enfants et d'enseignants dans des écoles urbaines. Ce livre a reçu en 2008 le prix AERA Narrative Research Special Interest Group Outstanding Book award et en 2009 le prix AERA Division B Outstanding Book Award. Elle a aussi dirigé la publication du *Handbook of Narrative Inquiry: Mapping a methodology* (Sage, 2007). Elle a été vice-présidente de la Division B (Études sur le curriculum) de la American Educational Research Association (AERA) et a été lauréate en 1993 du prix AERA's Early Career Award. En 1999, elle a reçu le prix Whitworth pour la recherche en éducation, décerné par l'Association canadienne d'éducation. La Division B de AERA lui a décerné son Lifetime Achievement Award en 2002. Elle a été lauréate en 2001 du Kaplan Research Achievement Award, a été nommée en 2004 Killam Scholar et en 2008 a reçu le prix Larry Beauchamp décerné par l'Université d'Alberta. Elle consacre maintenant ses travaux à trois projets majeurs : une étude narrative multi-sites où elle s'intéresse aux recoupements entre les histoires d'école des enfants, des familles et des enseignants; un projet de pratique réflexive narrative avec de futurs médecins et une étude narrative sur les expériences des jeunes qui abandonnent l'école tôt.

Dans le domaine de l'éducation, les recherches du Dr Clandinin ont eu un impact significatif sur la relation entre le savoir de l'enseignant, la formation de l'enseignant et les études narratives sur la formation des enseignants. Dans un article publié dans la très prestigieuse *Review of Research in Education* (1994), elle est présentée comme l'un des trois premiers chercheurs au monde dans le domaine du savoir des enseignants en compagnie de Donald Schön du MIT et de Lee Shulman de l'Université Stanford. Ses recherches sur le savoir pratique personnel des enseignants ont modifié notre compréhension du rôle de l'enseignant dans l'élaboration du curriculum dans sa classe et dans la nécessité d'incorporer ces connaissances dans les programmes de formation des enseignants. Elle a joué un rôle décisif dans l'élaboration d'une approche narrative comme forme de méthodologie pour la conduite de recherches en sciences sociales.

CATE / ACFE 2004

Keynote Address

Narrative Understandings of Lives in School

D. Jean Clandinin
University of Alberta

In the paper I share with you tonight I sketch a kind of narrative overview of the research program I have been involved with over the past 20 years or so. In so doing I compose a narrative thread that connects what has come before with current work I am engaged in with a group of graduate students, teachers, children, parents and administrators in one school. I begin with my work in a school in Toronto, Bay Street School, in 1981 and end with another school in Edmonton, Ravine Elementary, in 2004. I pick up on moments and tensions that connect these diverse projects with what I am trying to understand about lives in school. My purpose is to show the need for more multilayered, multivocalic research in curriculum studies made possible within a narrative view of curriculum. However, as a kind of prologue, I give a very personal account of how I saw the landscape, the research context in curriculum studies, in which I began.

When I began my doctoral work in the late 1970's at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto, it was at an exciting time. Michael Connelly and Freema Elbaz had just begun their work on teacher knowledge. Their ideas of teacher knowledge bubbled out of what was then a fairly new field, that is, the field of teacher thinking. I was a brand new doctoral student, but as a former teacher and school counselor, I found the discourse of teacher thinking refreshing.

As a fledgling curriculum theorist, I was concerned about how much research being done focused on implementation of curricular reforms. While I recognized how one could see teachers as the ones who failed to implement school reforms and new school policies when school change did not happen as planned, I wondered how teachers would give an account of what happened. These abstract teachers I was meeting in the literature were supposed to be the generalized representations of the people I had just left in school. I wondered if teachers' practices did shift, just not in the ways that reformers planned. I wondered what teachers would say about those curricular reforms and how they interacted with their ongoing practices. What if researchers took a different view, I wondered, not one that constructed teachers as deficit "other" in the way the curriculum implementation and development literature was doing?

I knew teachers were knowing people who made choices and decisions that seemed appropriate to their understandings of the children and youth with whom they worked, to the

contexts in which they worked and to the subject matter they were teaching. I worried about how teachers were portrayed in the curriculum implementation and reform literature. I began to wonder if I could become a curriculum theorist after all.

I was just as troubled, however, by how teachers were being portrayed in a very different literature, a literature I will call the critical theory research literature. Michael Apple's (1971) research on what he termed the hidden curriculum was all the talk around my graduate study hallways. In much of that work that I loosely grouped together, teachers were also seen as not knowing, as not understanding the complex issues of race, class and gender and as mindlessly reproducing social structures (Anyon, 1981, Popkewitz, 1977). This, too, was deeply troubling to me. While I found the ideas compelling and even a bit seductive, I realized that in none of the discourses did teachers appear as the hard working, thoughtful people with whom I had shared my school life. I told a story of myself as a wide-awake teacher and yet I could recognize some of my practices in some of the critical theory discourse. I knew that literature was helpful to me in reconsidering what I knew about teaching. However, in this literature, I still felt teachers were constructed as deficit "other," as not being quite "good enough." I was having difficulty finding a place where I could continue to name myself as a teacher and to maintain respectful relationships with former teacher colleagues. I wondered if there was a way to understand teachers within curriculum research that was more respectful of the lives teachers were composing within the contexts in which they lived and worked.

The research on teacher thinking (Clark and Yinger, 1977) with its focus on the ways that teachers made decisions and with an underlying assumption that teachers thought before they acted seemed a first opening for me. But these ideas that teachers thought, that we should attend to teacher cognition, did not go quite far enough. The work on teacher knowledge (Connelly and Elbaz, 1980) gave an even more expansive starting point. Now I saw a way to engage in research that began with a view that teachers were knowing people, that they held knowledge born of their experience, reflected upon and expressed in their practices. It was an exciting break from what had been evident in research on teaching and in curriculum research.

As I began to understand what it meant to be a curriculum theorist, I positioned myself in a tradition of curriculum research grounded in John Dewey's (1938) ideas of experience and in Joseph Schwab's (1970) ideas of curriculum. It was Schwab's influence that led Michael Connelly and me to write of four curriculum commonplaces, that is, teacher, learner, subject matter and milieu. In a 1988 description of the curriculum commonplaces, we wrote

The commonplaces are a set of factors or determinants that occur in statements about the aims, content and methods of the curriculum. Taken as a whole they serve to bound the set of statements identified as being curricular. They comprise the simplest model for looking at curricular problems. (Connelly and Clandinin, 1988, p. 84)

We described some characteristics of the commonplaces in the following way: one, "they are commonplace in the usual sense of the word, i.e., they appear and reappear in curricular statements. We cannot escape them. An adequate curriculum statement must say something about each of them"; two, "many arguments tend to focus on a single commonplace. If so the role played by the others will be, in part, determined by the focal commonplace" (e.g. if organized knowledge is the focus, then the learner may be treated largely as a receptacle, the teacher as a dispenser and the milieu as the housing for the old knowledge and the accumulator of the new); three, "there are a number of different possible foci within a single commonplace (e.g. learner as an inquirer, learner as a social organism, learner as a recording machine) (Connelly and Clandinin, 1988). Establishing this way of looking at curriculum, that is, in terms of the four commonplaces, we acknowledged our starting point as with the curriculum commonplace, teacher. We worked from

a Deweyan view of the curriculum from a teacher's vantage point (Clandinin, 1986; Connelly and Clandinin, 1988). Dewey's (1938) notion of "situation" and "experience" enabled us to imagine the teacher not so much as a maker of curriculum but as a part of it and to imagine a place for context, culture (Dewey's notion of interaction), and temporality (both past and future contained in Dewey's notion of "continuity"). (Clandinin and Connelly, 1992, p. 365).

Further we wrote,

teachers and students live out a curriculum; teachers do not transmit, implement, or teach a curriculum and objectives; nor are they and their students carried forward in their work and studies by a curriculum of textbooks and content, instructional methodologies, and intentions. An account of teachers' and students' lives over time is the curriculum, although intentionality, objectives, and curriculum materials do play a part in it. (Clandinin and Connelly, 1992, p. 365)

This way of thinking about curricular situations became the way I thought about my work in teacher education, both pre-service and in-service. But it also became a way of thinking about the research I was doing for I wanted the research I did to be profoundly curricular research. Thinking about curriculum making in classrooms and schools was an important way for me to connect what I was doing in the university and in my research with my colleagues and other practitioners in schools, colleagues with whom I wanted to maintain relationships and alongside of whom I hoped to make a difference in the ways they and I were able to compose their and my lives in school.

This, then, was the beginning point of learning to live and tell a story of myself as a researcher, of beginning to engage the difficult questions of understanding teachers' lives in classrooms as connected not only to their experiential knowledge, what we have come to call their personal practical knowledge (Connelly and Clandinin, 1988; Clandinin, 1986) but also to their professional knowledge landscapes (Clandinin and Connelly, 1995). As I engaged in research, I continued to see the research I did as curriculum research even as many traditions in curriculum research moved farther and farther from teachers' and children's lives in school or became more and more subject matter specific.

When I began my doctoral research I lived alongside one teacher, Stephanie. In the context of a larger project, we were interested in the reform context in which Stephanie and others in her school were living and working. In the larger study we asked what happened to teachers' knowledge, to their practices, when a new policy was being heavily implemented in their school. My doctoral research focused on Stephanie, a primary school teacher and her knowledge. I studied her knowledge as it was expressed in her practices. In order to understand how her knowledge was held, Michael Connelly and I came to terms such as image (Clandinin, 1986), rhythms (Clandinin and Connelly, 1986), metaphors (Connelly and Clandinin, 1988), and narrative unities (Connelly and Clandinin, 1986) as ways to give an account of her knowledge and, perhaps, as a way to talk about teacher knowledge more generally. We defined personal practical knowledge as:

a term designed to capture the idea of experience in a way that allows us to talk about teachers as knowledgeable and knowing persons...Personal practical knowledge...is in the person's past experience, in the person's present mind and body, and in the person's future plans and actions...It is seen and found 'in our practices'. It is a particular way of

reconstructing the past and the intentions for the future to deal with exigencies of a present situation. (Connelly and Clandinin, 1988, p. 25)

Returning to the curriculum commonplaces, my initial curriculum research focus was on teachers with students as learners, subject matter and milieu forming an interactive backdrop. Of course, teachers such as Stephanie were also seen as learners in this view. Students as learners were seen as co-composers of their lives within milieus that were understood as evolving, shifting, moral, epistemological contexts, shaping and shaped by teachers, children, administrators, parents and larger social, cultural and institutional contexts. We came to define these contexts in which teachers lived using a landscape metaphor as professional knowledge landscapes.

A landscape metaphor is particularly well suited to our purpose. It allows us to talk about space, place, and time. Furthermore, it has a sense of expansiveness and the possibility of being filled with diverse people, things, and events in different relationships. Understanding professional knowledge as comprising a landscape calls for a notion of professional as composed of a wide variety of people, places and things. Because we see the professional knowledge landscape as composed of relationships among people, places, and things, we see it both as an intellectual and a moral landscape. (Clandinin and Connelly, 1995, pp. 4-5)

Of course, I continued to focus, in further research on beginning teachers' knowledge, on how teachers came to have personal practical knowledge, on how school contexts interpreted in terms of a professional knowledge landscape came to shape teachers' knowledge, on how teachers' identities, their stories to live by (Connelly and Clandinin, 1999), shaped and were shaped by their positions on different professional knowledge landscapes.

Tonight, however, I return to the field texts or data (Clandinin and Connelly, 2000) from my research with Stephanie at Bay Street to help develop an understanding of curriculum puzzles that were apparent in that first study but, for a number of reasons, some of them methodological, I could not yet study. My argument, in brief, is that what I first became aware of in Stephanie's classroom was the bumping up of children's life experiences with the dominant stories of school and with my own storied life experiences as I worked as participant researcher alongside Stephanie. In curricular terms, I was aware, in that first study, of the need to study the moments of intersection between children's experiences and teachers' experiences as curricular moments.

I return with you to that first classroom, Stephanie's primary school classroom at Bay Street School, where I spent more than a year living in relationship with Stephanie and the children. Her classroom was an inner city classroom in multicultural Toronto. Her students were children of many cultures, ethnicities, first languages and religions. The students and their families came from homes classified as in the lower socioeconomic range. Many were from families in transition, families engaged in kinds of nomadic searching for home places as they came from refugee camps, other countries, other places in Toronto and Canada.

I was new to Toronto, new to teaching classes with such a range of cultural backgrounds and such a diversity of religions. I was familiar with children living in poverty, but the children from the refugee camps seeking havens in Canada were a new phenomenon for me. I was not accustomed to the inner city of a huge city like Toronto. It made Edmonton where I had been teaching seem small and uncrowded. My early life was spent on a farm with space and quiet to spread out. I knew acres of farmland, small groves of trees, running creeks and prairie skies. But I had come to know urban life in Edmonton as I studied and later taught there. I was, however, just awakening to an understanding of the Christian emphasis in our schools and how Christian holidays shaped school

holidays and some school activities. I was new to discussions of Festivals of Light and what it meant to live alongside children of multiple faiths and religions such as Judaism, Buddhism and Islam.

When I return now to my field notes, I see that I was in a space of wonder. My field notes are filled with wonders about children who had not known the experience of planting and growing seeds in soil because their world was a concrete one. My field notes are filled with notes about the many languages children spoke in the hallways and in the playgrounds. I wondered at their lives composed within the noises of sirens, traffic, and street cars, crowded apartment homes and rows of townhouses and older houses jammed into crowded spaces.

At one point I wondered if I could characterize my experience as being in a kind of liminal space (Heilbrun, 1988; Kennedy, 2001) and in some ways I could. However, while I was new to the children's lives and new to what it meant to be a researcher in someone else's classroom, there was much that I recognized about life in Bay Street School. Stories of school were bred into my bones by this time in my life. I had been a student, teacher, counselor and psychologist in urban and rural Canadian schools. I knew in my bones the dominant story of school. And I knew how to compose a story of success within stories of school. While many of the storylines of the children's lives were unknown to me, the story of school was a felt known with its rhythms, cycles of teaching, assessing and reporting cycles, the physical structure of long corridors and isolated classrooms as separate box-like spaces with closed doors.

On my first day in Stephanie's classroom, April 21, 1981, I met Dimitra, a child of the Greek Orthodox faith, who was coming up to her Easter celebration; Michael had just arrived from Guatemala and was paired up with Dennis, a Spanish speaking child from Ecuador. Stephanie pointed these children out to me as she went about her classroom work, and we negotiated how I could be useful in the context of the ongoing classroom life. The next day, April 22, 1981, I listened in awe as the librarian worked with a class of students, only 4 of whom had been born in Canada. As I began to live alongside the children at Bay Street I found myself wondering who these children were, what their lives were like outside of school and what sense they were making in school.

At first I felt just wonder but soon I began to experience the places of bumping up as Stephanie asked me to teach. She wondered if I could plan and teach a science unit attentive to the changing seasons, something I later learned was an important rhythm in Stephanie's yearly curriculum planning. The choice was easy for me. In early May, 1981, I started an extensive planting unit, something I had experienced in Edmonton classrooms and something embodied in me as a child who had grown up on a farm attentive to the cycles of planting, growing and harvesting. While my notes of May 4 indicated "I was not sure how many seeds the children have actually looked at before" and on May 8 "I noted my impression that the students have not much contact with seeds and growing things," I did not stop in these curricular moments to attend to these as moments of tension. I kept on creating experiences that were comfortable for me and that fit within what I saw as the mandated curriculum of science. My focus was on fulfilling Stephanie's request for my involvement. Rereading my field notes I now know I was in a moment, a place of discontinuity (Carr, 1980) for many of the children.

On May 11, 1981, I wrote in my field notes

I called the remaining three groups back to work with me. The children were very excited about what we were planting. A number of the students, particularly Sanish, enjoyed playing in the soil. He expressed amazement over finding pieces of root, stones, little pieces of wood in the soil. Denise, a little girl of African-Canadian heritage, dug up her bean seed and was very excited that it had started to grow. Shuk-Shan, a little girl of Chinese heritage, was the student I chose to water the bean plants first. We spent some time together learning how to water them.

And on May 25, 1981, I wrote

Perhaps the most interesting event happened when I had table two at the back. Denise was having a good deal of difficulty settling down. She wanted more seeds so she could take them home. She didn't want to plant the seeds that I gave her. She dropped her seed and made a fuss about finding it again. She really wanted to take them home to show her mother. [My field notes do not show if I created that opportunity for her.]

The unit continued: the children and I planted bean seeds, measured their growth, recorded our findings in journal record books, wrote experience charts about what we were doing, read books, both fiction and non fiction, about plants, created a miniature garden in the sand box and worked on an integrated subject matter approach until mid-June. While my field notes illustrate the bumping up, the tensions between my stories to live by and theirs, I did not attend to the tensions. Neither did I attend to the children's lives. Their lives were not my research focus. My research focus was on how to understand and give an account of Stephanie's knowledge (Clandinin, 1986). In the research representations, the research texts, I attended to Stephanie's knowledge. Any accounts of the children were given through my account of Stephanie's knowledge. In terms of the curricular commonplaces, my attention was on the teacher commonplace. Learner, subject matter and milieu were understood from the vantage point of Stephanie, as teacher. But the living of the curriculum in the classroom was richly described in the field notes which were filled with children's experiences, integrated subject matter, a teacher, all nested within vibrant school, community and cultural milieus.

The children in Stephanie's Bay Street classroom live not only in the field texts but also in my memory. Those children awakened me not only to the diversity of children's lives but also to the complexity of attending narratively to curriculum in research. The silences I now see in the research texts are what bring me to the current research with which I am engaged with Shaun Murphy, Anne Murray Orr, Marni Pearce, Janice Huber, Vera Caine and Marilyn Huber.

In 1996 Michael and I began to attend more directly to the ways in which teachers' and children's lives intersect, into the ways that children shape teachers' stories to live by, their knowledge and their contexts at the same time as teachers' stories are shaped by children's stories (Connelly and Clandinin, 1999; Huber, Huber, and Clandinin, 2004). I realized as I framed that research that I was turning back on that early research in Stephanie's classroom, on those children of diversity who had so puzzled, amazed, captivated me.

In other research I listened to children's stories, but in that research again it seemed one-sided. I heard the children's stories, but the teachers' stories were silent. This time I wanted to stand alongside, amongst children, teachers and administrators to hear stories in a multivocalic kind of way, a kind of listening to the stories of many participants positioned differently on the landscape as stories being lived and told swirled, bumping, shifting, changing and evolving. Trying to attend to these curricular moments where the stories of children, families, teachers, administrators and stories of school intersect is difficult work. Writing theoretically about narrative understandings of curriculum seemed easy compared to trying to empirically study these curriculum moments. In what follows I detail only four of the methodological challenges we faced as a group of researchers attempting to do this work.

The first challenge is intricately involved with knowing that narrative inquiry is relational inquiry (Clandinin and Connelly, 2000; Connelly and Clandinin, in press; Huber and Clandinin, 2002). By that I mean that as narrative inquirers we enter into landscapes and attempt to negotiate ways of living alongside research participants. In the Bay Street work, I entered into Bay Street and negotiated ways to live alongside Stephanie, the primary school teacher in whose classroom I worked, as well as some other school staff members. My main relationship was with Stephanie, and it

was through my involvement with her that I came to live in the classroom. My relationships with the children and families were mediated by my relationship with her. However, in this new work we wanted to negotiate relationships that allowed us to live alongside teachers, administrators, children and families and to hear their stories in their own terms, following their own plotlines. Each researcher tried to position him/herself so we could hear, for example, the stories of a teacher and administrator or a teacher and several children or a teacher, several children and some family members. This involved the negotiation of multiple relationships that evolved over time.

A second challenge involved the need to negotiate thoughtfully ways to enter into the midst of an ongoing story of school and to learn to stand alongside multiple people as they lived their lives. As we begin to work alongside participants we need to understand that individuals are also in the midst of their lives. Participants' lives do not begin when we, as researchers, arrive nor do they end when we leave. As we entered into those spaces, we needed to attend thoughtfully to who we were in those relationships and to how we might shape the lives that were being composed alongside of us. We also needed to attend thoughtfully to how we would move away from those lives at the end of the study. Because we knew that we would be in fairly intensive relationships for at least one year and, as it has worked out, we have been in these relationships for more than two years now, we needed to attend to how we were shaping the lives both by our presence and by our imagined absence from those lives.

A third challenge was learning to live with a skin-tingling kind of awareness to all that was happening. When Maxine Greene (1995) writes of wide awakesness, it was this kind of wide awakesness that needed to live within and among us. As a group of researchers we all knew a story of school and we all had a deeply felt embodied sense of school. We knew it was possible that we would "sleep through," that is, be inattentive to, the tensions that might seep through the ongoing stories to live by as they were lived out in schools. As you will see below we employed diverse methods to compose field texts with participants in order to allow us to hear and see and feel the tensions as children's, families', teachers', administrators' and our storied lives bumped against one another and against institutional, social and cultural stories. In addition to working with a range of field texts, we also worked closely with each other. For the 2002-2004 study in Ravine Elementary we were there as a group, working alongside each other and those in the school. As a research group we came together often to share stories, transcripts, field notes and other field texts and to respond to each other's stories. In that way we stayed awake to possible moments and places of tension.

A fourth methodological challenge was imagining kinds of field texts that would allow us to attend closely to children's, families' and teachers' stories to live by. I will outline three ways we composed field texts in addition to the field notes of classroom, school and home participation, taped conversations with small groups, individual teachers, children and administrators and our own research journals and writing.

Anne Murray Orr (in progress) created an innovative approach of working alongside small groups of children reading children's literature with them. Her intent was to use the children's literature to create spaces for the children to share their stories to live by. Her research, situated in the context of a grade one/two classroom, is still a work in progress as she is in the midst of writing about their work together. Working from her relational knowing of children in the classroom, she carefully selected literature that would draw out their stories. Attending to the children's lives in the classroom, she watched their friendships, their writing, their talk and, based on what she imagined would be a narrative thread in an unfolding life, she chose books to share with children in small groups, books such as *A Gift for Gita* for a girl of Pakistani heritage, *Red Parka Mary* for a girl of Aboriginal heritage and so on, opened up conversations and spaces for the sharing of life stories.

Shaun Murphy (2004), working with a group of grade 5/6 students, developed several ways to come to hear the students' stories as they intersected with their teacher's stories of them. One of

them involved the use of students' report cards. In this classroom, as in classrooms all over Canada, report cards are written three or four times a year. As Debbie Schroeder so eloquently wrote "report cards are a teacher's way of giving back student stories and are powerful in shaping children's stories to live by."

Shaun used the occasion of report cards both as an opportunity for the grade 5/6 students to tell what story they heard/read of them in their report cards but also to create a space for them to retell their teacher's story of them. After the November report cards were sent home to parents and conferences were held, Shaun and Lian, the classroom teacher, returned the children's report cards and asked them to create found poetry from the words in their report cards. Found poetry is an arts-based research process written about by Lynn Butler-Kisber (2002) and Laurel Richardson (1994). The process of composing found poetry involves working with transcripts and other written texts to pull out key or meaningful words to create an interpretive reading of the text, a reading that is both poetic and deeply meaningful to the person creating the text. It was this process of creating found poetry of their report cards that Shaun and Lian engaged in with the children. In creating this space for the students, Shaun was able to hear the children's stories to live by as they tried to come to a narrative coherence of who they were with the story that their teacher told of them. As with Anne, much more of this work will be found in their dissertations (Murphy, 2004; Murray-Orr, in progress).

The third approach to composing field texts that allowed us to study this moment/place of intersection was created by Vera Caine. In her master's work (Caine, 2002), Vera worked with young women of aboriginal heritage who were HIV/AIDS positive and who lived in an urban centre away from their home communities. Vera gave each young woman a camera and asked her to engage in a visual narrative inquiry (Bach, 1998) with her, composing photographs of their lives and telling their stories over a year or more long study. Vera wanted to continue her work with the use of visual narrative inquiry and to use photographs as a way to compose field texts with children similar to the work of Wendy Ewald (2001).

Vera joined our research group and came to work with a special needs classroom at Ravine Elementary, a classroom with 14 boys. They worked with one teacher, Kristi. The classroom was engaged in the study of a provincially mandated social studies unit on community during the time that Vera was first involved in the classroom. At first, Vera did preliminary camera work with the children. With the support of the research project she provided each child with a camera and black and white film. Their task was to take photographs of community. After the photographs were developed Vera heard each child's stories of the photographs, including details about their purposes for taking them and how they connected to their understandings of community.

Tonight, I focus on one child, a child of aboriginal heritage, a child I call Josh. I had a particular interest in Vera's work with visual narrative inquiry and often stopped down to speak with Kristi, Vera and/or the children in the classroom when I was in the school. As soon as I knew the children's photographs of community were back from the developers, I stopped down to speak with Kristi and to ask to see the children's photographs. I asked to see Josh's. Kristi initially told me she thought Josh had not understood the task. In her words "He must just have taken pictures of the first things he saw." Kristi's sense was that Josh had misunderstood the meaning of the task as he did not understand he was to take photographs of community. For Kristi, as detailed in the mandated curriculum, community is seen in terms of interdependence, in terms of goods and services. Some of the children in the classroom took photographs of schools, churches, supermarkets, gas stations. For Kristi, these children had understood the photography assignment as well as the concept of community. Josh, she thought, had not.

However, as I looked at Josh's photographs, I sensed he *had* understood the task and that in these photographs we could learn much about Josh's story to live by, his story of community and the rubbing points between his story and the teacher's story to live by. One photograph particularly

stands out in my memory. It was a photograph of three guitars leaning against a sofa. The photograph was carefully composed and was a striking example of photography. I felt the sense of aesthetic composition and the care that had gone into the photograph design. He had understood what Vera had been teaching about photographs. But I knew there was more at work here. I knew we were about to learn something of the bumping up places between stories of school and our dominant stories of community with Josh's story to live by in his community.

When Vera and he sat down to talk about the photographs, he spoke of the three guitars as being a community because "one belonged to my dad, one to my uncle and one is mine, and sometimes we play together". There were, of course, other stories of the other photographs, but this one serves as a marker of a moment when we see the interaction of a child, a learner, with his teacher, also a learner, with the subject matter of community as part of a social studies unit all within the nested milieus of classroom, school, cultures and social narratives.

It is moments such as this one that we need to study as curricular moments if we are to understand what it means to compose lives in schools. When children of diversity come to our schools living their life stories, it is such moments that teach us all how to be attentive to what we are doing in these educative or miseducative places we call school. As we are asking in our current study, are schools interrupting children's and teachers' stories to live by? Are their stories to live by interrupted for educative or miseducative reasons? It is in trying to understand educative moments revealed in a photograph of three guitars that perhaps we can begin to understand.

In summary I want to come back to where I began. As I looked back over these more than twenty years as a curriculum researcher I realize that I am just now being able to engage in some of the most pressing curriculum research, research that attends to those moments of interaction among the four curriculum commonplaces as they intersect in the lives of the children, teachers, administrators and families in our Canadian schools. In 1988 we wrote:

[W]ith the narrative perspective, we understand the child's education in terms of the child's and the teacher's dominant narratives embedded within cultural and historical narratives. The child's education, for instance, is seen in terms of his or her personal narrative and of the meaning this conveys of his or his learning experiences in a particular classroom. The child's education is seen temporally in terms of past, present, and future. (Connelly and Clandinin, 1988, p. 111)

My hope is that this current research offers a way to begin to engage these questions about the lived curriculum in our schools where diverse children and families lives are shaped.

References

- Anyon, J. (1981). Social class and school knowledge. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 11(1), 3-41.
- Apple, M. (1971). The hidden curriculum and the nature of conflict. *Interchange*, 11(4), 27-40.
- Bach, H. (1998). *A visual narrative concerning curriculum, girls, photography, etc.* Edmonton, Alberta: Qualitative Institute Press.
- Butler-Kisber, L. (2002). Artful portrayals in qualitative inquiry: The road to found poetry and beyond. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 48(3), 229-239.
- Caine, V. (2002). *Storied moments: A visual narrative inquiry of aboriginal women living with HIV*. Unpublished master's thesis. University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada.
- Carr, D. (1986). *Time, narrative and history*. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press.
- Clandinin, D. J. (1986). *Classroom practice: Teacher images in action*. London: Falmer Press.

- Clandinin, D. J. & Connelly, F. M. (1986). The reflective practitioner and practitioners' narrative unities. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 11(2), 184-198.
- Clandinin, D. J. & Connelly, F. M. (1986). Rhythms in teaching: The narrative study of teachers' personal practical knowledge of classrooms. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 2(4), 377-387.
- Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (1992). The teacher as curriculum maker. In P. Jackson (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Curriculum* (pp. 363-401). American Educational Research Association. New York: MacMillan Press.
- Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (1995). *Teachers' professional knowledge landscapes*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (2000). *Narrative inquiry: Experience and story in qualitative research*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Clark, C. M., & Yinger, R. J. (1977). Research on teacher thinking. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 7(4), 279-304.
- Connelly, F. M., & Clandinin, D. J. (1986). The reflective practitioner and practitioners' narrative unities. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 11(2), 184-198.
- Connelly, F. M., & Clandinin, D. J. (1988). *Teachers as curriculum planners: Narratives of experience*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Connelly, F. M., & Clandinin, D. J. (1999). *Shaping a professional identity: Stories of educational practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Connelly, F. M., & Elbaz, F. (1980). Conceptual bases for curriculum thought: A teacher's perspective. In A. W. Foshay (Ed.), *Considered action for curriculum improvement: ASCD Yearbook* (pp. 95-119). Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education*. New York: Collier Books.
- Ewald, W. (2001). *I wanna take me a picture*. New York: Beacon Press.
- Greene, M. (1995). *Releasing the imagination: Essays on education, the arts, and social change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Heilbrun, C. (1988). *Writing a women's life*. New York: Norton.
- Huber, J., & Clandinin, D. J. (2002). Ethical dilemmas in relational narrative inquiry with children. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 8(6), 785-803.
- Huber, J., Huber, M., & Clandinin, D. J. (2004). Moments of tension: Resistance as expressions of narrative coherence in stories to live by. *Reflective Practice*, 5(2), 181-198.
- Kennedy, M. (2001). *Race matters in the life/work of four, white, female teachers*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada.
- Murphy, M. S. (2004). *Understanding children's knowledge: A narrative inquiry into school experiences*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada.
- Murray Orr, A. (in progress). *Stories to live by: Book conversations as spaces for attending to children's lives in school*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada.
- Popkewitz, T. S. (1977). The latent values of the discipline centered curriculum. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 5(1), 24-40.
- Richardson, L. (1994). Writing: A method of inquiry. In N. K. Denzin, & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 516-529). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Schroeder, D. (1996). *Reclaiming our teaching lives: The curriculum of middle space*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada.
- Schwab, J. J. (1970). *The practical: A language for curriculum*. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, Center for the Study of Instruction [Reprinted in Westbury & Wilkoff, Science, curriculum, and liberal education: Selected essays. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978].

CATE/ACFE Keynote Address 2005

Is Teacher Education Reform Possible?

Tom Russell
(Queen's University)

presented at

University of Western Ontario
29 May 2005

Introduction to the 2005 Address

Tom Russell's text re-creates his address from notes. Drawing upon his own experience as a teacher educator and the teacher education literature, Russell considers the obstacles to teacher education reform. Two persistent problems are central to his main argument. The first concerns the tendency of those involved in university-based teacher education to identify all aspects of the program as requiring change save one: the teacher educator's own classroom. Contributing to this tendency are two factors, the assumption that expert teachers make teacher education expertise and the plethora of research topics that preoccupy teacher educators and crowd out an interest in the study of learning to teach. In the absence of such research and analysis, teacher educators rely on methods and course design that are incapable either of using what they know about learning from their own biographies of successful teaching or of supporting beginning teachers' abilities to examine the relations between their actions and student learning. The second factor, which parallels the first, addresses a difficulty specific to the teaching profession: everyone who enters teacher education has had many years of experience observing teachers at work. Russell argues that such observation does not easily translate into understanding how teachers perform or think about their work. A double move is required: helping beginning teachers to unpack their own assumptions and also to become students of learning, both their own learning and that of their students. He calls upon teacher educators to replace calls for reform on the part of others with collective attention to all that remains invisible and unquestioned in our familiar structures and practices. Teacher education reform will remain possible but unlikely unless we turn our gaze toward ourselves in order "to identify our assumptions grounded not in research but in practices that were modeled for us when we were students in schools, university and graduate school."

Tom Russell is a Professor in the Faculty of Education at Queen's University. His research focuses on how we learn to teach, with special attention to developing skills of reflective practice and learning from experience. He teaches preservice physics methods, supervises the preservice practicum, and teaches action research in the graduate program. Tom is a co-editor of the *International Handbook on Self-Study of Teaching and Teacher Education Practices* (Kluwer, 2004) and a co-editor of the journal *Studying Teacher Education: A journal of self-study of teacher education practices*. In 2007 he was appointed for 3 years to a Queen's University Chair in Teaching and Learning.

Note d'introduction à la conférence de 2005

Dans cette contribution, Tom Russell puise dans la littérature scientifique sur la formation des enseignants mais aussi à même sa propre expérience de formateur d'enseignants pour réfléchir aux obstacles à la réforme des programme de formation des enseignants. Deux problèmes persistants

sont soulevés dans sa discussion. Le premier est la tendance qu'ont les formateurs universitaires à considérer tous les aspects du programme nécessitant un changement, à l'exception d'un seul: ce qui se passe dans leur propre salle de classe. Deux facteurs contribuent à renforcer cette tendance: d'une part l'hypothèse que les enseignants experts sont aussi des experts de la formation et, d'autre part, la pléthore des sujets de recherche qui préoccupent les formateurs d'enseignants et les distraient de la recherche sur la manière dont un individu apprend à enseigner. En l'absence d'une telle recherche, les formateurs s'en tiennent à des méthodes d'enseignement et à des design pédagogiques qui ne leur permettent pas d'utiliser ce qu'ils savent de l'apprentissage en se basant sur leur propre expérience d'enseignants ou de soutenir les enseignants débutants dans à évaluer la relation entre leurs actions et l'apprentissage des élèves. Le deuxième facteur, non sans lien avec le premier, concerne une difficulté particulière à la profession d'enseignant : tous ceux qui entrent dans le programme de formation des enseignants ont, derrière eux, des années d'expérience à observer les enseignants à l'œuvre. Tom Russell soutient que ces observations ne se traduisent pas facilement par une compréhension de la manière dont les enseignants performant ou réfléchissent à leur action professionnelle. Une double action est requise : aider les enseignants novices à mettre au jour leurs propres conceptions et à devenir eux-mêmes des étudiants de l'apprentissage pour leur propre apprentissage et pour celui de leurs élèves. Il appelle aussi les formateurs d'enseignants à remplacer leurs appels à une réforme chez les autres acteurs, pour porter une attention collective à ce qui reste invisible et n'est jamais remis en question dans nos structures et dans nos pratiques courantes de formation. La réforme de la formation des enseignants reste possible mais peu probable si nous ne tournons pas nos regards vers nous-mêmes pour «identifier nos conceptions basées non pas sur la recherche mais sur les pratiques qui nous ont été modelés quand nous étions étudiants à l'école, à l'université et aux études supérieures.»

Tom Russell est professeur à la Faculté d'éducation de l'Université Queen. Ses recherches portent sur la manière dont les individus apprennent à enseigner, avec une attention particulière au développement d'habiletés liées à la pratique réflexive de même qu'à l'apprentissage par l'expérience. Il intervient dans les programmes de premier cycle comme professeur en didactique de la physique de même que dans la supervision des stages en enseignement. Aux deuxième et troisième cycles, il enseigne les méthodologies de la recherche-action.

Tom Russell est coéditeur de l'*International Handbook on Self-Study of Teaching and Teacher Education Practices* (Kluwer, 2004). Il est aussi coéditeur de la revue scientifique: *Studying Teacher Education: A journal of self-study of teacher education practices*. En 2007, il a été nommé président d'une chaire de recherche sur l'enseignement et de l'apprentissage à l'Université Queen, pour un mandat de trois ans.

CATE / ACFE 2005

Keynote Address

Is Teacher Education Reform Possible?

Tom Russell
Queen's University

My short answer to this question is “possible, yes; likely, no.” Teacher education reform is certainly possible; yet, it seems highly unlikely, not only because the challenges are many and considerable but also because many of the biggest challenges are invisible—taken for granted and lost in forgotten history. In creating a paper from my keynote address to the Canadian Association for Teacher Education at the CSSE conference in May 2005 at the University of Western Ontario, my goal is to make more visible some of the challenges that we face as teacher educators. Only if we understand and focus on the complexity of the educational system of which we are a part and that we work to improve are we likely to make progress with teacher education reform.

If invited to make one and only one change to the preservice program in which they work, many teacher educators seem likely to respond by requesting a change to the structure of the program—the length or spacing of practicum periods, addition or modification of a particular course or its place in the sequence of courses, or the length of the program and the need to add courses on additional topics. Few of us seem inclined to seek a change in our own teacher education classrooms, and in my personal view this is one of the major reasons why teacher education changes so little and has minimal influence on how people teach.

Some may find my assumptions and my approach presumptuous; my goal is not to offend but to stimulate productive thinking about how we enact teacher education, and I am willing to risk offending in order to stimulate. I begin with an assumption that most faculties of education are similar in many respects to the one in which I have taught for 3 decades. I know that there are exceptional and innovative teacher education programs, but they are not common (Queen's had one in 1997-1999, but the changes proved unsustainable). I intend no criticism of my past and present colleagues or of the deans who have provided leadership at Queen's. I am as much a part of the problem as anyone else. Early in my career here, I did make a deliberate (and apparently uncommon) decision to concentrate my research on how people learn to teach. As a result, I necessarily attend to research on teacher education in ways that many teacher educators do not. My teacher education colleagues at Queen's and across Canada have many other research interests, all quite appropriate to the broad range of topics relevant to a faculty of education.

A fundamental problem resides in the breadth of topics relevant to education: the many curriculum areas and levels, special needs, social justice, provincial policies, psychology, philosophy, history, sociology, and of course school law, policy and administration as well. Because there are so many topics and because a faculty requires expertise in most of them, there tends to be little *collective* interest in the growing literature of research on teacher education. Nor have I been aware of much *collective* interest in studying what we are doing in our preservice education classrooms. In today's university, teaching is often a chore while research is the basis of one's reputation. Teaching graduate students often seems more productive than teaching preservice students.

I have arrived at the personal conclusion that teacher education reform is not possible without shared and collective interest in the content and processes of preservice teacher education, nor is it possible without ongoing study and interaction among the many individuals who enact a preservice program. When I presented this talk in 2005, I found myself suggesting that every member of a faculty of education should be required to have two research focal points, a personal one grounded in the expertise acquired by experience and graduate study and a shared one in teacher education research. We are very far from such a reality.

Can Teacher Education Be “Powerful”?

Since preparing and presenting my address in 2005, Darling-Hammond's (2006) discussion in *Powerful Teacher Education* (an unlikely title for a book about teacher education) has refocused my attention on what Lortie (1975) termed the *apprenticeship of observation*. We have all heard this phrase, but do we fully understand how significant it is for our work as teacher educators? As Lortie explained, that apprenticeship is an unusual one, for it is not intended that people learn how to teach as they move through the school system. The apprenticeship of observation is incomplete as well as incidental, for students in school classrooms rarely have access to how their teachers are thinking about their work. Given that teachers have authority both by knowledge and by position and, given that one authority can be substituted for another (“Because I said so” vs. “Here are the reasons”), it is hardly surprising that students who go on to prepare to become teachers have conflicting views that require detailed analysis and careful development.

Every individual who attends a school learns the norms of teacher behaviour. In the 1960s, Flanders (1970) developed a 10-category scheme of classroom interaction analysis that was used to study me (and others) during my student teaching at Harvard. Those were the early days of computer analysis that relied on stacks of punch cards to insert data; Flanders' scheme was limited to 10 categories by the technology. His categories were (1) accepts feelings, (2) praises or encourages, (3) accepts / uses idea of student, (4) asks questions, (5) lectures, (6) gives direction, (7) criticizes or justifies authority, (8) student response, (9) student initiated, and (10) silence or confusion. If one types *Flanders Interaction Analysis* into a search engine, the results suggest that this view of teaching is alive today in many countries. We all recognize these behaviours as common to our own teachers and in our own teaching; it is far less clear what one should make of any analysis based on those categories. I recall being told that these categories were taught explicitly in some preservice programs in the 1970s. Like all good students, the student teachers quickly worked out what they should and should not do, as in advice such as “Don't seven the kids.” We learn these behaviours as normal and appropriate to teachers by sitting in countless classrooms for thousands of days, but we certainly do not come to understand the behaviours and how they influence student learning. Rather, these behaviors become comfortable, familiar, and part of a default teaching style that we readily take for granted. Most adults do not go on to become teachers, but they do expect their children's teachers to act as their own teachers did. Those adults who do become teachers or teacher educators

spontaneously act as their own teachers did and, if asked to change these behaviours, quickly discover that changes are not easy. Changing one's default teaching behaviours is no easier in a teacher education classroom than in a school or university classroom generally.

Darling-Hammond (2006) describes three major problems associated with learning to teach:

1. The problem of the "apprenticeship of observation" (pp. 35-37).
2. The problem of enactment (pp. 37-38).
3. The problem of complexity (pp. 38-40).

She then suggests seven components of powerful teacher education programs, four of which strike me as particularly important and indicative of the challenges associated with creating powerful teacher education:

- "A common, clear vision of good teaching permeates all course-work and clinical experiences."
- "Well-defined standards of practice and performance are used to guide and evaluate coursework and clinical work."
- Explicit strategies help students (1) confront their own deep-seated beliefs and assumptions about learning and students and (2) learn about the experiences of people different from themselves."
- "Strong relationships, common knowledge, and shared beliefs link school- and university-based faculty." (p. 40)

The ways that I think about my preservice physics methods course and practicum supervision have developed dramatically since reading this reminder of the importance of the prior knowledge (acquired subconsciously in the apprenticeship of observation) that prospective teachers bring to the opening of a preservice program. Prospective teachers could not be further from the status of "blank slates," and yet they often see themselves as knowing little or nothing about teaching and learning. Often their courses teach them as though they knew very little. If we are to preach active learning methods and constructivist perspectives, then we must challenge candidates' existing assumptions explicitly, and we must be explicit about how and why we are creating active learning experiences from which they can build their own skills and understandings of such methods.

Can Learning in a Teacher Education Program be "Powerful"?

In *Powerful Learning: What We Know about Teaching for Understanding*, Darling-Hammond et al. (2008) present three "fundamental and well-established principles of learning that are particularly important for teaching" (p. 3):

1. Students' prior knowledge "must be addressed if teaching is to be effective." (p. 3)
2. "Students need to organize and use knowledge conceptually if they are to apply it beyond the classroom." (p. 4)
3. "Students learn more effectively if they understand how they learn and how to manage their own learning." (p. 4)

While these principles are presented with reference to students who are learning in schools, these same principles seem particularly relevant to teacher education classrooms and to any efforts to reform our preservice programs. The prior knowledge of teacher candidates that must be addressed if our teaching is to be effective is the knowledge acquired in their apprenticeships of observation, yet it is only too easy to ignore that prior knowledge because addressing it is difficult and unfamiliar and also because there is so much that teacher candidates seem to want to be told. Teacher candidates often return from practicum experiences with concerns about the complexity of applying what they believed they had learned in teacher education classrooms, in part because they are working in someone else's classroom but also in part because organizing and using knowledge about teaching *conceptually* is not something that teacher educators tend to focus on. Finally, teacher candidates who have just completed an undergraduate degree tend to have little understanding of their learning and how to manage it, and teacher educators tend to be poorly prepared to help them improve that understanding. Darling-Hammond et al. (2006, p. 5) summarize matters as follows:

Studies consistently find that highly effective teachers support the process of meaningful learning by:

- Creating ambitious and meaningful tasks that reflect how knowledge is used in the field
- Engaging students in active learning, so that they apply and test what they know
- Drawing connections to students' prior knowledge and experiences
- Diagnosing student understanding in order to scaffold the learning process step by step
- Assessing student learning continuously and adapting teaching to student needs
- Providing clear standards, constant feedback, and opportunities for work
- Encouraging strategic and metacognitive thinking, so that students can learn to evaluate and guide their own learning.

If we wish to create powerful learning experiences in our teacher education programs, these are the ideas that need to permeate the teaching we do in our teacher education classrooms. Few of us seem to be there yet.

As Teacher Educators, Are We Aware of Our Own Assumptions?

How much do we take for granted and accept without question about our own work in preservice programs? How often do we challenge our perceptions of our own work and test our assumptions about what our teacher candidates are learning in our classes? As teacher educators, we are committed to improving teaching and learning in our schools, but are our premises really that different from those dominant in society generally? Did moving into a faculty of education magically transform our thinking, or do we still work with the assumptions that develop by observing teachers from kindergarten through graduate school?

Given today's primary focus on how much *research* faculty members conduct and publish, how many of us work in a context where the focus on research is balanced by a significant amount of time devoted to the issue of *how we teach*? I fear that most of us are working in a research-based environment in which teaching is something to be dealt with quickly so that we can return to our research and publications. Does our research address topics related to how individuals learn to teach?

Are we as critical of ourselves as we tend to be of the schools to which we send candidates for their practicum experiences? Teacher educators often speak of changes needed in the classrooms where candidates teach during practicum placements. How often do we look closely and carefully at the interaction in our own teacher education classrooms? Are we really better in some significant

way than the schools we tend to criticize, those schools that in turn tend to criticize us for being theoretical, out of touch, and irrelevant? How motivated do teacher candidates feel in their education classes? When teacher candidates report that students in practicum schools seem bored and uninterested in learning, do we ask ourselves if it is possible that activities and assignments in our teacher education courses might leave our students bored and uninterested in learning?

How Well Do We Understand the Uniqueness of Teacher Education?

In a chapter on “the peculiar problems of preparing teachers,” Labaree (2004) seeks

to demonstrate the enormous complexity of teaching and the extraordinary challenge of trying to teach people to teach well. The idea is to throw into sharp perspective the chasm between the simplistic perception of teaching and teacher education (held by both the public and the prospective teacher) and the reality of these forms of professional practice.... Teacher candidates quickly discover the complexities of the task of teaching after they spend a little time in charge of their own classroom. And if they choose to rise to the challenge, if they strive to teach effectively rather than merely to replicate the traditional forms of teaching behavior learned during their lengthy apprenticeship of observation, they find themselves wrestling with the multitude of pedagogical dilemmas described here. (p. 59)

He concludes the chapter with another important point:

The special expertise of teachers is not the subject matter of the curriculum but the capacity to teach others how to learn this subject matter. And by extension, the special expertise of teacher educators is not disciplinary knowledge but the capacity to teach others how to teach this knowledge effectively. (p. 60)

In the final chapter of his book, Labaree summarizes the situation in which departments, schools and faculties of education find themselves:

The good news about ed schools is that they are not powerful enough to do much harm to American education, despite all the heinous crimes that are often attributed to them. But the bad news is that they are also not powerful enough to do much good for a system of schooling that could really use their help.... The central functions of the research-oriented ed school—teacher education, knowledge production, and researcher training—are extraordinarily difficult, and thus it is not surprising, though nonetheless disappointing, that the ed school does not carry them out very well. (p. 194).

A report from the National Academy of Education (1999) contains several novel statements that also challenge our traditional thinking about teacher education. The following quotation, the first of three, rejects teaching practitioners in ways that we reject for the teaching of children.

For the most part we have treated the intersection of research and practice as one in which researchers transmit the products of research to practitioners. This situation is ironic, for we know that the transmission model does not work for the education of children. Why, then, do we think that it should work for the education of practitioners? (p. 31)

Later in the same report, the contributors reject an implicit premise of preservice teacher education that new teachers can and should be trained fully before they begin to practice (and learn from experience). Because we see clearly the communal norms for teachers in schools, teacher educators often act as though we are capable of protecting new teachers from those norms.

We do understand that the norms of communities of professional practice can stymie efforts to educate teachers to teach differently. The assumption that professionals get trained for their work before they start, and then just do what they have been trained to do, is false. People always learn in their activity, however it is arranged. But their learning does not necessarily develop the complex abilities needed for effective practice. Instead, people can develop strategies of coping superficially with the requirements of work without personal engagement in the activity. For example, teachers can learn in practice not to expect all students to achieve high standards. We must figure out how to organize practice to produce the more desirable outcome of high expectations for all and the sense of efficacy that accompanies it. (p. 75, italics added)

Finally, the report alludes to the familiar epistemology of schooling, which it sets within the default model of learning to teach. This view is rejected as both inaccurate and inadequate.

The simple model of learning to teach that has dominated both the design of teacher education and the conduct of research on teacher change is that knowledge goes in during teacher education and professional development and then comes out to be used in classrooms. Conventional schooling, from kindergarten through [university], teaches us that knowledge is lodged in textbooks, experts, and people with more experience. It comes in the form of rules, definitions, and facts that are to be remembered, practiced, and applied. Being a good learner means learning the rules well and applying them appropriately.

Such assumptions about learning are at odds with what we know about the role of knowledge in the activities of teaching. We reject the notion that being able to teach competently transfers easily from one context to another.... Constructing knowledge in the context in which it needs to be used is an essential aspect of teaching, and one must be attentive to the consequences of action and prepared to make speedy shifts of direction. When an appreciation for this kind of deliberate action is absent, the connection between knowing and doing is truncated to the “application of theory to practice” or the enactment of learned technical skills. It is not professional development. (p. 77)

How we teach teachers seems to be both the heart of the matter and the invisible issue. It is only too common and easy for teacher education to focus on teaching behaviours and what are often referred to as best practices. We may then assume that we can foster good teaching by telling new teachers about good teaching behaviours. Yet the ultimate goal for teacher educators and teacher candidates alike is to develop the most productive learning possible for those we teach. Hiebert, Morris, Berk, & Jansen (2007) present a refreshing case for a shift in focus in teacher education:

The goal of teaching is to support student learning. It is hard to imagine teachers becoming more effective over time without being able to analyze teaching in terms of its effects on student learning. What did students learn, and how and why did instruction influence such learning? How could lessons based on this information be revised to be more effective when teaching them next time? *We propose that assessing whether students achieve clear learning goals and specifying how and why instruction did or did not affect this achievement lies at*

the heart of learning to teach from studying teaching. This kind of analysis is different than that which focuses on particular features of teaching or behaviors of teachers, such as asking higher order questions or managing discourse. We propose that focusing on students' learning and explaining such learning (or its absence) in terms of instructional episodes provides a targeted but comprehensive and systematic path to becoming an effective teacher over time. (p. 48, italics added)

Now consider Nuthall's (2005) insights into the complexity of determining what students are learning. His comments also illustrate the risks of focusing on procedures for teaching rather than on what students are learning as a result of a given procedure. These risks are just as possible in teacher education classrooms as in classrooms in elementary and secondary schools and in universities generally.

Teachers are forced to rely on secondary indicators such as the visible signs that students are motivated and interested. They are sustained, however, by the commonly held belief that if students are engaged most of the time in appropriate activities, some kind of learning will be taking place. For example, the class brainstorm is a typical ritualized classroom routine. It is carried out in the belief that a brainstorm is a good way to find out what students know about a topic and is used in the constructivist classroom as the basis for further activities (e.g., Roth, 2001). The brainstorm is a teacher-led whole-class routine that is initiated by the teacher's asking the students to share the ideas they have about a topic. Typically, a few students contribute the majority of the ideas, a few more students contribute one or two ideas, and most students are silent. Most teachers (and most observers) are convinced that if this routine is followed faithfully, it is an effective way of finding out what all the students know. In fact, teachers depend on the responses of a small number of key students as indicators and remain ignorant of what most of the class knows and understands (A. L. Cole, 1988; Dahllöf, 1967; Sahlstrom & Lindblad, 1998). So long as ritualized routines, like the brainstorm, are recognized by teachers (and the society at large) as the right way to run classrooms and students have learned to play, and accept without question, the reciprocal roles that these routines require, then teachers do not have to pay more than passing attention to the experiences of individual students. (p. 920)

The point of these lengthy quotations from a number of sources is to make visible some of the generally invisible features of teacher education, features that are invisible because it is so easy to take for granted that which has become so familiar over so many years in the role of student.

How Do We Think about the Reform Process?

How do we conceptualize the reform process in schools or in teacher education? Do we rely on some of the numerous principles for how change should happen, as suggested by a host of popular authors and speakers? Do we rely on authors who provide provocative perspectives on schools and teacher education? Decades ago, Sarason (1971) argued convincingly that the modal process of change is the same for schools and for universities. When change is attempted, a means to an end typically becomes an end in itself, and the original purpose of the change tends to be lost. After more than 30 years of writing about reform, Sarason concluded that reform was unlikely:

What finally convinced me was the recognition that no one—not teachers, not administrators, not researchers, not politicians or policymakers, and certainly not

students—willed the present state of affairs. *They were all caught up in a system that had no self-correcting features, a system utterly unable to create and sustain contexts of productive learning.... There are no villains. There is a system.* You can see and touch villains, you cannot see a system....

The reform movement has been about parts, not about the system, not about how the purposes of parts are at cross-purposes to each other, not about how the concept of purpose loses both meaning and force in a system that is amazingly uncoordinated and that has more adversarial than cooperative features. (Sarason, 1998, p. 141, italics added)

What should be the overarching purpose of schooling and, by extension, what should be the overarching purpose of teacher education? “I would want students to be motivated to learn more, to develop more, to experience personal and cognitive growth” (p. 142). Sarason goes on to suggest that the starting point for change should focus on the difference between contexts for productive and unproductive learning. To what extent do teacher candidates experience preservice classrooms as contexts for productive learning? How would we know? Sarason sees three features of a context for productive learning:

1. Recognizing and respecting the individuality of the learner.
2. The teacher knows the subject matter well enough to know when or where the learner may have difficulty.
3. The teacher is always seeking ways to stimulate and reinforce the learner’s wanting to learn and do more. (p. 143)

Nuthall offers a similar perspective about the significance of our own perceptions:

So long as we remain unaware of the extent to which our hidden culture determines how we practice, think about, and do research on teaching, attempts at reform are likely to be ineffective and we will remain locked in a system that inevitably produces failure and social inequality. (Nuthall, 2005, p. 896)

Since 1993 I have studied various aspects of my own practices in my teacher education classroom and as a practicum supervisor, encouraged by and often collaborating with other members of the American Educational Research Association’s special interest group on Self-Study of Teacher Education Practices and the more recent group formed within the Canadian Association for Teacher Education. The single most important lesson I have learned concerns the importance of listening to those I am teaching, taking every opportunity to learn what my students are learning in my teacher education classes and to understand the uniqueness of each new teacher in my class. A second important lesson is that I must always question my own assumptions and focus on the big picture of teaching people how to learn from their earliest teaching experiences. A book chapter with the title “How Experience Changed my Values as a Teacher Educator” (Russell, 2007) provides personal illustrations of these two lessons.

Is Preservice Teacher Education at Risk of Being a Pathologizing Practice?

Shields, Bishop and Mazawi (2005) have constructed a compelling account of ways in which deficit thinking perpetuates the marginalization of minority children. Their introduction of the idea of pathologizing practices might well be held up to the experiences of preservice teacher candidates:

In most schools, educators use teacher-dominant pedagogies that transmit that which is already defined by those in power as official knowledge. This dominance is supported by a process wherein students are passive recipients of knowledge-out-of-context (Applebee, 1996).... Applebee (1996) sees the teacher as the provider of predetermined knowledge; the student, the replicator. Applebee describes this pedagogic process as learning about, rather than participating in, the educational experience. Content is thus separated from the purposes of engaging the learner with learning. In other words, Applebee suggests that this process has allowed a group of “experts” to determine what students should know: content is divorced from the content-creating processes. In this way, the dominant discourse as to what constitutes official knowledge is perpetuated and unquestioned and students are compelled to learn about knowledge that is selected by other (powerful) people rather than encouraged to use their own ways of knowing.... Fundamental to the perpetuation of such knowledge-out-of-context approaches is the belief that the ways of knowing of the minoritized students are in fact not worthy of use or development. (pp. 13-14)

With their fundamental goal of fostering social justice, teacher educators would never consciously or deliberately view teacher candidates’ ways of thinking from a deficit perspective, any more than they would view marginalized children in such a way. Yet the description of the consequences of teacher-dominant pedagogies readily suggests features of the pedagogy of teacher education. Teacher educators know how to teach; many moved to preservice teacher education after years of successful teaching practice. In important ways, teacher candidates already know how to teach, yet their education classes and the supervision of their practice teaching can easily send messages that there is so much to learn that they soon believe that they know little or nothing about how to teach. Those interested in teacher education reform may benefit considerably from exploring the risk that teacher education includes pathologizing practices.

The Power of Explicit Modeling: Can We Collectively Develop a Pedagogy of Teacher Education?

In the following words, Loughran (2006) captured the complexity of the challenge we face as teacher educators:

In developing a pedagogy of teacher education, there is a crucial need to look beyond the ability to perform particular skills and procedures and to aim to critique and analyze the nature of practice in both teachers and students of teaching. Such a stance... requires a need to accept that it carries inherent vulnerability because learning through such means is a risky business. However, if teacher educators do not see teaching as comprising specialized skills, knowledge and practice; if there is not a serious commitment to confront one’s own assumptions in order to better align actions and beliefs; and, if the possibilities for understanding derived from experience are not purposefully sought and grasped, then there is little likelihood that teacher education will be more than the transmission of information about practice and the pursuit of technical competency. (p. 29)

More quickly than anything else, teacher candidates recognize when what we are doing as we teach them does not match what we are urging them to do when it is their turn to teach in their practicum placements. In my early years in preservice teacher education, my science methods classes joked about being lectured on the importance of teaching science by discovery. Today, my students speak

across all subjects about their frustration with lectures about the importance of not lecturing to high school students. Just as important as modeling what we recommend is explicitly unpacking our rationale for each particular way of teaching that we demonstrate. If teacher educators do not understand and achieve deliberate control over their own teaching practices, then we can hardly expect beginning teachers to do the same.

Conclusion

As long as there are schools and programs of teacher education, there will be calls for improvement and reform. What we do will never be good enough for everyone, but we must continue to try. My reading and teaching in recent years have led me to focus on the significance of our underlying assumptions about many aspects of teaching, learning, teacher education, and learning to teach. Often these assumptions are as invisible as the culture in which we live and work. As long as there are teacher education programs, they will fall short of our goals because most who participate in such programs have *little experience of learning from experience*. Going to school to learn how to teach is much like going to a driver education school to learn how to drive; it is the personal experience of teaching or driving that matters. The moment one steps to the front of the classroom to begin a lesson or sits behind the wheel of a car and moves into traffic, everything changes. We have watched teachers and drivers for years; we know what they do, but we do not yet know how to read the cascading signals from the classroom or highway environment quickly enough to decide what to do next. Learning to drive is often a cultural rite of passage, yet learning to teach is far more complex. Learning from experience is far more difficult as a teacher than as a driver; errors made in a car tend to have immediate consequences, while errors made in a classroom readily go unnoticed or unrecognized by both teachers and students.

I close with the following statements that serve to summarize some of the many reasons why teacher education reform is possible but not likely:

- Teacher candidates' initial conceptions of *what they need to learn* and *how they will learn* must be addressed directly, along with those of teacher educators.
- Listening to teacher candidates—actively, responsively, frequently, and explicitly—is a crucial element in any attempt to reform preservice teacher education.
- Teacher education reform seems *highly unlikely* until teacher educators work together to explore and critique their own assumptions and premises about how they try to help others learn to teach.
- Calls for reform and recipes for educational change have not created significant reform. Reform is a way of life for teacher educators, yet little changes because we are lost in a system that is largely invisible.
- Teacher education reform is unlikely until we identify, understand, and move beyond our unquestioned perceptions and perspectives.
- Challenging ourselves to create contexts for productive learning in our own teacher education classrooms is a powerful way to begin to reform teacher education.

Perhaps it is time to move beyond talking about reform in teacher education. We have seen much more talk than reform, and the complaints about the nature and quality of teacher education do not seem to be fading away. Just like teachers in schools, teacher educators are trying their best. Perhaps it is time to try to change ourselves instead of trying to find the perfect program structure or the

perfect classrooms for practicum placements or the perfect people to enter our programs. Perhaps we have been missing the big picture of what learning to teach really involves. Perhaps we need to return to our own apprenticeships of observation, to identify our assumptions grounded not in research but in the practices that were modeled for us when we were students in schools, university and graduate school.

References

- Darling-Hammond, L. (2006). *Powerful teacher education: Lessons from exemplary programs*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Barron, B., Pearson, P. D., Schoenfeld, A. H., Stage, E. K., Zimmerman, T. D., Cervetti, G. N., & Tilson, J. L. (2008). *Powerful learning: What we know about teaching for understanding*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Flanders, N. A. (1970). *Analyzing teaching behavior*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Hiebert, J., Morris, A. K., Berk, D., & Jansen, A. (2007). Preparing teachers to learn from teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 58, 47-61.
- Labaree, D. F. (1998). Educational researchers: Living with a lesser form of knowledge. *Educational Researcher*, 27(8), 4-12.
- Labaree, D. F. (2004). *The trouble with ed schools*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Lortie, D. C. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Loughran, J. (2006). *Developing a pedagogy of teacher education: Understanding teaching and learning about teaching*. London: Routledge.
- Loughran, J., & Russell, T. (2007). Beginning to understand teaching as a discipline. *Studying Teacher Education*, 3, 217-227.
- National Academy of Education. (1999). *Recommendations regarding research priorities: An advisory report to the National Educational Research Policy and Priorities Board*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved February 19, 2009, from http://www.naeducation.org/Research_Priorities_Publication.pdf
- Nuthall, G. (2005). The cultural myths and realities of classroom teaching and learning: A personal journey. *Teachers College Record*, 107, 895-934.
- Russell, T. (2007). How experience changed my values as a teacher educator. In T. Russell & J. Loughran (Eds.), *Enacting a pedagogy of teacher education: Values, relationships and practices* (pp. 182-191). London: Routledge.
- Sarason, S. B. (1971). *The culture of the school and the problem of change*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Sarason, S. B. (1998). *Political leadership and educational failure*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Shields, C. M., Bishop, R., & Mazawi, A. E. (2005). *Pathologizing practices: The impact of deficit thinking on education*. New York: Peter Lang.

CATE/ACFE Keynote Address 2006

*Teacher Education as Uneven Development:
Toward a Psychology of Uncertainty*

Deborah P. Britzman
(York University)

presented at

York University
28 May 2006

Introduction to the 2006 Address

Deborah Britzman deconstruct the myth of development that presupposes a chronology from immaturity to maturity. More generally, she suggests that this imagined march of progress serves as a foundational wish for any education that is at once defined as the movement from ignorance to knowledge. The wish serves to defend against the problem of regression, hatred, and not learning from experience. She proposes a view of development as uneven and as “out of joint,” made stranger by the postmodern university where teacher education occurs. Britzman then considers development as a problem of trying to know the mind that resists being known, as responsibility for the other, and as capable of containing frustration, or experience. To make this argument, she juxtaposes three views of development that center the question of uncertainty and unevenness: William James the psychologist who focused on the mind; Hannah Arendt, the philosopher who focused on the world; and Wilfred Bion, the psychoanalyst, who focused on affective relationships. With these views, she proposes an ethics of teacher education.

A revised version of this address was published under the same title in *The International Journal of Leadership in Education: Theory and Practice*, Vol. 10:1 (2007):1-12. Then, an even longer version is found in Britzman, D. *The Very Thought of Education: Psychoanalysis and the Impossible Professions* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2009)

Deborah Britzman is Distinguished Research Professor in the Faculty of Education at York University working in the area of psychoanalysis and education. She is author of five books: *Lost Subjects, Contested Objects: Toward a Psychoanalytic Inquiry of Learning* (Albany: SUNY Press, 1998), *Practice Makes Practice: A Critical Study of Learning to Teach*, revised edition (Albany: SUNY Press, 2003), *After-Education: Anna Freud, Melanie Klein and Psychoanalytic Histories of Learning* (Albany: SUNY Press, 2003), *Novel Education: Psychoanalytic Studies of Learning and Not Learning* (NY: Peter Lang Press, 2006), and *The Very Thought of Education: Psychoanalysis and the Impossible Professions* (Albany: SUNY Press, 2009). Her current book project is an introduction to Freud and education.

Note d'introduction à la conférence de 2006

Dans le cadre de cette présentation, Deborah Britzman déconstruit le mythe du développement qui présuppose l'idée d'une chronologie allant de l'immaturation à la maturité. D'une manière plus générale, elle suggère que cette idée de progression est à la base d'une conception selon laquelle toute éducation se définit comme un processus où l'individu passe d'un état d'ignorance à un état de connaissance. Cette idée a l'intérêt de masquer les problèmes de régression, de haine ou liés au fait que l'individu peut ne pas apprendre de ses expériences. Britzman propose plutôt de considérer le développement comme un phénomène irrégulier, inégal, rendu plus étrange encore par l'université

postmoderne où a lieu la formation des enseignants. L'auteure estime qu'il faut plutôt aborder la question du développement en considérant la difficulté d'accéder à un esprit qui ne résiste à se laisser appréhender, la responsabilité aussi envers l'autre. Pour soutenir cette perspective, Britzman juxtapose trois le point de vue de trois auteurs qui se sont intéressés à l'incertitude et à l'irrégularité : William James le psychologue qui s'intéresse à l'esprit; Hannah Arendt, la philosophe qui réfléchit sur le monde; et Wilfred Bion, le psychanalyste qui se centre sur les relations affectives. À partir des ces trois points de vue, elle propose une éthique de la formation des enseignants.

Une version révisée de ce discours a été publiée sous le même titre dans *The International Journal of Leadership in Education: Theory and Practice*, Vol. 10:1 (2007):1-12. Une version plus longue se trouve dans Britzman, D. *The Very Thought of Education: Psychoanalysis and the Impossible Professions* (Albany: State University of New York Press, In Press).

Deborah Britzman est Professeure de recherche distinguée à la Faculté d'éducation de l'Université York où elle travaille dans le domaine de la psychanalyse et de l'éducation. Elle est l'auteure de cinq livres : *Lost Subjects, Contested Objects: Toward a Psychoanalytic Inquiry of Learning* (Albany: SUNY Press, 1998), *Practice Makes Practice: A Critical Study of Learning to teach, revised edition* (Albany: SUNY Press, 2003), *After-Education: Anna Freud, Melanie Klein and Psychoanalytic histories of Learning* (Albany: SUNY Press, 2003), *Novel Education: Psychoanalytic Studies of Learning and not learning* (NY: Peter Lang Press, 2006), et *The Very Thought of Education: Psychoanalysis and the Impossible Professions* (Albany: SUNY Press, 2009). Elle travaille actuellement à la préparation d'un ouvrage présentant les travaux de Freud en rapport avec l'éducation.

CATE / ACFE 2006

Keynote Address

Teacher Education as Uneven Development: Toward a Psychology of Uncertainty

Deborah P. Britzman
York University

I

If we speak of development as a progression from immaturity to maturity, as a property of the individual, we are apt to miss the fact of development as our human condition. We are likely to forget that all of us are subject to the radical uncertainty of being with others in common and uncommon history, and this being with other beings makes development uneven and uncertain.

As for teacher education, when we speak of development there, rarely do we begin within development's quandaries. We still manage to approach development as if it is a correction for childhood. Our inquiries have not thought the problem of our childhood's strange duration: how, even compulsively, when faced with new and familiar events, whatever our age, our time repeats old conflicts. We may speak of development as an overcoming conflict, but not as conflict itself. We may agree that others develop, but rarely do we wonder how our own development affects our educational imagination. Nor do we tend to think of development as composing and revising a history of learning to live with others, or that our time of development contains a tendency to repeat, regress, and fixate upon moments of breakdown or gratification. And we assume that development in teacher education is unaffected by the social fact of having to be educated. However our front door discourses of teacher education protect us from these unwieldy matters, remnants of our childhood slip in through the backdoor of our theories of teaching and learning. Today, I invite you to consider areas of development in our field that remain conceptually underdeveloped.

Our opening problem is this: we have grown up in schools, have spent our childhood and adolescence observing teachers and our peers, and when we enter the field of teacher education, this avalanche of experience we have undergone, made from schooling, confirms itself. (Britzman, 2003; 2006). Growing up in education permeates our meanings of education and learning; it lends commotion to our anticipations for and judgements toward the self and our relations with others. It makes us suspicious of what we have not experienced and lends nostalgia to what has been missed. Simply put, our sense of self and our sense of the world are profoundly affected by having to grow

up in school. And this means that both the experience we have *and* the having of experience are problems of education. As much as the field of teacher education represses this peculiar childhood of education, the repressed returns.

The great repression of teacher education returns as paradox: newcomers learning to teach enter teacher education looking backward on their years of school experience and project it into the present. Teacher educators greet these newcomers as if they lack school experience and have no past. Both hold tight to deeply ingrained fantasies of education, playing out their childhoods through the idea of the teacher. They already know about good and bad students. Implicitly, the structure and ethos of teacher education rely on our childhood view: this oddly resistant childhood is cast in cement with the mantra, “we learn from experience.” So what can development actually mean when we cannot seem to leave our childhood of education? How is our field capable of changing itself, of developing responsibility for its representations, if everyone involved in teacher education was once a child who grew up in school and so relies on their childhood archive of education?

To look deeper into these quandaries, let us consider our beginnings through a radical claim, belonging to a psychoanalyst of development. Winnicott (1960/1996) proposed that “there is no such thing as an infant” (p. 39). He did so to remind his colleagues the infant comes with caregivers, then toys and other objects that make an infant. Our infancy is made as a relation to others. In this spirit, let us suppose there is no such thing as development, unless, of course, we can begin to conceptualize real and fantasied relationships, institutions, practices, culture, other minds, and education. There is no such thing as development unless we can begin thinking with what Winnicott (1970) called in another context, “the fact of dependence” (p. 83). If the question of development means there are always others because of the fact of dependence, then we cannot really think about development without also considering relations of responsibility. My position is that there is no such thing as teacher education without us creating the conditions to tolerate and value the uncertainty of development as a strange and even alienating resource for understanding the great conflicts our field absorbs, creates, and lives within. And, we should recall that there has always been great debate on the status of uncertainty in the helping professions.

In an age when we worry about essentialism, our debates have stalled with the question of what should count as essential in teacher education. And it should not escape us that these conflicts over the basics mirror larger public anxieties over the education of children, youth, and university students. Here is where our field is conditioned: because schooling is a mass experience, because we humans have to have education, we are all experts at knowing what has been missed or what we should have had more of, or of what went perfectly, and what we anticipate as going wrong. We become experts in lack. But this makes our expertise into a defence against all that is uncertain about our profession. We seem to experience amnesia here because if, in our early years, we once entered schools as frightened strangers and confronted this new place as utterly strange, by the time we leave, we have turned ourselves into anthropological informants, experts with our own experience, eager to share and even impose this experience onto others. Somehow the having of experience dulls our thinking. Somehow, the uncertainty that is our beginning has become predicable and routine. And somehow, we have forgotten our human condition as strangers.

I think we come to the heart of the matter when we turn to existential debates. Many years ago Maxine Greene (1973) named the teacher “as stranger.” She proposed the teacher as an incomplete project, as unfinished, as in the process of becoming a teacher with others. If the teacher chooses to become a critical subject, she supposed, what is critical only emerges when the teacher understands herself or himself as subject to uncertainty. Uncertainty resides within the acts of a self committed to becoming.

Greene imagined teacher education not through debates on proper preparation but as philosophy in the making. Her address to learning links freedom to our courage: “If he can learn to

do philosophy, he may liberate himself for understanding and choosing. He may liberate himself for reflective action as someone who knows who he is as a historical being, acting on his freedom, trying each day to be” (p. 7). The teacher’s unfinished work is to understand her representations of education as a project of learning to live with others. Existentially, development is uneven and uncertain because it is always affected by the question of freedom.

To analyse our existential dilemmas of learning I turn first to ideas from two philosophers who addressed, in different times, problems in conceptualizing development in teacher education: William James, whose psychology of teaching and learning ushered in the twentieth century, and Hannah Arendt, whose philosophy of the crisis of education occurs in the midst of the twentieth century. Later, I will bring their concerns into tension with what the psychoanalyst Wilfred Bion called, “not learning from experience” and his alienating assumption that there is a hatred of development. I’ll conclude with observations on our current context— the postmodern university—and the problem this untimely time leaves us to think when we think about our uncertain conditions in teacher education. For now, I use the work of James and Arendt to set the stage for understanding the grand meta-narratives in teacher education. Their work brings us to a problem that is beyond the childhood of education and that our childhood also presupposes, namely development as uncertainty, as subject to the fact of dependency and as an ongoing question of ethics and responsibility.

Some of you may wonder what the pragmatist James and the critical theorist Arendt had in common. For a brief moment in their long careers they shared an object of inquiry, namely the education of educators. They had, as their collective concern, the teacher’s responsibility for her and his own learning. They entered into discussions of this responsibility from different vantage—for James it was psychology and for Arendt, political thought; for James it was the nature of the inner world and for Arendt, the relation between adult and child; for James education confronted the problem of instinctual life, and for Arendt, education is lost and found in the world of others. Arendt posed education as a problem of commitment and social responsibility and as animating and deadening relations of self and other. James entered the problem with his question of the teacher’s passion. Together, they propose existential difficulties faced when the teacher chooses an education that is not yet present. Their sense of both psychology and social thought is neither solipsistic nor altruistic. In other words, these thinkers go beyond the great binary that catches short our educational imagination: whether teacher education should be focussed on knowing thyself or dedicating one’s life to others. Indeed, this divide forecloses the existential question the teacher confronts: what is it to choose uncertainty?

II

Around 1906 William James was invited to address the newly formed Department of Education at Harvard University. It was a heady time when the education of children became linked to the university’s responsibility for the education of teachers and when the profession of education itself became tied, simultaneously, to the vicissitudes of compulsory schooling and the university. Already James (1890/1950) was a famous psychologist, known for his two volume work *The Principles of Psychology* which outlined an orientation to understanding the nature of the human mind. In his view, understanding the human mind was the grand theme of and challenge to the new field of teacher education. And when he talked to teachers, he counselled that in trying to understand the human mind, there would be confusion and resistance to understanding. For example, James (1899/1983) suggests, we might hold a mistaken view of childhood and render it so simple that we ourselves would see childhood as something to master, something one leaves behind. We might feel the child’s mind as empty, as in need, and as something only to be instructed. We might take away the very

mind we are trying to communicate with. And if that happens, James suggests, we lose our own minds as well.

Trying to write about the mind was also a problem. In his lumbering two volumes on psychology, James (1890/1950) felt that his topic—the idea that “thoughts and feelings exist and are vehicles of knowledge” (p. vi) was almost impossible to write about without drowning in metaphysics and having to wrestle with the question of the soul. There would be no end point. Additionally, the metaphysics of the soul can only gesture toward a radical uncertainty and the limits of knowledge. This problem concludes the first chapter of his *Principles* when James writes: “The boundary line of the mental is certainly vague” (p. 6). James then advises readers to skip those few chapters that mire themselves in metaphysics. He warns his readers about what will happen to them as they begin a gigantic chapter in his second volume: “Chapter 20, on Space-perception, is a terrible thing. . .” (p. v). And indeed he is right, at least to this reader, for the avalanche of material presented threatens to crash into a thousand tiny thoughts as he winds his way through the maze of the psychology of perception, sensation, and cognition. He finds himself in a philosophical debate: Does the object world create understanding or does our mind create the world? Do we receive meaning from experience or does the meaning we make create what we represent as experience? That we want to know the nature of reality and our responsibility to it, he seems to imply, is why we have our own speculative psychology.

James’ *Principles of Psychology* discusses such things as instinct, habits, attention, memory, association, apperception, and the will. His interest was in specifying the design and force of mental acts. He wished to clarify what happens to perception when the human represents the world. And he wondered how ideas affect the mind and how the mind affects or metabolizes ideas. Metaphysics are not far behind, and this frustrates the pragmatist James. Perhaps he surprised himself when he wrote into unanswerable questions: What is indelible about experience? What makes us human? And then, what is the nature of consciousness and its experience? He could not differentiate between our capacity to doubt the mind and our mind’s creation of its own doubts. Can unanswerable questions, he wondered, matter to how we understand how the human learns?

James (1899/1983) revised these cumbersome volumes when he brought his psychology to those learning to teach. In my view, he had the good sense to leave out Chapter 20 and condense his meandering psychology into some short lectures. The book that resulted has a lovely title, *Talks to Teachers on Psychology and to Students on Some of Life’s Ideals*. His method was introspection, and he took the phenomenological approach. He will create the experience of the mind that he will then represent. He will posit the teacher’s mind before there is a teacher. He will concern himself with the Other and insist on the limits of our knowledge. He will posit a pedagogical orientation to his notion of mind and create new approaches to everyday problems. And he will present consciousness as continuous, as consciousness of something.

James’s big idea is that what is basic to the teacher’s education is her or his understanding of what other people are like. People are not static entities waiting to be taught so that they can then learn in an orderly fashion. They are difficult to know because they have their own minds. Moreover, the mind works through the stream of consciousness, through association, and so it is always in motion. The mind will not hold still. This complexity, he said, will be an obstacle to education. For if attention is always fleeting attention, awareness of this psychology makes the teacher’s work difficult. Still, the teacher’s work develops from trying to learn what the student is like while attempting to interest her or his attention. Conflicts then are the heart of this relation, and James, ever the pragmatist, blasted away at the romance of what he called, “a soft pedagogy”:

We have of late been hearing much of the philosophy of tenderness in education; ‘interest’ must be assiduously awakened in everything, difficulties must be smoothed

away. Soft pædagogics have taken the place of the old steep and rocky path to learning. But from this lukewarm air the bracing oxygen of effort is left out. It is nonsense to suppose every step in education can be interesting. The fighting impulse must be appealed to. Make the pupil feel ashamed of being scared at fractions, of being ‘downed’ by the law of falling bodies; rouse his pugnacity and pride, and he will rush at the difficult places with a sort of inner wrath at himself that is one of his best moral faculties. (James, 1899/1983, pp. 41-42)

At the heart of education James placed the problem of fear and asked the teacher to know how to use it. He was not afraid to suggest the need for the teacher’s authority. He had the courage to destroy the teacher’s illusion that somehow education will be a smooth affair if only the right technique could be applied. The mind that knows, he warns, resists being known.

Perhaps his cautions allowed second thoughts about this “soft pedagogy” since he returns to reformulate it. He tries for some clarification: “Elicit interest from within, by the warmth with which you care for the topic yourself. . .” (p. 72). The problem, it turns out, is with the teacher’s passion, with what the teacher cares about when the teacher cares about the student’s interests. The mind is, after all, an inter-subjective relation, not an ideal or a thing to fill with knowledge. Good night Descartes: even as we need our own mind to know this, there is no mind without the other’s mind. There is no passion without the other’s passion. One more turn will be made. Near the end of these lectures James will say that what makes life significant includes insignificance. So there are no promises for the future, and there is no future without conflict and questions. Education, he implies, requires the courage for making ideas un-habitual. Education, he implies, defamiliarizes our suppositions. Education, we might say, makes us strangers for there is nothing more strange and even estranging than trying to understand the Other’s mind.

Almost sixty years later, the philosopher Hannah Arendt (1961/1993) considered education not from the artistic problem of attitude but from the social vantage of its crisis. She joined the problem of education to larger cultural and historic changes still being worked through today. And she almost apologized for doing so, insisting that she entered the debate of education only as a philosopher-stranger, not as an educator.

Arendt, too, considered the special characteristics of the child, but rather than specify psychological processes, as James did, she confronted the existential problem of having to be educated and the teacher’s responsibility for this fact of dependency. She saw the child as a newcomer to the world, as a stranger to those already in the world. The child, a new human being, is in the process of becoming human. The child, in other words, begins with an uncertain relation to the world of others and to life itself. For Arendt, this meant that the teacher has a difficult responsibility: Teachers, because they greet children into the world they already live, must take responsibility for the world that the child could not have made. Both must choose history. Arendt puts the paradox boldly: “The teacher’s qualification consists in knowing the world and being able to instruct others about it, but his authority rests on his assumption of responsibility for that world” (p. 189). Like James, qualifications and authority are two different matters. Unlike James, there is a political problem. Teachers are responsible for the world they live in, even if they have not made this world. The teacher’s authority will be linked to knowing the world and taking responsibility for it. The responsibility is paradoxical, and it raises another dimension of dependency. The teacher is responsible for a world they did not make, and choosing responsibility means they are dependent on both the world and on the new relation with the child. Neither qualification nor authority will tell one how this occurs.

To understand the depth of this ethical quandary of authority as responsibility for the world they live in but have not made, Arendt turns to literature and quotes Shakespeare’s *Hamlet*. Hamlet

complained about existence as such when he said: “The time is out of joint. O cursed spite that ever I was born to set it right” (p. 192). Arendt’s conclusion still stuns: “Basically we are always educating for a world that is or is becoming out of joint, for this is the basic human situation, in which the world is created by mortal hands to serve mortals for a limited time as home. Because the world is made by mortals it wears out and because it continually changes its inhabitants it runs the risk of becoming as mortal as they” (p. 192). Here is where the tragic and the potential meet. We are always educating for a world in crisis, a world that is a human world and so will, like the human, wear out. What renews this world are those just entering. Arendt’s idea is that the essential relation of education is determined by what she calls our natality: that we are born and that others welcome us in our absolute dependency. Our mortality means that we are also responsible for making room for the new. Arendt is careful in what she supposes the teacher’s work entails: teachers are obligated to tell the students what the world is like, not to instruct them in the art of living. It boils down to our attitude toward the fact of natality. And everything is at stake: “Education,” Arendt writes, “is the point at which we decide whether we love the world enough to assume responsibility for it. . .” (p. 196).

As you may hear in both James and Arendt, when it comes to education, what is essential is the crisis of education. The time of education is always out of joint because of the nature of the mind, because of the nature of the world, because of the nature of dependency, and because of the nature of responsibility. Many years later, Derrida (1994), too, will ruminate on this problem of our out of joint time by attending to two of its disjunctures: that of injustice, as Hamlet felt when he felt he was being asked to choose his becoming and the disjuncture presented by the other, the disjunction of difference Derrida also called justice. Derrida, too, will speak of justice without condition, linking responsibility for the other to “hospitality without reserve” (p. 65). The hospitality without reserve will take responsibility for the stranger.

There is no conclusion for responsibility. And Arendt considers education as presenting a difficult choice between loving and hating the world, between the work of setting it right and the sadness incurred with the knowledge that the world wears out. I think this choice characterizes the existential problem of teacher education and raises the problem of a psychoanalytic psychology of uncertainty. We must now step back into the subject. Which choice did teacher educators face when they were children in schools? Did they have teachers who accepted responsibility for a world they did not make? Did their teachers love the fact of natality and so show themselves unafraid of dependency, helplessness and so the unpredictability of life? Did their teachers wonder about what the child’s mind was like? Or, did their education wear out before its own time?

III

So far, I have been sketching an ethics of teacher development. With James and Arendt I have proposed the problem of teacher education as trying to understand and address the mind of the Other and doing so in a way that the teacher is taking responsibility for both a mind they have not made and a world they have not made. With the help of Winnicott, I have also described the concept of development from the vantage of its uneven and uncertain qualities because of its relation to our fact of dependency. And I have posed a paradox from which teacher education operates: that we grow up in school and that we return there as adults, that we bring to teacher education our own history of learning, only to meet the teacher educator’s history of learning. I now turn to a psychology of uncertainty with the help of the psychoanalyst Wilfred Bion. Unlike James, who saw consciousness as continuous, Bion insisted on the problem of discontinuity through the psychoanalytic idea of the unconscious. That is, being itself is constituted through conflictive mental

structures that cannot know its own representations but nonetheless represents its distortions.

Here is the example. Education wears out not only because we are mortal but also because there is a hatred of learning from experience. And the way this hatred of learning plays out in our field resides in the terrible fact that many teachers hate their own teacher education. They convey their disgust to those newly arrived who undergo their own teacher education. They may have hated the dependency that also characterizes learning to teach. They may have forgotten the fact of natality, or that they are responsible for a world they have not made. Teachers may say to newcomers: “My teacher education was irrelevant, the real experience is here in my classroom, and theory is not useful.” Teachers and student teachers may believe that the university idealizes theory and ignores school constraints. Let me put the problem of what inhibits responsibility for the world one has not made in the strongest way I can: teacher education is a hated field; no teacher really loves her or his own teacher education. They may soften this rage without a thought by saying, “They didn’t prepare me for the uncertainty.”

What are we to make of this? The psychoanalyst Wilfred Bion has argued that there is a hatred of development, a hatred of learning because learning, for the adult, means thinking about one’s painful emotional experience of helplessness, dependency, and frustration. Bion (1961/1994) will name this frustration “experience,” and in his discussion of group psychology he will posit “a hatred of learning from experience” (p. 86). Oddly, this hatred emerges from the need for security that scaffolds basic assumptions which protect the group from the insecurity of experience. Keep in mind that Bion defines experience as frustration because experience cannot be known in advance, and even while undergone there is a kernel of unthinkability. In Bion’s view there are only two ways to deal with the frustration that uncertainty or not knowing creates. One can evacuate these feelings and consider the world of strangers as the source of distress. These evacuated feelings will destroy reality and the group’s capacity to think. The other way of experiencing frustration is to try to think about it, even if it means thinking about what one does not know. One thinks about frustration to modify it and to contain it. One learns with others to tolerate the frustration of having to learn from experience.

What exactly then is learning? For Bion learning is an emotional acceptance of our ignorance. Learning means understanding that knowledge does not exhaust what is unknowable, that we act from not understanding. We may then become receptive to what has not been thought or understood without evacuating the uncertainty. Here is where responsibility emerges. Reality becomes larger not smaller. Bion (1962/1994) defines learning this way:

Learning depends on the capacity for the container [by which he means the capacity to hold doubt and not knowing without evacuating the bad feelings this involves] to remain integrated and yet lose rigidity. This is the foundation of the state of mind of the individual who can retain his knowledge and experience and yet be prepared to reconstrue past experiences in a manner that enables him to be receptive of a new idea (p. 93).

Provided that the past can be thought anew, learning may be understood as learning from emotional experience. Bion sees these functions as “tolerance of doubt and tolerance of infinity” (p. 94) or tolerance of the unknown and the unknowable. And the old defences of splitting the world into good and bad can then be analysed as the problem. Thinking becomes more complicated, tying experience to responsibility for the unknown. Our responsibility is to interpret reality.

Bion’s interest in the hatred of development clashes with our commonsense understanding of experience as the royal road to learning, indeed as capable of possessing learning. It is noteworthy that Bion’s understanding of development emerges from the study of group psychology, itself the

foundation of education. The basic assumptions of groups, he suggests, begin with a desire for security as a defence against the unknown, but this means that insecurity, also a feature of individual and group life, will frustrate security. In teacher education, our security blanket of learning from experience actually creates profound insecurity. The insecurity is expelled and returns in the form of bad students, bad grades, bad theory, bad university, and bad methods.

One does not learn from experience but rather tolerates having to think about its emotional qualities. Bion offers a second way to define experience, now as an emotional experience difficult to know. He is not so far away from James' view of the difficulty of knowing the Other's mind. And he is not far away from Arendt's claim that we take responsibility for a world we have not made. For Bion, knowing is an approximation, representations are not the thing in itself, and at some level learning itself is unrepresentable. This is part of what is hated, I think, the hatred of frustration. Here is how Bion (1962/1994) poses the quandary: "If the learner is intolerant of the essential frustration of learning he indulges phantasies of omniscience and a belief in a state where things are known. Knowing something consists in 'having' some 'piece of' knowledge and *not* . . . 'knowing'" in the sense of 'getting to know' something" (p. 65). Our capacity to create value within emotional experience allows for new ideas and the experience of getting to know something new. No value is an attack on one's thinking; thinking is a way to render valuable one's emotional experience. Being responsible for one's emotional experience opens a psychological dimension to what Derrida called justice, or "hospitality without reservation."

IV

I described teacher education as a conditioned field, in that all that it meets becomes a condition of its development. I have described our childhood of education as a significant condition of our work and included there the problem of the hatred of development. I have suggested that how we conceptualize development will affect not only the ways in which we think about others and our knowledge but also how we feel about our own teacher education. And along with Arendt, I have suggested education as a time that is always out of joint. Briefly, I want to turn to the problem of the university itself as affected by what Arendt called, "the crisis of education."

The particular crisis universities face is the decline of Enlightenment as a metaphor for education. Our meta-narratives have worn out. Here uneven development takes on institutional force. As a field of thought and practice, institutions of education are affected by what Lyotard (1984/1987) called, "the postmodern condition." He was describing the state of knowledge in post-industrial societies, and argued that the idea of knowledge as capable of training minds and as bringing up of culture (*Bildung*) is now obsolete: knowledge itself changes so fast that its old use of changing minds is exhausted. Today, we think of minds as processing data, as a human extension of the information highway. We travel this highway as both consumers and producers, perhaps feeling knowledge as now something to display or access as quickly and as easily as possible. This is our postmodern soft pedagogy. Yet our postmodern condition has quickened the way knowledge wears out. Just as knowledge is pre-packaged and disposable, it returns recycled as nostalgia. With this new instrumentalism comes a new definition of the high speed student. Learners must become adept, flexible, and able to judge knowledge in terms of its use value, its applicability to real life concerns, and its prestige. But this means that skills supplant ideas, technique is confused with authority, and responsibility and know-how short circuit the existential question of indeterminacy.

The expansions of multinational and now global corporations into every corner of our lives have terrific force in the university. Students, too, are consumers; they judge the competency of their education rather than their own efforts. Teachers deliver a curriculum with no destiny. Excellence

awards proliferate and are used to market the university, which must compete with other universities. Yet the pervasiveness of excellence awards has not always been the case, as Bill Readings (1996) remarked in his study of the university. Excellent adventures have supplanted Enlightenment narratives. The postmodern worker places new demands on the university—she is both consumer and potential litigant. Readings' (1996) critique suggests the university is best described not as postmodern but as post-historical. He means the university has lived beyond its founding values of "historical development, affirmation, and inculcation of national culture" (p. 6). Here is the new sense of where education wears out. The critical function of university education—to expand minds, to be critical of knowledge, to create personal and social insight—is obsolete. There is nothing to take responsibility for. In Readings' view, the significant quandary is how we will think of the social bond, community, recognition, responsibility, and difference if knowledge has no moral force and if consumerism designs experience as excellent.

Our postmodern university complicates the childhood of teacher education and our work of taking responsibility for the world we have not made. Indeed, we may ask, in the post-historical university, has childhood itself become obsolete? What will the strange duration of childhood fixate upon if experience is so fleeting and if knowledge itself becomes obsolete faster than it can be learned? What then becomes of retroactive time, of uneven development? How will this slippery, surface animate the depth of our soul? Is it now the case as Gertrude Stein once said, "There is no there, there?"

I want to propose that the post-historical university, despite its shiny surfaces, animates the depths of our dependency; we are even more dependent upon the human condition than we have previously understood. We may now understand that even our meta-narratives wear out. While no longer dependent upon meta-narratives, now we are subject to how quickly they slip away. Before our eyes, we see the world wear out. This loss may provoke us to defend nostalgia, causing us to turn our backs on the crisis of education, gazing instead on what we imagine as a time before, when everything about experience was certain. This imaginary loss renders our education melancholic, filled with complaint that is then evacuated into the other who fails. Or we might risk the pain of thinking and ask ourselves to symbolize education without the defence of the idealization of experience. We might begin to ponder the problem that the experience we have *and* the having of experience has always been our crisis of education. We may come to think of what it means for education to lose its ideals, including the ideal of experience. Then we may consider uncertainty as what Arendt called the human condition. Our work, after all, like the world where we live, is always out of joint. And there are new problems experience cannot solve. Now we have the odd postmodern condition of sending our student teachers back to the nineteenth-century school where they encounter the twenty-first century child.

Here, then, is my concluding thought on the question of teacher education as uneven development. If teacher education is to matter, we are obligated to create conditions for learning to live in this time that is out of joint, in discontinuous time and the disjuncture of self/other relations. This means taking responsibility for the discomfiting fact of our dependency on the unknown. If we are responsible for a world we have not made, if we have the strange work of trying to understand the minds of others and still keep our own mind, if we have the work of welcoming what cannot be understood and the responsibility for a hospitality without reserve, if we confront a world that is wearing out, if we must work from all this ignorance, we may then begin our teacher education. It will be a teacher education as an unfinished project, more fragile than we ever imagined, now lost and found at the point where our fact of dependency develops within the promise of responsibility.

References

- Arendt, H. (1961/1993). The crisis of education. In *Between past and future: Eight exercises in political thought* (pp. 173-196). NY: Penguin Books.
- Bion, W. (1961/1994). *Experiences in groups and other papers*. London: Routledge.
- Bion, W. (1962/1994). *Learning from experience*. Northvale NJ: Jason Aronson.
- Britzman, D.P. (2003). *Practice makes practice: A critical study of learning to teach* (rev. ed.). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Britzman, D.P. (2006). *Novel education: Psychoanalytic studies of learning and not learning*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Derrida, J. (1994). *Spectres of Marx: The state of debt, the work of mourning, and the new international* (Peggy Kamuf, Transl.) New York: Routledge.
- Greene, M. (1973). *The teacher as stranger: Educational philosophy for the modern age*. Belmont CA: Wadsworth Press.
- Lyotard, J.-F. (1984/1987). *The postmodern condition: A report on knowledge* (Geoff Bennington and Brian Massumi; Transl.) Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press.
- James, W. (1890/1950). *The principles of psychology* (Vol. One and Two). New York: Dover Publications.
- James, W. (1899/1983). *Talks to teachers on psychology and to students on some of life's ideals*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Readings, B. (1996). *The university in ruins*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Winnicott, D.W. (1970/1987). Dependence in child care. In C. Winnicott, R. Shepherd, and M. Davis (Eds.), *Babies and their mothers* (pp. 83-88). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Winnicott, D.W. (1960/1995). The theory of parent-infant relationship. In *The maturational processes and the facilitating environment: studies in the theory of emotional development* (pp. 37-55). Madison: International Universities Press.

CATE/ACFE Keynote Address 2007

*The Best Lack All Conviction
While the Worst Are Full of Passionate Intensity*

Peter P. Grimmett
(Simon Fraser University)

presented at

University of Saskatchewan
27 May 2007

Introduction to the 2007 Address

Peter Grimmett's address considers the relatively short history of teacher education policy and research through the lens of Yeats' powerful poem *The Second Coming* where expansion and contraction vie for dominance in cycles that predict contesting movement if not the actual content of the contests. Within the broad struggle between university-based teacher education and public governance of the field of practice or the guarding of the public trust, research and policy trends mark three periods of approximately twenty years each. During the first period, teacher education was seen as a problem of training; this period gave way to a second, in which teacher education was defined as a problem of learning. Overlapping with this phase is a third in which teacher education has emerged as a problem of policy. The key terms he uses to characterize the poles within each phase are de-regulation and professionalization, and he explores their features in relation to the political and social context of each phase. Familiar problems of the separation between university culture and school life, theory and practice, professional and political regulatory bodies take on new urgency in our contemporary landscape of teacher education design and research. We must, he argues, muster renewed conviction to act with "passionate intensity" in the search for common ground in our educational research, policy commitments and teacher education practice. Using the Association of Canadian Deans of Education's *Accord on Teacher Education* (May, 2006) as a touchstone for such pan-Canadian commitment, Grimmett proposes a fusion of accountability with a respect for complexity as the hallmark of our future and provides a comprehensive list of research themes aimed at deepening our understanding of our current realities and at shaping our future development "in the interests of teachers and students."

Peter P. Grimmett is Professor of Education in the Faculty of Education. A former Associate Dean, he also serves as Director of the Institute for Studies in Teacher Education at Simon Fraser University and was recently appointed by the BC Cabinet as the BC Deans of Education appointment to the Council of the BC College of Teachers (the professional body that governs teaching and teacher education in the province). He has recently been involved in a five-year Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC) -funded \$2.5 million Canada-wide study of the impact of public policy decisions on conditions of teaching and learning, completed a review of teacher education program accreditation for the province of Ontario, and given keynote addresses at conferences in Oslo (Norway), Stockholm (Sweden), Lahti, Tampere, and Helsinki (Finland), Tel Aviv (Israel), Ljubjana (Slovenia) and Queensland (Australia).

In total, he has published 43 refereed journal articles, written eight books and 38 chapters in books, and in May 2000, he received an honorary doctorate from the University of Tampere, Finland, in recognition of his outstanding merits as a researcher and educator in the areas of professional development and teacher education.

Note d'introduction à la conférence de 2007

Le discours de Peter Grimmett évoque l'histoire relativement courte des politiques et de la recherche en matière de formation à l'enseignement à travers le poème de Yeats *The Second Coming* (La seconde venue) dans lequel expansion et contraction se disputent la position de dominance dans des cycles de mouvement contrastés. Dans le cadre des tensions entre la formation universitaire des enseignants et la gouvernance publique par des instances du milieu de pratique, la recherche et les politiques sont marquées par trois périodes d'une durée approximative de vingt ans chacune. Pendant la première période, la formation des enseignants est considérée comme une question d'entraînement; Au cours de la période suivante, la formation des enseignants était envisagée comme une question d'apprentissage. Dans la troisième période, qui chevauche la précédente, la formation des enseignants est devenue une question de politique. Les termes clés utilisés par Grimmett pour caractériser les pôles présents à chacune de ces phases sont la dérèglementation et la professionnalisation. Il en explore les caractéristiques relativement au contexte politique et social propre à chaque phase. Les questions habituelles sur la distance entre la culture universitaire et l'environnement scolaire, la théorie et la pratique, les corps professionnels et les instances politiques, connaissent un regain d'importance dans le monde actuel de la recherche et de la formation à l'enseignement. Selon Grimmett, nous devons faire preuve de conviction pour agir avec «une passion intense» afin de trouver un terrain d'entente entre notre recherche en formation, les engagements politiques et les pratiques de formation. En se basant sur *l'Accord sur la formation à l'enseignement* (Mai 2006) de l'Association canadienne des doyens et doyennes d'éducation pour un engagement pancanadien, Peter Grimmett propose une fusion des responsabilités avec un respect de la complexité comme marque de l'avenir et donne une liste exhaustive des thèmes de recherche destinés à approfondir notre compréhension des réalités actuelles et à élaborer les développements futurs «dans l'intérêt des enseignants et des élèves».

Peter P. Grimmett est professeur à la Faculté d'éducation de l'Université Simon Fraser en Colombie-Britannique. Ancien vice-doyen, il a aussi été directeur de *l'Institute for Studies in Teacher Education* à l'Université Simon Fraser et a été récemment nommé par le Conseil des ministres de la Colombie-Britannique comme représentant des doyens de l'éducation au BC College of Teachers (l'organisme professionnel chargé de l'enseignement et de la formation des enseignants dans la province). Il a récemment collaboré à une étude pancanadienne, échelonnée sur une période de 5 ans, subventionnée par le Conseil de recherches en sciences humaines du Canada (CRSH) à hauteur de 2,5 millions de dollars dans laquelle il s'est intéressé à l'impact des décisions de politiques sur les conditions d'enseignement et d'apprentissage. Il a terminé une étude complète sur l'agrément des programmes de formation des enseignants dans la province de l'Ontario. Il a aussi été conférencier invité à Oslo (Norvège), Stockholm (Suède), Lahti, Tampere et Helsinki (Finlande), Tel Aviv (Israël), Ljubjana (Slovénie) et Queensland (Australie).

Il a publié 43 articles arbitrés, écrit huit livres et 38 chapitres de livres. En mai 2000, il a reçu un doctorat honorifique de l'Université de Tampere (Finlande), en reconnaissance de la qualité exceptionnelle de ses travaux en tant que chercheur et éducateur dans le domaine du développement professionnel et de la formation des enseignants.

CATE / ACFE 2007
Keynote Address

*The Best Lack All Conviction, While the
Worst Are Full of Passionate Intensity*

Peter P. Grimmett
Simon Fraser University

*Turning and turning in the widening gyre
The falcon cannot hear the falconer;
Things fall apart; the centre cannot hold;
Mere anarchy is loosed upon the world,
The blood-dimmed tide is loosed, and everywhere
The ceremony of innocence is drowned;
**The best lack all conviction, while the worst
Are full of passionate intensity.***

*Surely some revelation is at hand;
Surely the Second Coming is at hand.
The Second Coming! Hardly are those words out
When a vast image out of Spiritus Mundi
Troubles my sight: a waste of desert sand;
A shape with lion body and the head of a man,
A gaze blank and pitiless as the sun,
Is moving its slow thighs, while all about it
Wind shadows of the indignant desert birds.
The darkness drops again but now I know
That twenty centuries of stony sleep
Were vexed to nightmare by a rocking cradle,
And what rough beast, its hour come round at last,
Slouches towards Bethlehem to be born?
The Second Coming, by William Butler Yeats*

William Butler Yeats wrote *The Second Coming* in 1919 after the catastrophe of World War I at a time when communism and fascism were rising. It signifies a compelling glimpse of an inhuman world about to be born. According to Yeats' cosmology, two intersecting cone-like spirals or gyres represent the sweep of history. Yeats believed that as one gyre widens over a period of two thousand years the other narrows, producing a gradual change in the age. The process then reverses after another twenty centuries have passed, and so on, producing a cyclical pattern throughout time. Yeats says in his notes to the poem:

The end of an age, which always receives the revelation of the character of the next age, is represented by the coming of one gyre to its place of greatest expansion and of the other to that of its greatest contraction.... All our scientific, democratic, fact-accumulating, heterogeneous civilization belongs to the outward gyre and prepares not the continuance of itself but the revelation as in a lightning flash...of the civilization that must slowly take its place. (p. 493)

Thus, in *The Second Coming* the uncontrolled flight of the falcon is representative of this primary expansion at its chaotic peak, while the coming of an antithetical disposition is symbolized in the appearance of the "rough beast" in the desert, a harbinger of the new era. More likely than not, the sphinx-like beast of the poem's second half represented the forces of violence and anarchy of the time, e.g., the Russian Revolution, World War I, the Irish Civil War of 1916, Fascism, or rising communism. But Yeats was using this image to emphasize the dreadful and foreboding nature of what was to come and to associate its emergence with the decline of western civilization.

What I want to emphasize is that at the time of this change, the best are paralyzed by lack of conviction, while the worst are fired with the 'passionate intensity' that accompanies the intoxicating effect of anarchy, fanaticism, and hatred, especially in the context of political struggles. How does this connect to teacher education?

The poem uses many simple but powerful images: the falcon's gyre widening, disintegration, anarchy, tide of blood, drowning of ceremony of innocence, weakness and intensity. In the symbol of the falcon, the falconer represents control but stands at the lowest point of the gyre's apex, so that, as the falcon towers higher, it can no longer hear the controlling centre. "Things fall apart; the centre cannot hold." A revelation is at hand. An image emerges from "Spiritus Mundi," the world's creative and active mind. But the figure is not a Phoenix rising from the ashes (Joyce and Clift, 1984), but "the rough beast . . . / Slouches towards Bethlehem."

I want to suggest that the falcon can be seen as a symbol of university-based teacher education, with the falconer, the centre, representing public governance of the field of practice or the guarding of the public trust. Both the falcon and the falconer affect the flight, i.e., the field of practice. The widening gyre in this case is not "twenty centuries of stony sleep" but almost sixty years (three phases of two decades each) of theory-practice blood-seeping fissure that was vexed to nightmare by scientific-rationalism. Things have fallen apart at the end of each twenty-year phase, leading to a revelation at hand that characterized the next phase. We are now toward the end of the six-decade period, and things are falling apart because of contestation that is widening the theory-practice chasm, leading to the possibility in Canada (in some countries, already the reality) of an emerging "beast" that will coalesce the centre and harness control for the next 20 years or so. I want to explore this analogy for teacher education, not so much as a foreboding, more so as a discussion of what we could do to ensure that, in university-based teacher education, *the best possess energized conviction that enables them to work with passionate intensity to re-vision, co-constructively with the field and public governance, the education of teachers in ways that meet the challenges of today's post-modern world.* In the end, I want to show that, in teacher education, the best must have all conviction and work toward it with passionate

intensity. Otherwise the beast (harsh political imposition) will slouch toward Bethlehem, as it were, to be born in Canada.

Within the overarching gyre of six decades of fissure, I want to suggest there are two smaller intertwining gyres in teacher education—research and policy—consisting of three phases that each seem to go for two decades at a time. Phase 1 goes from 1960 to 1980, phase 2 from 1980 to 2000, and phase 3 from about 1990 to approximately 2010. The *research* gyre focused between 1960-1980 on teacher education as training; between 1980-2000 on learning to teach; and between roughly 1990-2010 on teacher education as policy. The *policy* gyre focused between 1960-1980 on governmental control; between 1980-2000 on institutional governance; and between roughly 1990-2010 on professional governance accompanied by de-regulation. These two gyres influenced practice between 1960-1980 to focus on direct instruction and classroom management; between 1980-2000 on reflective practice, inquiry, and social justice; and between approximately 1990-2010 on both content-based instruction and on-the-job learning.

Research Gyres

Cochran-Smith and Fries (2005) review the “recursive but nuanced” (p. 69) history of research on teacher education over the last fifty years. They identify three shifts during this period in how teacher education research was conceptualized and studied. Their premise is that each approach was shaped by the political and professional contexts of the time, by the ways in which teacher education was constructed as a “problem,” and by the research designs used to study teacher education and make recommendations regarding practice, policy, and further research. They portray research from the late 1950s to the early 1980s as constructing teacher education as a training problem. They depict research from the early 1980s to the early 2000s as constructing teacher education as a learning problem. And they characterize research from the mid 1990s to the present and beyond as constructing teacher education as a policy problem.

Phase 1 (1960-1980): Teacher Education as Training

Researchers whose disciplinary base was psychology and whose involvement in the practice of teacher education was minimal accounted for most of research conducted during this phase. The Research and Development Center for Teacher Education at the University of Texas, Austin was a major player in the States and the Center for Research on Teaching (CRT) at the University of Alberta in Canada. The focus of the Texas center was on the development of innovations in educational settings (Freiburg & Waxman, 1990) while the Alberta center focused on classroom observation and analysis (Marland, 1977; Tuckwell, 1980), but both were essentially concerned with inventing technologies for the training of teachers in effective ways. This line of research was closely linked to the competency-based teacher education movement of the 1970s that focused on observable behaviors and competencies (Gage & Winne, 1975). Its major purpose to identify “the most effective procedures for training teachers to display teaching behaviors already validates as effective ways to raise pupils’ test scores” (Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2005, p. 76). It also included studies of recruitment and, the old chestnut, student teaching.

In this conception of teacher education as training, teaching was assumed to be content transmission, and researchers presumed an unproblematic and linear connection both between teaching and learning, and between training and teacher behavior. The focus in teacher education as training research, then, was on changing teacher behavior that was viewed as a proxy of student achievement. This led to correlational and experimental studies of specific training procedures—such

as microteaching, interaction analysis, behavior modification, lecture and demonstration, and so on—as independent variables to ascertain whether or not teachers trained by them could show they had mastered desirable behaviors—such as, teaching to the objective, varying questioning techniques, giving corrective feedback, and so on. Teacher education was thus conceptualized as a process that ensured that prospective teachers displayed the behaviors of effective teachers.

Phase 2 (1980-2000): Teacher Education as Learning to Teach

The advent of the Holmes group, the report of the Carnegie Forum on teacher education, and the founding of the National Network for Educational Renewal (NNER) all came about in 1986 as a response to the National Commission on Excellence in Education's (1983) report *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform*. All were committed to the idea that, to produce a professional teaching force, research had to codify the professional knowledge base of teaching and teacher education. Goodlad's (1990) study of teacher education institutions was both particularly critical of what was happening and catalytic of an emphasis on teacher learning. He noted:

...that the teacher education train is *not* on the tracks...the engine is not coupled to the cars nor the cars to one another.... Confusing signals have demoralized many of the workers; unsure about what is expected, they do not know where to direct their energies in order to be rewarded.... Programs for the education of teachers must be characterized in all respects by the conditions of learning that future teachers are to establish in their own schools and classrooms.... [They] must be conducted in such a way that future teachers inquire into the nature of teaching and learning. (pp. 270, 291)

Cochran-Smith and Fries (2005) sum it up in the following way:

Much research on teacher education during the 1980s and continuing into the 2000s was shaped by contemporary critiques of teacher education as well as by the emerging agenda to produce knowledgeable professional teachers who were learners, leaders, and school reformers. This research was also shaped by the expanded array of questions, multiple research designs, and broadened problematics of research on teaching, learning, and schooling that came to characterize the time. (p. 83)

Hence, the language of “learning to teach (Feiman-Nemser, 1983) replaced the language “teacher training.” Zumwalt's (1982) “deliberative orientation” came to replace a “technical orientation.” Schön's (1988) focus on “reflective practice” super-ceded direct instruction. Teacher learning was more than formal preparation; it included the beliefs, knowledge, and experiences that pre-service teachers brought with them into teacher education; it included their understanding of subject matter knowledge and how to connect it pedagogically; the way they made sense of their course work and field experiences in light of their own school experiences as students; and ways in which they developed professionally through observing other teachers' practice, talking with them about it, and generally engaging in the “joint work” that made them colleagues (Little, 1982). The major center in the States was at Michigan State University, while research centres sprang up in Canada at the Centre for the Study of Teacher Education at UBC (Grimmett & Erickson, 1988; Housego & Grimmett, 1983; Housego & Grimmett, 1985; Erickson & Brandes, 1998; Clarke & Erickson, 2003), at the Institute for Studies in Teacher Education at SFU (Grimmett, 1997, 1998; Grimmett & MacKinnon, 1992; Wideen & Grimmett, 1995, 1997; Wideen, Mayer-Smith, & Moon, 1999), at the Centre for Teacher Development (CTD) at OISE (Connolly & Clandinin, 1996, 2001; Thiessen & Cole, 1993), at the Centre for Research on Teacher Education and Development (CRTED) at the University of

Alberta (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000), and at Queen's University with its research on the authority of experience (Munby & Russell, 1994; Munby, 1999; Russell, 1998).

Phase 3 (1990-2010): Teacher Education as Policy

Viewing teacher education as learning to teach did not, however, concern itself with outcomes. During phase 2, Haberman (1985) and Evertson, Hawley and Zlotnik (1985) began to ask questions about whether or not teacher education made a difference to student learning in classrooms. This line of inquiry foreshadowed the shift that emerged in the 1990s toward framing teacher education around policy issues, "including efforts to document the effectiveness of teacher preparation on pupils' learning" (Cochran-Smith, 2005, p. 89). As a consequence, much research followed the recommendations of critiques of conventional teacher education programs to focus on teacher quality and public accountability. Underlying this approach is the assumption "that empirical evidence linking teacher preparation and desirable outcomes can and should shape the policies and practices that govern teacher education" (Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2005, p. 93). Wasley and McDiarmid's (2003) paper tying the assessment of new teachers to student learning and teacher preparation is an example of this line of thinking.

In North America, there has been unrelenting commentary urging this shift from right-leaning organizations and critics. In the States, Chester Finn and the Fordham Foundation (Finn & Kanstoroom, 2000) and, in Canada, a conservative critic (Nikiforuk (1993) and two conservative think tanks¹, the Fraser Institute (Cowley & Easton, 2003; Dare, Hepburn, & Merrifield, 2006) and the Society for Quality Education (Dare, 2002), became major advocates of de-regulation of teacher education. This advocacy led in the States to the provision of alternative routes to certification (without pedagogy) and an unforgiving focus on results; in Canada, it led to an unremitting concern for standards and accountability. Darling-Hammond (1998, 2000a, 2000b, 2000c) has emerged as the primary education policy analyst to defend teacher education by countering arguments for de-regulation. Her reviews conclude that teacher preparation and certification contribute considerably to teacher effectiveness and student achievement. With the organization she directs, the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (NCTAF), she is an ardent advocate of the professionalization agenda (i.e., creating strong learning communities, assuring quality teacher preparation, and supporting professionally rewarding careers). The battle lines have thus been drawn in the States between the NCTAF and the Fordham Foundation over which evidence should inform and drive teacher education policy. In Canada, the struggle is just beginning. While the research centres established during the second phase are still conducting strategic research, independently funded centres not attached to universities are sponsoring their own studies. For example, Helen Raham's Kelowna-based Society for the Advancement of Excellence in Education (SAEE) conducted a study of teacher quality in Canada (Phillips, 2002) and has recently commissioned Crocker, Dibbon, and Glickman (2007) to conduct a study that will provide a baseline portrait of undergraduate teacher education programs across the country. Unlike Cole (1999, 2000a, 2000b) who has conducted SSHRC-sponsored research along these lines, none of these researchers has been closely associated with the "learning to teach" direction of phase 2. The agendas are thus becoming complex, if not complicated, as the professionalization and de-regulation policy trends begin to intersect.

¹ These analyses differ quite markedly from the less polemic and more balanced analytical reports coming from the older, more conventional conservative think tank, the C.D. Howe Institute of Toronto (see Raptis & Fleming, 2003; Johnson, 2005, 2007; and Pakravan, 2006)

Policy Gyres

The same approximate time periods also characterized changes in the policy of teacher education. Whereas government control characterized the first phase, the second phase was constituted by an emphasis on institutional governance. The third phase has brought a parallel, if not competing, emphasis on professional self-regulation and de-regulation.

Phase 1 (1960-1980): Government Control

During this first phase, the governance of teacher education was largely in the hands of benign governments that consulted with professionals and the body politic to make policy changes affecting the practice of teacher education. Joint Teacher Education Boards advised policy makers on appropriate direction and the approach functioned with considerable good will from all parties, probably because benign government control essentially allowed institutions a lot of freedom within broad policy constraints. As criticism (Neatby, 1953; Pederson & Fleming, 1979) of Canadian teacher education demanded a response, however, the limitations of this approach were exposed. Myers and Saul (1974) argued for a move away from government control to institutional governance because the former had the potential to exclude professional expertise and collegial relations. This was particularly the case in some jurisdictions where it was assumed that teacher education policy could be enshrined in regulation so that "actions at the centre can somehow yield results at the periphery" (Gideonse, 1993, p. 5). Vestiges of this phase still pertain in some parts of Canada but are no longer benign. For a while, however, they were on the periphery, as institutional governance characterized the policy context in Canadian teacher education.

Phase 2 (1980-2000): Institutional Governance

Institutional governance essentially took root in the first phase and has continued to the beginning of the 21st century. Some teacher educators still act as if there is no other way. In this approach, the institution responsible for the delivery of a teacher education program exercises self-governance. Gideonse (1993) noted that this idea gained credence because a teacher education institution "not only is the place where the preparation needs and conflicts have to be resolved, but also is where the specifics of aim, design, resources, logistics, schedule, and so on, are all supposed to come together" (p. 6). The downside of this is the potential for both inappropriate and occasional irresponsible use of the autonomy that is granted to universities. That typically occurs when there is, at best, a highly narrow and idiosyncratic view of what must constitute the program and, at worst, an egregious misunderstanding of tenure and academic freedom for the purpose of self-indulgence.

Both these examples are grounded in a lack of attention to external stakeholders, which could be overcome if teacher education held a central place in university faculties of education. But, as Sheehan and Fullan (1995) pointed out, it has not achieved its rightful place in the broad scheme of things. Often it remains on the periphery and seldom do policy makers see teacher education as a player in school reform (Howey, 1995). And yet the move of teacher education from normal schools to university faculties of education in the mid to late 1950s (Sheehan & Wilson, 1994) had occurred during times of robust economic growth and a strong belief in an education-based future. It had led to a period of expansion in faculties of education during 1960s, 1970s and early 1980s, an expansion that paralleled the growth in higher education. Policy makers were persuaded of a vision of a better society that rested with education, which in turn rested on obtaining and preparing better teachers for our schools. Schools and better-prepared teachers would be central to a vision of the new society and preparing young people for that new society. And it was in the university as opposed to the

normal school setting that such improvement would be realized. In the literature in both North America and Europe three types of arguments were used to justify the move and the costs: 1) that universities can attract a higher caliber of student into teaching, 2) that needed research on practice could be undertaken and disseminated, and 3) an atmosphere of inquiry would foster the exploration of imaginative alternatives in program and pedagogy.

Thus, the task of preparing teachers moved from the normal school to the university. But, in making the move, many faculty members made a “Mephistophelian bargain” (Grimmett, 1998) in which the pressure to succeed on campus drew them away from initial teacher education that ultimately became “ill-regarded work” (Clifford & Guthrie, 1988, p.4). Teacher educators had succeeded in obtaining university faculty status but, regrettably, had lost sight of the mission of preparing teachers that had brought them there in the first place. Criticism from graduates was frequent. It seems that the central criticism is that teacher education does not prepare students to address major curricular changes (Glassford, 1997) needed to meet the diverse learning needs of a multicultural student population (BCCT surveys, 1998, 2001, 2004; Grimmert, 2007). And the criticism persists.² The consequence of all this was that institutional governance was not regarded as a viable way of enabling innovative programs and fresh pedagogical approaches to materialize. The profession had to have a greater say.

Phase 3 (1990-2010): Professional Self-Regulation and De-Regulation

The professionalization agenda for teaching and teacher education has two different and sometimes competing thrusts: one toward professionalizing the practice of teaching by creating strong learning communities, assuring quality teacher preparation, and supporting professionally rewarding careers; and a second toward professionalizing the status of teaching by handing over governance to members of the profession. These two aspects come together in “the articulation of a knowledge base for teaching in the form of competencies or standards that address many different aspects of teaching” (Zeichner, 2006, p. 60). Advocates (Darling-Hammond, 1998, 2000a, 2000b, 2000c; Grossman, 1990; Wasley & McDiarmid, 2003) of the professionalization agenda make a strenuous case for the presence of pedagogy and professional course work in teacher preparation. Those who argue for de-regulation (Cowley & Easton, 2003; Dare, Hepburn, & Merrifield, 2006; Dare, 2002; Finn & Kanstoroom, 2000; Nikiforuk, 1993) vigorously contest this position. The de-regulation agenda shifts the focus from pedagogy to content knowledge and verbal expression, maintaining that pedagogy and professional learning are best acquired on the job. Accordingly, advocates of the de-regulation agenda argue strongly for alternative routes to certification outside normal teacher preparation programs.

One of the ironies of this policy phase is that, in both British Columbia and Ontario, the shift toward professional control through the articulation of standards was born in a policy context of de-regulation. The British Columbia and Ontario Colleges of Teachers, as the licensing and regulatory bodies, were originally given the opportunity to accredit those programs in the province whose

² Moreno (2007) of the World Bank, cites the Portuguese educator Antonio Novoa that teacher education is a field of “too many discourses and very poor practice”, and also Arthur Levine, the former President of Teachers’ College, Columbia University, who said that “teacher education is the Dodge City of the education world. Like the fabled Wild West town, it is unruly and chaotic”. These criticisms, and the perception that teacher education institutions are weak, are clearly adding to the increasing social vulnerability of the teaching profession. The paradox is that, with the exception of a few countries, we live in a world that praises Education but seems to despise teachers and educators.

graduates would apply to it for a certificate to teach. As the professional bodies, the Colleges viewed themselves as acting on the professionalization agenda driving teacher education. In so doing, a set of program approval or accreditation procedures was established to ensure quality control of teacher education programs in BC and Ontario. But the professionalization agenda pushes beyond quality control of inputs toward quality assurance of outcomes. Many people within the respective Colleges and within the field of teacher education have expressed their support of this. Unfortunately, enabling quality assurance is neither straightforward nor easy when the pressures of regulation and professionalization turn in on one another and compete. This happens when the Colleges are perceived by university teacher educators to be emphasizing the bureaucratic aspect of its regulatory function—i.e., control of licensing and certification as distinct from enhancing professional learning in teacher education programs—as the primary driving force behind attempts at program approval or accreditation. Consequently, we have reached a situation in which many university personnel, rightly or wrongly, interpret attempts at program enhancement by professional bodies as preoccupation with minutiae, or worse, over-regulation. So, in the middle of a policy context emphasizing de-regulation, professionalization has, in some instances, come to be seen as over-regulation.

One possible explanation for this is that program approval and accreditation as conceived and practised by the Colleges has become a form of systemic education reform that has failed to take account of the micro-politics at work among the various players, particularly those in the field of university-based teacher education. Put differently, the complexity of collaborating to improve teacher education has been complicated by the implementation of an accreditation system that has meant a significant change for teacher education institutions that comes into conflict with some of the values deemed central to a university and that also affects the politics and power sharing that exists within and between them and with society. Such a change needs to be carefully mediated if professionalization is to become effective, feasible, and not distorted. What is needed is a collaborative approach to professionalization that is both responsive and responsible, that enables positive interrelationships and micro-politics, and that moves the agenda forward to a form of accountability that truly safeguards the public trust.

Summary of Gyres

Phase 1

Things fell apart because training, direct instruction, and an emphasis on classroom management was seen to have little or no effect on producing the kind of citizens needed for a democratic society and the workforce requisite for sustaining economic viability; as a consequence, the centre of government control could not hold. The best supporters of the training model lost conviction and the worst passionate intensity of business and academic critics came through. The catalyst for the revelation of the emphasis on teacher learning that was to characterize phase 2 was *A Nation At Risk*.

Phase 2

Things fell apart toward the end of this phase because research and practice became totally consumed with a concerted focus on teacher's beliefs, values, and their learning as professionals, to the neglect of careful attention to quality assurance and outcomes. The centre of institutional governance could not hold because universities were seen not as partners with the field but as independent institutions protecting their vested and prioritized interests. The best in universities were too busy with their own world of research and practice—much of it, as Cole's (1999, 2000a,

2000b) research points out, a case of survival in the academic world—to enter the public debate about the nature and purpose of teacher education. The worst displayed their passionate intensity in calling for the de-regulation of teacher education and the handing over of vital practice experiences to the field. The catalyst for the revelation of contrasting policies of professionalization and de-regulation was the unrelenting criticism of right-wing think tanks.

Phase 3

Things are now falling apart because the competition between professionalization and de-regulation policies is making the governance of teacher education very difficult for universities and professional bodies alike. The delicate balance between professional control and institutional autonomy has not always been attended to with care. Consequently, the centre of professional self-regulation is not holding. University institutions have contested what they see as unwarranted intrusion into their programs and autonomy. The best in universities and professional bodies have tried to work toward collaboration, but they are in the minority and have lost conviction. The worst in universities and professional bodies have gone about the contestation, which ultimately became a legal struggle, with a passionate intensity that ran deep. The catalyst for the revelation of a phase that is yet to come is the two British Columbia court cases and the recent Ontario College of Teachers' accreditation review. A "best" foreshadowing of this new phase could be found in the *ACDE Accord on Teacher Education*; a "worst" possibility could entail the dissolution of professional bodies and the consignment of teacher education to schools, as has happened in England.

Let me address each in turn. Because I live in hope, I shall end with the "best" scenario, one that requires us to act together with considerable conviction over the next twenty years or so.

The "Worst" Scenario: Dissolution of Professional Bodies and Consignment of Teacher Education to Schools

Four Anglophone jurisdictions currently have professional regulatory bodies, Scotland, British Columbia, Ontario, and England. Unlike these four, the USA does not have any professional regulatory bodies and accreditation of teacher education is undertaken by regional agencies and by two national agencies, the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC).

Scotland

Scotland has had its own professional regulatory body, the General Teaching Council of Scotland (GTCS), since the *Teaching Council Scotland Act* in 1965. Prior to 1999, the GTCS undertook reviews of teacher education arrangements that constituted a consultative approach to program approval, an approach that the British Columbia College of Teachers (BCCT) followed. A review of the GTCS in 1999 concluded that both increases in powers and operational changes were required. Hence, GTCS now accredits teacher education programs in a manner that is remarkably similar to that of the Ontario College of Teachers. In other words, the GTCS has moved from a consultative professional governance approach to one based on regulation.

British Columbia

Like Scotland, British Columbia has its own professional regulatory body, the British Columbia College of Teachers (BCCT). From its inception in 1988 until 2004, accreditation in BC took a similar form to that practised in Scotland prior to 1999, the reviews of teacher education arrangements constituted a consultative approach to program approval. Two court decisions in 2001 brought about a fundamental change. First, the Supreme Court of Canada Decision—*Trinity Western University versus BCCT*—dismissed the BC College of Teachers' appeal of the Court of Appeal of British Columbia decision, that had confirmed the order to the College to approve the Trinity Western University teacher education program and the conditions recommended by the BCCT's Teacher Education Programs Committee in 1996. Consequently, BCCT began the process of working with Trinity Western University to implement the court-ordered approval of their teacher education program. Second, the British Columbia Supreme Court Decision—*the University of British Columbia versus the BC College of Teachers*—handed down a ruling on the judicial review application by the University of British Columbia at the decision by the BC College of Teachers to deny approval of the revised teacher education program at the University of British Columbia. The court ruled that the College had exceeded its jurisdiction in establishing some of the conditions under which the Council indicated it was prepared to approve the proposal from the University of British Columbia. The court referred the matter back to the Council of the College of Teachers for re-consideration.

As a consequence of these two momentous court decisions, BCCT undertook to co-construct with the Association of British Columbia Deans of Education (ABCDE) a Letter of Understanding (LOU) that would govern how graduates from the eight existing teacher education programs in the province would be certified by BCCT. In 2004 this agreement was concluded. These programs must ensure that their graduates meet the *Standards for the Education, Competence and Professional Conduct of Educators in BC*. This historic agreement between the Association of BC Deans of Education and the College, signed on June 18, 2004, committed the two parties to work collaboratively to prepare and certify only those who meet the standards.

Ontario

Like British Columbia and Scotland, Ontario has its own professional regulatory body, the Ontario College of Teachers. In 1995, the Ontario Royal Commission on Learning, *For the Love of Learning*, recommended the establishment of a College of Teachers that would have authority for teaching standards, as well as for accreditation of teacher education programs, and for setting standards of professional development. Consequently, the *Ontario College of Teachers Act* in 1996 set up the College and also gave it responsibility for the accreditation of pre-service teacher education. Each review includes an examination of the program to determine if it reflects such aspects as current Ontario curriculum plus relevant legislation and government policy related to curriculum, including the College's *Standards of Practice for the Teaching Profession* and the *Ethical Standards for the Teaching Profession*. Thus, professionalization in Ontario is framed by regulation in a policy context that was initially, and in some respects still is, one of de-regulation. As I (and Frank Echols) have suggested elsewhere (Grimmett & Echols, 2006), this has sometimes led to over-regulation, creating misunderstanding and friction between the College of Teachers as the professional body and the universities as teacher education institutions.

England

Like Scotland, British Columbia, and Ontario, England also has its own professional regulatory body, the General Teaching Council (GTC). The GTC was established by the Teaching and Higher Education Act 1998, and the first Council began its work in September 2000. (This Act also established GTCs in Wales and Northern Ireland.) Hence, the 1998 Act gave effect to the long-held aspiration to give teaching the same status as other self-regulating professions. The Act set the Council two aims: “to contribute to improving standards of teaching and the quality of learning, and to maintain and improve standards of professional conduct among teachers, in the interests of the public”. However, this did not include the power to approve and accredit initial teacher education programs. That was retained by the Teacher Training Agency (TTA), previously established in 1994 and transformed in 2005 into the Training and Development Agency (TDA). Teacher education accreditation in England is thus not associated in any way with peer review or with the professional regulatory body. As the professional body for teaching in England, the GTC is restricted to three functions: 1) to maintain a register of qualified teachers in England, 2) to enable the teaching profession to regulate itself, and 3) to provide advice to government and other agencies on key issues affecting the quality of teaching and learning. Unlike Scotland, British Columbia, and Ontario, then, the professional regulatory bodies in England (and in Wales and Northern Ireland) have no power and only moral influence over the practice of teacher education.

Dissolution of Professional Bodies and Consignment of Teacher Education to Schools

It is no coincidence that England has an emasculated professional regulatory body and the USA has none. The lack and absence of a strong professional body has led to the consignment of much teacher education activity from higher education institutions to schools.

The USA

The USA does not have any professional regulatory bodies and accreditation is carried out by six regional agencies and by two national agencies, the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC). The process is voluntary and based on peer review. Thus, while in practice members of the profession may be used as members of a peer review committee, appointed according to the selection criteria used by NCATE and TEAC, the *jurisdiction* for accreditation does not rest with professional bodies in the USA. Jurisdictional control thus resides outside of the profession, typically with governments, policy makers, and bureaucrats. This has led to considerable debate over which of the two accrediting agencies is best for American teacher education.

Zeichner (2005) has called on teacher educators to transcend this debate by focusing on what is important for the future of teacher education, ensuring that the agenda of de-regulation is contested to safeguard quality in teacher education:

Probably the most important thing that we [teacher educators] can do to contribute to the preparation of our nation’s teachers is to ensure that whatever colleges and universities choose to engage in teacher preparation, this work receives strong support from permanent faculty and from regular institutional budgets.... College- and university-based teacher education has an important role to play in achieving it [provide a high-quality

public education to everyone's children]. It would be a terrible mistake, in my view, to continue on the path of deregulation and to destroy college and university teacher education and to lower standards for entry into teaching. (pp. 335, 336)

But that is exactly what is part of the agenda in the USA. In June, 2002, the USA Education Secretary, Rod Paige called for a radical transformation of teacher certification systems by raising standards and lowering barriers that keep many highly qualified candidates from pursuing teaching careers.

We now have concrete evidence that smart teachers with solid content knowledge have the greatest effect on student achievement. If we are to meet the challenge of having a highly qualified teacher in every classroom by the 2005–06 school year, states and universities must take heed and act now to bring more of these people into our nation's classrooms. There is much to be done, but we know what it is and have no time to waste if no child is to be left behind. (Paige, 2002)

What did Paige propose? To raise academic standards, prospective teachers would be required to pass rigorous exams in the subjects they plan to teach. To lower barriers, institutions of higher education would be required revamp their teacher preparation programs and eliminate many of their rigid certification requirements, such as the massive number of methods courses. More consequentially, Paige claimed that while teachers need to understand how to teach—and to have other basic skills such as classroom management—there was no evidence that lengthy preparation programs helped prospective teachers achieve these goals any better than streamlined programs that get talented teachers quickly into the classroom. For Paige, requiring excessive numbers of pedagogy or education theory courses acts as an unnecessary barrier for those wishing to pursue a teaching career. In a variant of Pierre Trudeau's famous line in 1980, "well, welcome back to the 1950s."

Cochran-Smith (2000) maintains that this attack on university-based teacher education in the USA was made possible by the poor perceptions of teacher education programs. Alternative approaches to certification are now burgeoning in the States. That is not the case in Canada, and much of the credit for that must go to the stands taken by the professional self-regulating bodies (The Ontario and BC Colleges of Teachers) and principled policy makers. Nevertheless, the warning signs are there and if teacher education is seriously undermined by alternative approaches, then much will be lost. The profession itself could be weakened which would ultimately reflect on the quality of schooling. Grossman (2003) confirms this:

The crossroad is clearly marked. We can continue to invest in the development of highly qualified and well-prepared teachers and create the incentives and working conditions to keep them in the profession. Or we can once again ease standards for entry into teaching and allow students, primarily those in high-poverty schools who are most in need of high-quality teaching, to be taught by less than qualified teachers. To pursue the latter path would only increase the disparities in educational opportunity and achievement that already exist within our society. The nation, and the teaching profession, remain at risk. (p. 17)

De-regulation policies therefore not only undermine the need for professional teacher preparation and pedagogy but also cast a cloud over professional governance. Whereas this policy context led in the USA to alternative certification routes and the prolonged absence of any form of professional self-regulation, in England it led to the consignment of teacher education to schools, the retention of

accreditation power in a government agency, and the establishment of an emasculated professional body.

England

The professional body was established in England as a token after-thought to pressure from groups with the long-held aspiration to give teaching the same status as other self-regulating professions. But it came after the powers of accreditation were firmly rooted in the government (TTA) agency and the responsibility for teacher preparation had been largely devolved to schools.

A powerful campaign of attack on teacher education both from within and without contributed to this direction in teacher education in England. During the Thatcher era, it was claimed that too much time was devoted in teacher education to abstract theoretical studies—so-called “trendy theories” based on dubious sociological or philosophical premises. Ball (1990) called it a “discourse of derision” that came from right-wing critics and some insider educators. Most notably, David Hargreaves (2000) forged an unholy alliance with the government to criticize the practice of teacher education, coming up with 20 lessons on how to change it:

1. Do not let those who are engaged in teacher training lead the reforms
2. Devise a national curriculum for teacher training, specify the expected outcomes and establish standards (but not too many)
3. Rethink the structure of the teaching profession so that trained teachers do what only trained teachers should do.
4. Accredite and inspect all institutions providing teacher training
5. Embed the training of teachers in effective schools and provide flexible and employment-based routes into the profession.
6. Give practicing teachers the principal responsibility for trainees.
7. Pay trainees a training salary.
8. Establish “training schools” as centers of excellence in teacher training.
9. Avoid a theory-practice division of labour between higher education and schools.
10. Record the standards achieved by trainees as the first step to their induction and continuing professional development.
11. Link the training of teachers to schools involved in research and development activities.
12. Focus educational research on supporting teachers and policy makers in the pursuit of evidence-informed policy and practice.
13. Provide training for school leaders.
14. Provide sabbaticals and research fellowships for teachers.
15. Devise a coherent and cost-effective system of continuing professional development.
16. Staff the training institutions with practicing teachers seconded from schools.
17. Create networks of schools to transfer knowledge of “what works.”
18. Ensure that principals and teachers model “learning how to learn” for their students.
19. Create a professional culture of coaching and mentoring.
20. Transform schools into learning communities.

Central to these lessons were two assumptions: that education reform is driven by central government and that the unit of effectiveness is the school, not university-based teacher education.

Hence, universities were expected to become knowledge providers to schools as institutions of education reform and teacher education.

The consequence of this was that many teacher education institutions were closed. A new financial regime was introduced to universities that put partnership with schools firmly on the agenda, the harbinger of a definite shift toward a school-based approach to training. The outcome of this was a political definition of teacher training (not education), closely linked to a prescriptive view of the school curriculum. The national curriculum was a response to the belief that previous curricula had distorted traditional values and that teachers had been duped by progressive ideologues. The outcome was that standards have to be assured in the public domain by inspection and by reform of teacher training toward an apprenticeship model. What that meant was more time spent in schools and less theoretical input from universities, etc. It also led to a national curriculum for teacher training with specific competences that all teachers must acquire before being certified as qualified, i.e., before entry into the profession. The teacher's job has thus become bureaucratically controlled; teachers are to implement decisions made by others.

In England, then, teacher education moved back to the schools—with what Gilroy (2002) has characterized as desultory effects—from whence it came some 100 years ago. Cochran-Smith (2001b), a strong proponent of teachers and their craft knowledge, has expressed serious misgivings about what happened in England, calling for greater collaboration between faculties of education and teachers in the field in the co-construction of teacher preparation:

A frightening description of the dramatically curtailed role of universities in teacher education in England. . . where standardization and prescription are being mistaken for higher standards [when what is needed is] genuine critique, which emerges out of the collaborations of college- and school-based educators working together to alter children's life chances, [and] is vital to the future of public education in a democratic society. (p. 4)

Conclusion

What these two Anglophone jurisdictions demonstrate is that, when professionalization and de-regulation policies are in competition, the latter undermine not only university-based teacher education but also professional governance in the form of self-regulatory bodies. What we are witnessing toward the end of phase 3 are the vestiges of thinking that was applied to universities at the end of phase 2. Now the profession and its regulatory bodies are regarded as institutions protecting their own vested interests. The logical outcome of this way of thinking is that only political imposition and market forces can stem the tide of vested self-interest in the profession that is characterized as not being in the interests of children and their learning. *My thesis is that when policy makers align their thinking about education with market forces, the "beast" of harsh political imposition emerges.* It is a real stretch even to imagine how such a state of affairs can be in the best interests of children and learning. But when the discourse is co-opted toward this ideological position, even this justification can be made to sound plausible.

Clearly, advocates of the profession of teaching and teacher education must contest this co-optation of the discourse. But we must also do more. We must recognize that the situation has now reached the point where we are faced with a forced choice—either professionalization or de-regulation—because the era of institutional governance has long since gone. My strong advice is that we must choose professionalization, ensuring that we professionalize practice, as distinct from status. That means university-based teacher educators have to find a way of working with professional regulatory bodies to sustain and improve teacher education policies and programs. This will lead to

requisite stands being taken within the academy about the priority of teacher education. Likewise, it means that professional regulatory bodies have to work well with university-based teacher educators to avoid the distorted temptation of bureaucratic expansionism and professional protectionism that comes from exuberant over-regulation. They need to find a way of rendering Humes' (1994) critique³ inoperative by focusing their energies on raising standards and improving teacher education. For me, it is the *delicate relationship between institutional autonomy and professional governance that needs to be constructively negotiated together, so that the professional and pedagogic values embedded in teacher education can be preserved and better expressed in a manner that grapples with outcomes.*

Or as Heap (2006) put it aptly, teacher education programs need to become *oriented, reflexive, and responsive*. By *oriented*, he means that each faculty should have an orienting framework consisting of a vision statement (what the organization wishes to create), a mission statement (why the organization exists), and statement of its philosophy of education with which a set of learning outcomes for each program should be in alignment. By *reflexive*, he means that each faculty would be required to have ways to know and show that learning outcomes are being achieved at an acceptable level. This requires an ongoing formative and summative assessment system that records and represents efforts to use assessment data to improve program quality. By *responsive*, he means that each faculty must have ways to demonstrate that it has been responsive to feedback from graduates, employers and stakeholders. This would entail gathering data and using the analyses of data to reflect on and, where appropriate, undertake program revision. Being responsive, however, would also entail going to the heart of society's need for appreciation and respect for diversity, equity, and social justice.

Is there a way out of this vortex? I believe that there are three instances in Canadian teacher education that give rise to hope: the ABCDE-BCCT (2004) Letter of Understanding in BC (http://www.bcct.ca/documents/AboutUs/Committees/agrmt_bcct_abcde.pdf); the current OADE-OCT constructive talks about accreditation; and the ACDE Accord on Teacher Education. I shall comment only on the latter.

The “Best” Scenario: The ACDE Accord on Teacher Education and Needed Research and Program Re-Visioning

The recently signed Association of Canadian Deans of Education (ACDE) *Accord on Initial Teacher Education* (Collins & Tierney, 2006) emphasizes a strong framework of normative principles for initial teacher education. All institutions signing the Accord on the Principles of Initial Teacher Education document are expected to aspire to these principles in their initial teacher education programs. The Deans believe that programs of initial teacher education should involve the development of situated practical knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, and academic content knowledge, as well as an introduction to research and scholarship in education. They see as essential to that development a form of induction into the profession as well as ongoing communication with professional peers. For

³ Humes (1994) maintains that 'independent' professional bodies or “policy communities” like BCCT and OCT become the means whereby government directives are made more palatable, tantamount to an exercise in political control that permits bureaucratic expansionism and professional protectionism. Humes argues that “real power over the form of content of teacher education still lies with [the government]” (p. 54) and professionalism is used as a mechanism of control because the historical evolution of professions shows that “over time, the self-interested impulse [to control certification, develop a mystique about the occupation, and improve rewards for the professionals] becomes stronger than the altruistic impulse [to raise standards, protect the public from the unqualified, and operate in an ethical way]” (p. 55).

them, becoming a teacher is a developmental process that includes initial preparation and continues throughout life, in order to enhance both the profession and teachers' own professional ability. Consequently, they maintain that an effective initial teacher education program commits to preparing teachers for their continuing professional development.

**Figure 1. ASSOCIATION OF CANADIAN DEANS OF EDUCATION (ACDE)
PRINCIPLES OF INITIAL TEACHER EDUCATION**

ACDE supports the following principles for initial teacher education in Canada:

An effective teacher education program demonstrates the transformative power of learning for individuals and communities.

An effective initial teacher education program envisions the teacher as a professional who observes, discerns, critiques, assesses, and acts accordingly.

An effective initial teacher education program encourages teachers to assume a social and political leadership role.

An effective initial teacher education program cultivates a sense of the teacher as responsive and responsible to learners, schools, colleagues, and communities.

An effective initial teacher education program involves partnerships between the university and schools, interweaving theory, research, and practice and providing opportunities for teacher candidates to collaborate with teachers to develop effective teaching practices.

An effective initial teacher education program promotes diversity, inclusion, understanding, acceptance, and social responsibility in continuing dialogue with local, national, and global communities.

An effective initial teacher education program engages teachers with the politics of identity and difference and prepares them to develop and enact inclusive curricula and pedagogies.

An effective initial teacher education program supports a research disposition and climate that recognizes a range of knowledge and perspectives.

An effective initial teacher education program ensures that beginning teachers understand the development of children and youth (intellectual, physical, emotional, social, creative, spiritual, moral) and the nature of learning.

An effective teacher education program ensures that beginning teachers have sound knowledge of subject matter, literacies, ways of knowing, and pedagogical expertise.

An effective initial teacher education program provides opportunities for candidates to investigate their practices.

An effective initial teacher education program supports thoughtful, considered, and deliberate innovation to improve and strengthen the preparation of educators.

But how do these principles move the discussion forward? My view is that the *Accord* commits university-based teacher educators to engage in rigorous discussions with professional regulatory bodies about outcomes; that is, they have to translate the above principles into desirable outcomes that can be debated and assessed. In turn, the *Accord* constrains professional regulatory bodies to leave processes up to the university-based teacher educators and to assess how well the co-constructed outcomes match the principles embedded in the agreement.

As I see it, the *Accord* calls all teacher education parties to participate in an assessment process that helps institutions develop a culture of continuous improvement. This would involve us in action

projects around the *Accord's* principles, which provide a framework for examining the central processes of teacher education to ensure that the investment of energy and resources is focused on achieving desirable outcomes. Each principle spawns the generation of important questions around context, process, outcomes, and improvement. For example, what processes are present in a teacher education program that fosters a sense of responsiveness and responsibility to students and their parents around their learning? How is this evidenced in pre-service teachers' professional observation, discernment, critique, assessment, and action? How do the assessment practices in the teacher education program mirror the kind of performance assessment processes that account appropriately for diverse learning styles while promoting understanding, inclusion, and respect for difference? And so on. These questions permit teacher educators to analyze, understand, and explore opportunities for improving these processes and the interrelationships among them. Because the principles also address processes present in all higher learning organizations, they promote critical reflection that allows universities to share and learn from other organizations' experience and insight. In the process, the professional regulatory body becomes more a partner and a conduit than an evaluator. In this way, teacher education institutions and professional bodies become co-constructors of a rigorous accountability process that attempts to be "responsible and responsive to the concerns of the public, to acknowledge the exigencies of public policy, and to preserve complexity in the press for accountability" (Cochran-Smith, 2003, p. 4). Being accountable while honoring complexity will involve us all in fruitful conversation about non-trivial outcomes:

What is needed and generally missing from the discourse so far are discussions of outcomes measures that—ironically—make teaching harder and more complicated for teacher candidates rather than easier and more straightforward. Such measures would recognize the inevitable complexity and uncertainty of teaching and learning and acknowledge the fact that there are often concurrent and competing claims to justice operating in the decisions prospective teachers must make from moment to moment, day to day. The new teacher education ought to make room for discussions about outcomes that demonstrate how teachers know when and what their students have learned as well as how they manage dilemmas and wrestle with multiple perspectives. Outcomes ought to include how prospective teachers open their practice to public critique and utilize their own and others' research to generate new questions as well as new analyses and actions. They ought to include how prospective teachers learn to be educators as well as activists by working in the company of mentors who are also engaged in larger movements for social change. (Cochran-Smith, 2001a, p. 180)

Holding ourselves accountable while honoring complexity will inevitably involve us in the renewal of programs. It is impossible to renew a teacher education program without open, serious, and substantive collaboration with colleagues in other Faculties who introduce prospective teachers to their subject matter content. As I pointed out almost a decade ago (Grimmett, 1998,1995), teacher education must be located in collaborative partnerships between faculties of education and the field on the one hand, and between faculties of education and university faculties of arts and science on the other. I further argued that such an arrangement calls for a revisioning of teacher education around interdisciplinary study and teacher research in a manner that brings together discipline- and practice-based knowledge, involving: 1) the engagement of pre-service teachers in action research into dilemmas of teaching, and 2) the rigorous integration of liberal arts and sciences with professional pedagogy, instead of the convenient separation—I called it a Mephistophelian bargain—that is currently indulged. My views have not changed, but the window of opportunity has shortened.

Parallel to interdisciplinary action research occurring within the program, there is a need for thematic and strategic research to take place around it. Let me sketch some possible themes that

need to be researched:

PART I: CURRENT REALITIES

1. *Teacher Candidates*—Who is going into teaching in Canada, how are they being prepared and what career paths do they follow?
2. *Demographics and Quality*—What is the relationship between the demographic teacher profiles and quality teaching in classrooms?
3. *Subject Matter Preparation and Teaching*—How does subject matter preparation take place in Canada and what is the implication for teaching practice and student learning?
4. *Interdisciplinary Thought*—To what extent do Canadian teacher education programs foster interdisciplinary thought through close collaboration between faculties of arts, sciences and education around subject matter acquisition and its pedagogy.
5. *Methods Courses*—How do methods courses affect the educational knowledge, pedagogical repertoires, and professional practice of pre-service teachers?
6. *Field Experiences*—What role do field experiences play in the formation of the educational knowledge, pedagogical repertoires, and professional practice of pre-service teachers?
7. *Mentoring*—What role is played by mentoring, and how does positive role mentoring relate to successful induction into the profession? Likewise, what are the professional attrition rates for beginning teachers in Canada?
8. *Pedagogical Approaches*—What different programs and pedagogical approaches to teacher education (e.g., case teaching, e-portfolios, etc.) are used in Canada and what outcomes do they produce in the practice of pre-service teachers?
9. *Inquiry/Reflective Practice*—How are teachers prepared as learners and as field researchers in Canadian teacher education? To what extent is an emphasis on professional learning constrained by the configuration of programs, i.e., concurrent or consecutive, conventional liberal arts/foundations or a practice-before-theory orientation?
10. *Diversity*—How do we prepare pre-service teachers with the requisite knowledge, skills, and dispositions to work with an increasingly culturally, ethnically, and linguistically diverse student population? Additionally, how do we attract into teaching the needed candidates of diverse cultural, ethnic, and linguistic backgrounds?
11. *Multiculturalism*—To what extent has there been curriculum revision and cultural change to foster multiculturalism in Canadian teacher education programs? How do we prepare candidates to become caring, competent teachers in the complex classrooms of a multicultural society like Canada?
12. *Aboriginal Teacher Education*—What curriculum revision and cultural change has been made in Canadian teacher education programs for indigenous and Aboriginal people to be involved in both the preparation for teaching and the preparation of teachers? What progress has been made toward attracting persons of Aboriginal ethnicity into teacher education both as pre-service teachers and as teacher educators?
13. *Inclusion*—How do we prepare pre-service teachers for teaching in inclusive classrooms where students of varied abilities and disabilities are integrated?
14. *Social Justice and Equity*—In what sense and to what extent are teacher education programs in Canada framed around a focus on social justice and equity?
15. *Assessment*—To what extent are pre-service teachers educated in ways of providing culturally responsive, appropriately authentic, equitable, and learning-centred assessments in today's diverse, complex classrooms?
16. *Accountability and Accreditation*—What are appropriate systems and processes of accountability in Canadian teacher education and what outcomes do they produce for pre-

service teachers and the students they teach? To what extent does public accountability demand a process of program accreditation, and to what extent would this approach undermine the intellectual independence and professional autonomy of teacher education institutions?

17. *Teacher Education Programs and Professional Entry Points*—How varied are the teacher preparation programs across the country and to what extent do the differences represent variable points of entry into the profession?

PART II FUTURE POSSIBILITIES

1. Revisioning teacher education programs toward social justice and equity
2. Revisioning teacher education programs toward preparation for diversity
3. The Policy Context: The ACDE Teacher Education Accord
4. The Policy Context in British Columbia: The ABCDE Letter of Understanding with the BCCT
5. The Policy Context in Ontario: The OADE-OCT Co-Construction of Teacher Education Program Accreditation toward Program Enhancement

Conclusion

The current gyre is coming to an end. We need to renew our conviction to act with passionate intensity in the interests of teachers and students. This will have implications for the practice of teacher education. We do not need to prepare teachers who lack all conviction about public education, nor ones who are full of passionate intensity about esoteric issues. Rather, we need to prepare wise and poised public intellectuals deeply committed to and advocates of education both as a field of rigorous academic study and as a public trust; teachers who are a model of fairness and decorum, who possess moral courage to stand for what is right and good, whose contributions are lucid and engaging, bold and provocative; people whose very presence commands respect for all human endeavor and difference.

We need teachers who are equally at home discussing compellingly matters of international and local public policy as they are talking engagingly about artistic, musical, literary, mathematical, scientific, or social culture (Hamlet or Quantum Physics). It seems that many conceive of this in a bifurcated fashion—either they regard themselves as subject specialists and generalists, or they involve themselves in public policy but in a politicized way. We need teachers who can address policy matters in a non-partisan fashion by connecting their subject matter expertise with issues of life in today's postmodern, turbulent society.

If we prepare teachers in this way for the vexing problems and dilemmas of a postmodern world, then we have to take seriously our responsibilities for research and policy in the next gyre. I believe we have a moral obligation to prepare teachers rigorously for today's world and an equally strong obligation to provide the conditions that permit continuing research and policy development. We are faced with a choice about what kind of teachers we want to prepare and about what kind of teachers we want them to become. Research, education policy, and teacher education practice must come together. So too must different university faculties with teacher educators, and teacher educators with professional bodies. It won't be easy, but it will be productive and, if we wish to keep the beast at bay, ultimately non-negotiable.

References

- British Columbia College of Teachers. (2004). Letter of Understanding (LOU) signed between the BC College of Teachers (BCCT) and the Association of British Columbia Deans of Education (ABCDE) in May, 2004. http://www.bcct.ca/documents/AboutUs/Committees/agrmt_bcct_abcde.pdf
- British Columbia College of Teachers. (2004). *Results of 2003 survey of graduates of BC teacher education programs*. <http://www.bcct.ca/forms.aspx#5> Vancouver: BCCT
- British Columbia College of Teachers. (2001). *Results of 2000 survey of graduates of BC teacher education programs*. <http://www.bcct.ca/forms.aspx#5> Vancouver: BCCT
- British Columbia College of Teachers. (1998). *Results of 1997 survey of graduates of BC teacher education programs*. <http://www.bcct.ca/forms.aspx#5> Vancouver: BCCT
- Clandinin, J., & Connelly, M. (2000). *Narrative inquiry: Experience and story in qualitative research*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Clarke, A., & Erickson, G. (2003). *Teacher inquiry: Living the research in everyday practice*. London, UK: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Clifford, G., & Guthrie, J. (1988). *Ed school: A brief for professional education*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (2001a). Editorial: Higher standards for prospective teachers: What's missing from the discourse? *Journal of Teacher Education*, 52(3) 179-181.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (2001b). Editorial: Learning to teach against the (new) grain. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 52(1), 3-4.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (2000). Editorial: Teacher education at the turn of the century. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 51(3) 163-165.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (2003). Editorial: The unforgiving complexity of teaching: Avoiding simplicity in the age of accountability. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 54(1) 3-5.
- Cochran-Smith, M., & Fries, K. (2005). Researching teacher education in changing times: Politics and paradigms. In M. Cochran-Smith & K.M. Zeichner (Eds.), *Studying teacher education: The report of the AERA panel on research and teacher education* (pp. 69-109). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum (for the American Educational Research Association, Washington, DC).
- Cole, A. (1999). Teacher educators and teacher education reform: Individual commitments, institutional realities. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 24(3), 281-295.
- Cole, A. (2000a). Case studies of reform in Canadian preservice teacher education. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 46(2), 192-195.
- Cole, A. (2000b). Toward a preliminary understanding of teacher education reform in Anglophone Canada. *McGill Journal of Education*, 35(2), 139-154.
- Collins, A., & Tierney, R. (2006). Teacher education accord: Values and ideals of the teaching profession in Canada. *Education Canada*, 46 (4), 73-75.
- Connelly, M., & Clandinin, J. (1996). Teachers' professional knowledge landscapes: Teacher stories—stories of teachers—school stories—stories of schools. *Educational Researcher*, 25 (3), 24-30.
- Connelly, M., & Clandinin, J. (2001). Exploring the landscape of Canadian teacher education. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education and Development*, 4(1), 1-11.
- Cowley, P., & Easton, S.T. (2003). *The \$100,000,000 giveaway: Who says education doesn't get enough money?* Vancouver: The Fraser Institute.
- Crocker, R., Dibbon, D., & Glickman, V. (2007). *Proposed study of teacher preparation programs across Canada*. Kelowna, BC: Society for the Advancement of Excellence in Education. (http://www.sae.ca/research/B_019_DDD_MID.php).

- Dare, M. (2002). How can teachers' qualifications be upgraded? *Society for Quality Education*. <http://www.societyforqualityeducation.org/teachers/9.html>
- Dare, M., Hepburn, C.R., & Merrifield, J. (2006). *Why Canadian education isn't improving*. Vancouver: The Fraser Institute.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (1998). Teachers and teaching: Testing policy hypotheses from a national commission report. *Educational Researcher*, 27 (1), 5-15.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2000a). How teacher education matters. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 51 (3), 166-173.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2000b). Reforming teacher preparation and licensing: Debating the evidence. *Teachers College Record*, 102 (1), 28-56.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2000c). Teacher quality and student achievement: A review of the state policy evidence. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 8 (1). Retrieved April 20, 2007 from <http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v8n1/>
- Erickson, G.L., & Brandes, G.M. Developing and sustaining a community of inquiry among teachers and teacher educators. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 44 (1), 38-52.
- Evertson, C., Hawley, W., & Zlotnik, M. (1985). Making a difference in educational quality through teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 36, (3), 2-10.
- Feiman-Nemser, S. (1983). Learning to teach. In L. Shulman & G. Sykes (Eds.), *Handbook of teaching and policy* (pp. 150-170). New York: Longman.
- Finn, C., & Kanstoroom. (2000). *Improving, empowering, dismantling*. Washington, DC: Thomas B. Fordham Foundation.
- Finneran, R.J. (Ed.). (1989). *The collected poems of W. B. Yeats*. New York: Macmillan, 1989.
- Freiberg, H.J., & Waxman, H. (1990). Changing teacher education. In R. Houston (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 617-635). New York: Macmillan.
- Gage, N.L., & Winne, P.W. (1973). Performance-based teacher education. In K. Ryan (Ed.), *Teacher education: 74th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education* (pp.146-172). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gilroy, P. (2002). Controlling change: Teacher education in the UK. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 28(3), 247-252.
- Glassford, L. (June, 1997). *Meeting the needs of future teachers: Curricular changes for preservice programs from implications of secondary teachers' perceptions of recent changes in Ontario schools*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Canadian Association for Teacher Education, St John's, Newfoundland.
- Goodlad, J. (1990). *Teachers for our nation's schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Grimmett, P.P. (1995). Reconceptualizing teacher education: Preparing teachers for revitalized schools. In M.F. Wideen & P.P. Grimmert (Eds.), *Changing times in teacher education: Restructuring or reconceptualizing?* (pp. 202-225). London, UK: Falmer Press.
- Grimmett, P.P. (1997). A search for hope in teaching and teacher education during changing times. *American Journal of Education* 105 (4), 458-477.
- Grimmett, P.P. (1998). Reconceptualizing the practice of teacher education: On not throwing out the concurrent model with the reform bathwater. *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 44(3), 251-267.
- Grimmett, P.P. (2007). Ongoing data analysis in the Major Collaborative Research Initiative (MCRI) study, *Study of Current Trends in the Evolution of School Personnel in Canadian Elementary and Secondary Schools*. Five-year study funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, 2002-2007.
- Grimmett, P.P., & Echols, F.H. (2006). *What say we dance, but this time with music: Review of the provisions of Regulation 347/02, accreditation of teacher education programs in Ontario*. Toronto, ON: Ontario College of Teachers.

- Grimmett, P.P., & Erickson, G.L. (Eds.) (1988). *Reflection in teacher education*. Vancouver: Pacific Educational Press & New York: Teachers College Press.
- Grimmett, P.P., & MacKinnon, A.M. (1992). Craft knowledge and the education of teachers. In G. Grant (Ed.), *Review of Research in Education, Volume 18* (pp. 385-456). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.
- Grossman, P. (2003, January/February). Teaching: From a nation at risk to a profession at risk? *Harvard Education Letter*. Retrieved April 24, 2007, from <http://www.edletter.org/past/issues/2003-jf/nation.shtml>
- Grossman, P.L. (1990). *The making of a teacher: Teacher knowledge and teacher education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Haberman, M. (1985). Does teacher education make a difference? A review of comparisons between liberal arts and teacher education graduates. *Journal of Thought*, 20 (2), 25-34.
- Heap, J. (2006). Personal correspondence.
- Housego, B.E.J., & Grimmett, P.P. (1983). The performance-based/developmental debate about student teaching supervision: A typology and tentative resolution. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 29(4), 319-337.
- Housego, I.E., & Grimmett, P.P. (Eds.). (1985). *Teaching and teacher education: Generating and utilizing valid knowledge for professional socialization*. Vancouver: WEDGE Publications.
- Howey, K. (1995). The United states: The context for the restructuring and reconceptualization of teacher preparation In M.F. Wideen & P.P. Grimmett (Eds.), *Changing times in teacher education: Restructuring or reconceptualizing?* (pp. 19-33). London, UK: Falmer Press.
- Humes, W.M. (1994). Teacher education in British Columbia and Scotland: A response. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 20(1), 47-57.
- Johnson, D. (2007). *Ontario's best public schools: An update to signposts of success (2005)*. Toronto: C.D. Howe Institute.
- Johnson, D. (2005). *Signposts of success: Interpreting Ontario's elementary school test scores*. Toronto: C.D. Howe Institute.
- Joyce, B., & Clift, R. (1984). The Phoenix agenda: Essential reform in teacher education. *Educational Researcher*, 13(1), 5-16.
- Little, J. W. (1982). Norms of collegiality and experimentation: Workplace conditions of school success. *American Educational Research Journal*, 19 (3), 325-340.
- Marland, P.W. (1977). *A study of teachers' interactive thoughts*. Doctoral dissertation. Edmonton, AB: University of Alberta.
- Moreno, J.M. (2007). Do the initial and continuous teachers' professional development prepare teachers to understand and cope with the complexities of today and tomorrow's world. *Journal of Educational Change*, 8, 169-173.
- Munby, H. (1999). Issue editor: Planning, Implementing, and Evaluating a Field-Based Teacher Education Program. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 26 (2).
- Munby, H., & Russell, T. (1994). The authority of experience in learning to teach: Messages from a Physics Methods course. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 45(2), 86-95.
- Myers, D., & Saul, D. (1974). How not to reform a teacher education system. In D. Myers & F. Reid, (Eds.), *Educating teachers: Critiques and proposals*. Toronto: OISE Press.
- National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform*. Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office.
- Neatby, H. (1953). *So little for the mind: An indictment of Canadian education*. Toronto: Clarke Unwin.
- Nikiforuk, A. (1993). *School's out: The catastrophe in public education and what we can do about it*. Toronto: MacFarlane, Walter & Ross.

- Pakravan, P. (2006). *The future is not what it used to be: Reexamining postsecondary funding mechanisms in Canada*. Toronto: C.D. Howe Institute.
- Pederson, K. G., & Fleming, T. (1979). The more things change, the more they stay the same: Some inescapable conclusions on the nature of teacher education. *Teacher Education*, 14(2), 40-49.
- Phillips, S. (2002). *Teacher quality in Canada*. SAEI Research Series. Kelowna, BC: Society for the Advancement of Excellence in Education. http://www.saei.ca/publications/A_016_DDD_MID.php
- Raptis, H., & Fleming, T. (2003). *Reframing education: How to create effective schools*. Toronto: C.D. Howe Institute.
- Russell, T. (1998). Why doesn't teacher education begin with experience? *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 25 (4), 49-54.
- Schön, D.A. (1988) Coaching reflective teaching. In P.P. Grimmert & G.L. Erickson (Eds.), *Reflection in teacher education* (pp. 19-29). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Sheehan, N., & Fullan, M. (1995). Teacher education in Canada: A case study of British Columbia and Ontario. In M.F. Wideen & P.P. Grimmert (Eds.), *Changing times in teacher education: Restructuring or reconceptualizing?* (pp. 89-102). London, UK: Falmer Press.
- Sheehan, N., & Wilson, J.D. (1994). From Normal School to the University to the College of Teachers: Teacher education in British Columbia in the 20th century. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 20(1), 23-38.
- Thiessen, D., & Cole, A. (1993). Reorienting teacher education in Canada. *Journal of Education Policy*, 8(3), 205-217.
- Tuckwell, N.B. (1980). *Stimulated recall: Theoretical perspectives and practical and technical considerations*. Technical report 80-2-3, Center for Research on Teaching. Edmonton, AB: University of Alberta.
- Wasley, P.A., & McDiarmid, W.G. (2003). *Tying the assessment of new teachers to student learning and to teacher preparation*. Paper prepared for the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (NCTAF). Retrieved April 3, 2007 from http://www.nctaf.org/strategies/assure/quality_teacher_preparation/assessment_of_new_teachers.htm
- Wideen, M.F., & Grimmert, P.P. (1997). Exploring futures in initial teacher education: The landscape and the quest. In A.S. Hudson & D. Lambert, (Eds.), *Exploring futures in initial teacher education* (pp. 3-42). London, UK: London University Institute of Education Press.
- Wideen, M.F., & Grimmert, P.P. (Eds.). (1995). *Changing times in teacher education: Restructuring or reconceptualizing?* London, UK: Falmer Press.
- Wideen, M., Mayer-Smith, J., & Moon, B. (1999). 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), 130-178.
- Yeats, W.B. (1919). The second coming. Printings: *The Dial* (Chicago), November 1920; *The Nation* (London), 6 November 1920; *Michael Robartes and the Dancer* (Dundrum: Cuala, 1921); *Later Poems* (London: Macmillan, 1922; 1924; 1926; 1931). *The Literature Network*. <http://www.online-literature.com/yeats/780/>
- Zeichner, K. (2006). Different conceptions of teacher expertise and teacher education in the USA. *Education Research and Perspectives*, 33 (2), 60-79.
- Zeichner, K. (2005). Reflections of a university-based teacher educator on the future of college- and university-based teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 57(3), 326-340.
- Zumwalt, K. (1982). Research on teaching: Policy implications for teacher education. In A. Lieberman & M. McLaughlin (Eds.), *Policy making in education: 81st Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education* (pp.215-248). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

CATE/ACFE Keynote Address 2008

*Between Judgment and Constraint:
Reconsidering Autonomy in Professional Life*

Anne M. Phelan
(University of British Columbia)

presented at

University of British Columbia
1 June 2008

Introduction to the 2008 Address

Beginning with the 1928 news story of Mabel Estelle Jones, reported to have taken her own life as a result of unjustifiable criticisms of her teaching, Anne Phelan's address poses questions about the challenges of teacher autonomy in contemporary times. Phelan draws upon in-depth phenomenological interviews with three novice teachers and Hannah Arendt's political theory of freedom to investigate the paradoxical qualities of autonomy in teaching, a profession that continues to be marked by the force of patriarchal assumptions. How, she asks, might a teacher find and enact a sovereign sense of self in a profession defined by the care of others—a care often controlled, regulated and manipulated from external positions of power and authority? Phelan presents three teacher portraits wherein professional autonomy is variously rendered as exchangeable, as bent, and as burdensome. Each portrayal disrupts liberal notions of autonomy as individual and self-interested and permits new ways of thinking about freedom in the face of work demands and the exigencies of external realities in the world of education. Arendt's view that human freedom requires the presence of others provokes Phelan to articulate the risk of teachers becoming trapped in private concerns that correspond to dominant understandings of teachers' work and competence. Teachers must create a paradoxical and hard-won autonomy in conversation with one another, and, Phelan concludes, nurture a respectful companionship as an antidote to oppressive standards of professionalism. Autonomy as freedom emerges where the self can be narrated by and with others.

Anne Phelan is a Professor in the Department of Curriculum and Pedagogy, and a Research Associate with the Centre for the Study of Teacher Education, at the University of British Columbia. Her interests lie in (a) the relationship between language, subjectivity, and power, and (b) the play of judgment, and (c) the dynamic of autonomy and responsibility, in teaching and teacher education. Her current research, with Dr. Alice Pitt (York University), explores the paradoxes of autonomy (creativity and resistance) in professional life. Dr. Phelan's co-edited book, "*Critical Readings in Teacher Education: Provoking Absences*" (with Dr. Jennifer Sumsion, Charles Sturt University) explores how the 'post' literature might productively inform debates about teacher education and assist in establishing new trajectories for policy and practice.

Note d'introduction à la conférence de 2008

En commençant par l'histoire de Mabel Estelle Jones qui en 1928 se donna la mort à la suite dit-on de critiques non justifiées sur son enseignement, Anne Phelan s'intéresse aux défis que pose la question de l'autonomie des enseignants à notre époque. Anne Phelan puise dans des entretiens phénoménologiques menés auprès de trois enseignants novices de même que dans la théorie politique de Hannah Arendt sur la liberté pour analyser les qualités paradoxales de l'autonomie dans

l'enseignement, une profession toujours marquée par le poids de valeurs patriarcales. Comment un enseignant peut-il faire l'expérience de l'autonomie dans une profession souvent contrôlée, réglementée et manipulée par des autorités et des pouvoirs extérieurs? Anne Phelan présente trois portraits d'enseignants chez qui l'autonomie professionnelle est présentée comme échangeable, malléable ou comme un fardeau. Chaque portrait dérange les notions libérales d'autonomie en tant que caractéristique individuelle permettant d'envisager de nouvelles manière de concevoir la liberté au regard des exigences du travail et des réalités externes dans le monde de l'éducation. Le point de vue de Hanna Arendt à savoir que la liberté humaine requiert la présence d'autres conduit Anne Phelan à parler du risque qui guette les enseignants à se trouver pris au piège de leurs préoccupations personnelles, ce qui correspond à la perception dominante du travail et des compétences de l'enseignant. Les enseignants doivent développer une autonomie paradoxale et durement gagnée en discutant entre eux et en encourageant un compagnonnage respectueux comme antidote aux normes oppressives du professionnalisme. L'autonomie en tant que liberté émerge quand le soi peut être discuté par et avec d'autres.

Anne Phelan est professeure au Department of Curriculum and Pedagogy et chercheure associée au Centre for the Study of Teacher Education, à l'Université de Colombie-Britannique. Elle s'intéresse plus particulièrement (i) à la relation entre le langage, la subjectivité et le pouvoir, (ii) au jeu du jugement et (iii) à la dynamique de l'autonomie et de la responsabilité dans l'enseignement et la formation des enseignants. Sa recherche actuelle avec la Dr Alice Pitt (Université York) explore les paradoxes de l'autonomie (créativité et résistance) dans la vie professionnelle. Le livre *Critical Readings in Teacher Education: Provoking Absences* édité par Anne Phelan en collaboration avec Jennifer Sumsion, de l'Université Charles Sturt, explore comment la littérature «post» peut informer de manière productive les débats sur la formation des enseignants et aider à établir de nouvelles lignes directrices en matière de politiques et de pratiques.

CATE / ACFE 2008

Keynote Address

Between Judgment and Constraint: Reconsidering Autonomy in Professional Life

Anne M. Phelan
University of British Columbia

Framing a Question: The Tale of Mabel Jones

On the morning of 14 November 1928 an official of the Cowichan Lake Logging Company came upon a grisly scene in the teacher's residence at Nixon Creek, an isolated logging camp on the southwest shore of Cowichan Lake on Vancouver Island. Upon entering the three-room dwelling, they were horrified to find the body of the teacher, twenty-year-old Mabel Jones, stretched out on her back on the floor in the sitting room with a .22 rifle beside her. The post-mortem report coldly described 'a bullet wound of entrance on the front of the chest just to the left of the mid-line with about it a powder-burn.' A note was found.... Miss Jones wrote: *There are a few people who would like to see me out of the way, so I am trying to please them ... I know this is a coward's way of doing things, but what they said about me almost broke my heart. They are not true. Forgive me, please. Say it was an accident.'* The complaints registered against Mabel Jones by some parents (out of twenty-two children, the parents of only three were responsible for these criticisms) were enumerated as follows: the flag was continually flying, the children were allowed to march into school in a careless manner; schoolroom discipline was lacking; and the teacher was allowing the children to 'waste their scribblers' (Wilson, 1991, p. 202).

J. Donald Wilson (1991), historian, goes on to recount the coroner's report, issued one month later. The verdict was clear-cut: "Mabel Estelle Jones came to her death whilst temporarily insane." The jury added, however: "we are further of the opinion that the mental state was the result of unjustifiable, unfeeling and underhanded criticisms of her work on the part of two members of the school board." It recommended finding ways in future to free teachers in such small, isolated school districts "from the gossip of irresponsible and petty citizens" (p. 202/3).

Public outrage about the Mabel Jones case was instant. Newspaper journalists lamented the tragic death of "poor little Mabel Jones" who "took her own life because it had become intolerable to her in that lonely settlement in the deep woods of Vancouver Island" (the Vancouver *Province* in

Wilson, 1991, p. 203). Joshua Hinchliffe, the new Conservative minister of education at the time, dismissed the Nixon Creek school board, replacing it with an official trustee (Wilson, 1991). He then launched an investigation into conditions affecting the lives of teachers in rural and assisted schools. While none of the recommendations of that inquiry were ever followed through, Hinchliffe did appoint a Rural Teachers' Welfare Officer (Women) in the person of Lottie Bowron whose charge was to offer "pastoral care to the troubled female teachers in the province's isolated areas" (Wilson, 1991, p. 204).

The situation faced by Mabel Jones was not unlike hundreds of other rural teachers in early twentieth century British Columbia when loneliness, isolation, difficult and inhospitable communities were the order of the day. Yet compared to domestic service and other occupations open to women at the time, teaching offered many attractions (Wilson, 1991).

[M]any female teachers thrived on the independence and modest social status afforded them. The economic opportunity to live away from home made teaching a desirable transition stage between schooling and marriage.... For a minority of women...teaching became a vocation, in fact often a lifetime career.... 'we thought of ourselves as adventurers – like Olympic Torchbearers in our gumboots and mittens'. Finally, as work, teaching provided the challenge, satisfaction, and sense of accomplishment that came from reaching the minds and hearts of young children (p. 206).

Historians suggest that teachers were at once lonely yet independent; independent yet imposed upon by local community members; imposed upon yet adventurers and torchbearers; torchbearers yet lacking control of the workplace; lacking control yet identifying themselves as accomplished, intellectual labourers. The central theoretical problem in understanding women teachers in the past, writes Alison Prentice, is "how to evoke the oppressive structures that maintained a patriarchal order while at the same time affirming that women were not the passive victims of that oppression" (1991, p. 9). In the mid-nineteenth century, for example, some teachers (lady-principals in fashionable academies) began to carve out for themselves an area of autonomy while at the same time colluding in their own and their students' oppression as women (Prentice & Theobald, 1991).

History gives us pause as we consider the plight of contemporary teachers. The importance of teachers' autonomy—as thinking for oneself in situations that require judgment rather than routine—is widely recognized in the literature. It is also understood, however, that the nature of teachers' work and its social context complicates teacher autonomy, for teaching involves placing one's autonomy at the service of the best interests of children and their communities (Pitt & Phelan, 2005). Consider, for example, the range of policies during the 1980s and 1990s in North America and Europe articulated in the so-called public interest. Many would argue that the delineation of teacher competences, the establishment of teaching standards, the introduction of licensed and certified teacher schemes, the creation of prescriptive, outcome-based curricula, and systems of accountability through standardized testing constrain the autonomy of teachers (Furlong et al, 2000; Smyth & Shacklock 1998; Phelan 1996). Teachers seem inevitably caught between their own judgments and external constraints.

Lortie's (1975) question, "What does teaching do to teachers?" is thrown into sharp relief. Teachers want to make a contribution, but in light of their inheritance (in the form of policy and practice) they worry about the quality of that contribution. Teachers' intrasubjective experiences of self-doubt, loneliness, helplessness and efforts at over-achievement signal autonomy's paradoxical play in professional life: the autonomy of a profession depends upon the autonomy of each of its members. Yet these autonomous participants must create and account for the singularity of the profession as a collective vision of autonomy. In other words, professionals have to become

autonomous before there can be autonomy (Castoriadis, 1994; Pitt & Phelan, 2005). For example, while the establishment of teachers' colleges in British Columbia and Ontario have ensured self-regulation for the profession, ironically perhaps, professional autonomy has become less secure, more ambiguous, and amidst calls for accountability, even suspicious (Pitt & Phelan, 2005). In the face of the paradoxes of professional life, Alice Pitt and I ask, not only what does teaching do to teachers BUT what teaching (and learning to teach) does to the profession and the qualities of autonomy that may emerge there.

The question of what teaching does to the profession and the qualities of autonomy that might emerge is central to the ongoing political work of crafting democracy and social justice within the profession and its institutions. Thinking about a profession as having the same structure as a society and as being capable of contemplating its own implication in the creation of its laws allows us to analyze the conditions for a profession's responsibility in the delicate work of creating autonomy for its members while using an autonomy that does not yet exist (Pitt & Phelan, 2005).

Designing a Research Study

The research project, "Paradoxes of Autonomy in Professional Life" (See Pitt & Phelan, 2008), reflects a productive tension between our interest in teachers' subjective experience *and* the discursive production of autonomy in terms of its ambiguities and divergences in a range of contexts (Alvesson & Skoldberg, 2000). To sustain this tension, we use three mutually supportive and interactive research approaches over the course of the three year study: 1) a literary historiography of discussions of autonomy in humanities, social theory, and human services literature; 2) phenomenological in-depth interviews of beginning and seasoned teachers in two national contexts; and 3) a discourse analysis of relevant policy documents in both national contexts (e.g., professional standards and acts of parliament) that impact professional practice.

In this presentation, I draw on in-depth phenomenological interviews with teachers who are within the first three years of practice. These interviews are drawn from a larger group of interviews currently underway with teachers at various stages in career, in both British Columbia and Ontario. The purpose of the interviews is to engage how participants experience and understand the subjective meanings of the work of teaching and learning to teach and of belonging to a profession (Seidman, 1991). The in-depth phenomenological interview is designed to elicit the participant's narrative experience and reflection on it. The interview structure is attentive to the participant's reflections on personal, social, and historical narratives. I invited participants to reflect on a series of prompts about times when, for example, their authority was questioned by others; they questioned authority; or, they became aware of constraints of the institution on their teaching (Pitt & Britzman, 2003). This method was used in previous research (Pitt & Britzman, 2003) for the purpose of understanding 'difficult knowledge' in teaching and learning. This method solicits stories and metaphorical language and is thus designed to analyze rich language use, moments of conflict within stories, ambivalence in thought and feeling, and instances of working through dilemmas of autonomy.

Framing Autonomy

In viewing autonomy as a paradox within professional life, one is better able to grasp the intricacies of its emergence, the networks of influence that underpin it, and the professional inhibitions, fears, and defenses that render its expression vulnerable (Pitt & Phelan, 2008). Our focus on autonomy contrasts with the tendency in educational studies to cover it over by theories of professional induction where becoming a teacher is seen as developmental, as grounded in experience, and as informed by best practices (Stronach et al., 2002). Teacher autonomy vacillates between being portrayed as a mark of a robust professionalism and as a sign of the difficulty other educational stakeholders have in influencing or believing they have influenced what teachers do behind classroom doors (Labaree 1992). Whether cast as earned or stolen, bestowed by professional membership or diminished by external forces, autonomy is generally perceived as a quantifiable characteristic of an individual (Fournier 1999). As such, autonomy is equated with freedom to act in accordance with one's personal beliefs and, most dangerously, in one's own interest (Pitt & Phelan, 2005). Freedom of will and self-interest are potentially entangled in a dangerous fantasy of sovereignty according to which perfect liberty is incompatible with the existence of others.

Hannah Arendt (1993) criticized the dominant philosophical view of freedom as an escape from the dictates of others. For Arendt (1998), freedom requires the presence of others, what she termed plurality. In this, she signals the importance of others in making our lives together and in understanding ourselves (Coulter, 2002). Freedom needs the company of those others who are equal enough to allow communication but sufficiently distinct to make conversation worthwhile.

Arendt sought to salvage the possibility of agency, individuality and community from what she perceived as a mass society or totalitarian “system that has no concern for individual human beings at all, but uses them merely as material for the working of supposedly supra-human ‘laws’ of nature and history” (Canovan, 1992, p. 88). She reinvented Aristotelian praxis, Coulter (2002) writes, ‘which is no longer directly aimed at leading a good life in the polis, but at exercising human freedom’ (p. 199). She wrote that humans are free—“as distinguished from their possessing the gift for freedom—as long as they act, neither before nor after; for to be free and to act are the same” (Arendt, 1993, p. 153).

“To act, in its most general sense, means to take an initiative, to begin, to set something in motion” (Arendt, 1998, p. 176-177). The human ability to create something new in our own lives and in the company of others is what Arendt termed natality. The fact of natality suggests respect for the agency of others. Each of us has the capacity to begin something new, something totally unanticipated. “Natality is a reflection of freedom” (Coulter, 2002, p. 199). It is the hope of the world, as it were, because it suggests the possibility that the world can be renewed.

Importantly, our distinctiveness as human beings, as newcomers, is less a function of our individuality, but is our distinctiveness in relationship to other people. We are only fully human, can only act and hence experience freedom in companionship with others. Plurality is both a condition and an achievement.

In acting and speaking, men show who they are, reveal actively their unique personal identities and thus make their appearance in the human world, while their physical identities appear without any activity of their own in the unique shape of the body and the sound of the voice. The disclosure of “who” in contradistinction to “what” somebody is—his qualities, gifts, talents, and shortcomings, which he may display or hide—is implicit in everything somebody says or does (Arendt, 1998, p. 179).

One attraction of Arendt's conception of freedom as action is that the latter does not presuppose an identity prior to or apart from action. The self is "fragmented, discontinuous, indistinct, and most certainly uninteresting" (Honig, 1995, p. 140). The self becomes a 'who' by acting.

For the sake of the 'who' it might become, it risks the dangers of the radically contingent public realm where anything can happen, where the consequences of action are 'boundless' and unpredictable, where "not life but the world is at stake" (Honig, 1995, p. 140).

Arendt's actors are never self-sovereign. The consequences of action are unpredictable and irreversible, and that is precisely why promising and forgiving are necessary; they operate as temporary islands of certainty in a contingent world.

If freedom is not a quality of the will but an accomplice of doing and acting (Arendt, 1993), then what constitutes doing and acting for teachers? So much of teaching involves what Arendt termed 'labour' because it is ruled by the necessities of life and concern for its preservation. Teaching, and particularly learning to teach, is a continuous effort at keeping children engaged, learning to pace lessons, organizing and managing classrooms (Coulter, 2002). Our use of the term survival in relation to teaching is telling in this regard. Much of teaching also involves what Arendt termed 'work' or the creation of objects which are enduring and constitute the materials and resources of teaching. The autonomy often associated with teaching provides scope for work: teachers can create artifacts such as unit plans and lessons that interpret and organize the heritage of human experience as represented by the disciplines. If restricted to labour and work, teaching becomes locked within a logic of necessity and utility, limited to modes of thinking that try to answer "the question of how we can reach an end rather than why that end is what we should aim for at all" (O'Byrne, 2005, p. 396). The issue at stake is not instrumentality per se but its generalization such that necessity and utility become established as the ultimate standards of teaching and the profession. If teaching is narrowed to labour and work then this reduction misses what is truly meaningful in human existence: action (Coulter, 2002). "Only when ends and means are enmeshed in one another, when action is an expression of natality and plurality can humans be free" (Coulter, 2002, p. 200).

Public debate? Strike action? Program reform? Encounters with colleagues? Community webs? Salons? Action research? What is action? Action is that which interrupts the course of human life. Mordechai Gordon (2001) writes:

The point is that action, as the ability to interrupt and begin again, bestows meaning on human existence, which would otherwise resemble such other natural processes as the life of a volcano (p. 43).

Let us return for a moment to the plight of Mabel Jones. What is striking in its absence from the discussions that followed her death is her 'newness'—her status as a beginner. All newcomers bring with them the possibility that the teaching profession might be reinvigorated. Mabel's apparent lack of discipline might suggest the alternative value of relational authority. The 'wasting of scribblers' might indicate a different approach to writing than was common practice at that time. Mabel's plight, however, also suggests that while newness is always possible, its promise of renewal cannot be guaranteed. The link between natality and action is not assured (Levinson, 2001). In the absence of others with whom she might have generated a conversation with difference, the opinions of a few became solidified as truths to impose. Ironically, perhaps, it is the presence of others who make action—the forging of new realities in teaching and for the profession—possible and impossible.

The generalization of labour/necessity and work/utility in teaching may hinder teachers' capacity for action and further their alienation from each other and from a world that could exist

among them. What is troublesome is the manner in which teachers learn to reconcile their alienation and the absence of action in their lives. In my interviews with teachers for this study, I have been repeatedly struck by their reference to ‘the kind of person who is attracted to teaching’ when speaking about teachers’ reticence in speaking and acting inside or outside of schools. The description assumes a naturally occurring group of people whose being suggests a particular calling. “Poor little Mabel Jones,” as the journalist named her, is immortalized as passive vector of influences rather than an actor who might deflect those influences. The construal of labor, work and action as rival sensibilities can perhaps help to de-naturalize and de-essentialize this way of thinking. Honig (1995) explains,

Each would be understood as itself a performative production, not the expression of the authentic essence of a class, or a gender, but always the (sedimented) product of the actions, behaviors, norms and institutional structures of individuals, societies, and political cultures [and professions] (p. 143).

The reading of labour, work and action as rival sensibilities is compatible with Arendt’s view of the self as a multiplicity, an agonistic production, if you will.

Keeping in mind the notion of labour, work and action as performative productions, I have crafted portraits of autonomy in the lives of three new teachers. The portraits include narratives of teachers’ experiences and reflections. An analysis follows of teachers’ descriptions of natality (moments of originality, creativity and judgment) and influence (constraints, interference, authority), the conflicts these experiences pose for teachers, and their attempts to understand and/or repair them. I analyze the qualities of autonomy that emerge in so far as they reflect and complicate Arendt’s thinking about freedom as action and the link between natality and action.

Portraits of Autonomy

Clare

Clare teaches at an independent school where the “overarching, guiding theme... is that...we are preparing them for these tests¹.” There is “a lot of pride and a lot of prestige [is] associated with the school tied to our ranking and our continually improving our kind of status and how children are doing, whether or not they’re exceeding expectations” (p.6). A story of a colleague, Marion, who used to teach Grade 4 Language Arts, sets the scene for our interview. Over successive years, Marion’s students failed to score sufficiently high on the Fundamental Skills Assessment (FSA), and so Marion’s teaching responsibilities were changed.

[T]hey took Marion’s language arts and I think some of that was performance-based. And this year she’s not teaching language arts at all and I have her class’s language arts and my class’s language arts. So that was very interesting because it kind of created a shift in our relationship and I think she was upset about it at first, and not at me, but at our administration, and now it’s okay, now she loves the sciences and socials. And it made me

¹ One of the measures that has come to dominate achievement measurement in British Columbia is the Fundamental Skills Assessment (FSA). The FSA is administered each year to students in grades 4 and 7 to measure achievement in mathematics, reading and writing. “FSA results have acquired increased attention in the province because of annual school rankings produced by the right-wing business-funded think tank, The Fraser Institute, and published annually in two of the largest newspapers in the province”(Poole, 2007).

feel good in some ways, but it also highlighted the importance that is placed on standardized testing.

Clare has “risen to the occasion,” and her students’ scores “have been raised over the past three years.” She credits part of her success to the mentorship of her vice-principal who has taught her how to “create writers that exceed expectation.” Clare’s positive feelings about her performance are further reinforced when she takes the role of credentialed marker for the Ministry of Education.

[W]hen I marked in the summer...at one point, all of the bundles of essays were mixed up and we were in a room with 30 or 40 markers and the guy at the front of the room, one of the leaders, said ‘I’ve got to read you this story out loud’, and read it to the markers, and it was one of the kids... that I had team-taught but it was amazing, and the kid had written an amazing story and that was really rewarding...making a very specific difference in one area that we put a lot of emphasis on but...that is working. So that was very rewarding. An empowering feeling!

Despite some ambivalence on her part—“the children are so young, and they get stressed out, and we get stressed out, and it’s definitely a lot of pressure...”—she is philosophical about the perceived constraints imposed on her practice by virtue of what she terms “the school’s mentality.”

If you’re there, you’re buying into the system that the school had and the school does have ultimate control over kind of the way that they work, and certain things are more rigid...there are certain things I never have control over.

Part of what “you’re buying into,” according to Clare, is the understanding that “the parents truly feel that they have a right to have a say in how things happen,” and that, in her view, “definitely is an infringement on autonomy.” Parent teacher meetings are booked solid. Some parents are constantly in the building, asking questions. There are direct criticisms, and, in their absence, there are the “feelings of criticisms.” Parents “really recognize that they pay a lot of money for this education and they want to make sure that they are getting what they want.” She speaks of one occasion when, as team coach, she selected the recipient of the Most Valued Player (MVP) Award. Her judgment is called into question by a parent and subsequently by the school administration. “I did get spoken to about it” and asked “to give [my] reasoning” as “a complaint had been made.”

I’d made a mistake. And even when I’m justifying it and justifying it, I felt awful. I felt like I’d totally screwed up here. I’m in trouble. And I justified my kind of decision but of course you’re second guessing yourself ‘cause you’re questioned by authority or whatever and you’re like, well I must have made the wrong decision here.

Her feelings were further reinforced when the Physical Education Department, while supporting her initial choice of MVP, set a meeting to reconsider the MVP award, outlining a new policy and a set of criteria and categories to guide future selections. Clare describes several other occasions—for example, having what was deemed as inappropriate conversations in the staff room—when she was reminded of her visibility to the administrative team: “they’re always there, they’re always around!” She reflects on those moments when “the vice-principal has had to approach her with: ‘So, I’ve been told that you...’” She feels “horrified”, “awful”, “humiliated,” “angry,” and “not very professional.”

Clare describes the school principal as “quite top-down.” She is shocked by the manner in which she and her colleagues are addressed at times and the manner in which they are sometimes “made to kowtow to his authority.” The “vice-principals who are both women,” Clare explains, have

to “tiptoe” around the headmaster “because he is quite critical and brusque and ...when he’s in a good mood, he’s in a good mood, and when he’s not, he’s not. If we request something, [they’ll say], ‘Well, you know, we’ll have to see if Kevin’s having a good day, we’ll ask him that day’ kind of thing. Yet, on several occasions Clare has been at the receiving end of resources such as smart boards and conference funds from her principal with “always the understanding that ... it allowed me to help prepare for the FSA.”

From her experiences, Clare concludes that she has to learn how “to be able to dance around things,” to cultivate diplomacy with parents and colleagues. Her vice-principal is, in her view, “amazingly good...amazingly diplomatic.” “She gets you roped in...to agree to whatever it is, even though you don’t know what you’ve agreed to yet,”... “making someone feel that they came to that conclusion themselves, when really, she forces this conclusion upon them.” Clare “would love to ask for help, but then you don’t want to ask for help because then you feel like you’re not capable of doing it yourself sometimes.” That, she ponders, “is an interesting kind of balance....”

Helen

Helen is a teacher in her third year of teaching in the primary grades; she has had several long contracts since graduation in 2005. Although Helen believes that “there is autonomy to some degree” in that teachers “are allowed to sort of do what we want to an extent,” she wonders if autonomy is “theoretical.”

I can’t help but feel in many instances there is this sort of paternalistic, watchful, big brother eye that’s sort of looking down on us and wanting to make sure we’re doing the right thing as prescribed by the Ministry. And I see that particularly in the form of Pro D[velopment] where you know we have to be corralled into these big lecture halls.... I would have to say that I think that it’s that we live in a patriarchal social-cultural... political environment, teaching is a female-dominated profession, and I can’t help but feel sometimes that the hen’s in the proverbial henhouse, and the wolf is constantly at the door, just keeping an eye and making sure that the ladies are doing what they’re meant to be doing. [laughs]

Doing what one is “meant to be doing” amounts to what Helen terms “a perfunctory approach” in contrast to “being creative.”

I can’t teach in that way where you sort of say ‘look, we’re starting here and we’re going to end up here come hell or high water.’ I mean, that’s so stressful for me, and it’s so stressful for the little kids, you know, just, I don’t want to be the propagator of pain and depression.

While she accepts to some degree the necessity of ministry guidelines and protocols in the forms of PLOs (performance learning objectives) and IRPs (Individual Resources Packages), she also recognizes that her “creativity is sort of...bent...by the powers that be, the ministry.” For Helen creativity reflects the twin desires of intellectual and emotional engagement. During a brief two-day sojourn at one school, she encounters children who remind her of the absence she feels but had not articulated.

[T]hey were very loving little children with each other, towards me, towards other people in the school, just very, again a sense of humour and just warm and friendly to each other.

And I thought, my goodness, what a safe and wonderful little culture they have here. And that made me realize that that is what I wanted to create. And so I think that they provided that for me.... I suppose that, in an emotional sense, my character, which is given to being fairly affectionate, and effusive, and verbally demonstrative, was really welcomed and appreciated.

Helen is apprehensive about talking about her relationship with that particular group of children.

Again I feel a little bit nervous, going into the details of this, because there's all that stuff around, don't put your hand on the child's head.... Don't call the child 'darling', you know, all the weirdness.... So I feel a bit anxious, you know, sort of going into this territory, a little bit... because I wouldn't want to say anything that sounded incriminating, at all. I suppose that it partly felt safe for me because I, [pause] I didn't realize, but it was completely okay for me to be loving, [pause] and I am. But it was okay, in a way, it fit with their culture. They sort of expected it, in a way. It was like an idiom for them. And... it felt very normal for them, it wasn't odd for them. So that was very safe for me.... I felt...I felt, I felt good, I felt gratified about the job I was doing. And I mention these things partly because we're really not supposed to talk about them. And it's a bit disturbing not to be able to say that sometimes, it is.

Some of her reticence to describe “some real affection” she held for her students, Helen explains, is related to the tendency to “sexualize intimacy in this culture.” As a result, she feels that she’s “got to be quite covert in that way of expressing [her]self.”

Helen also conveys concern about the absence of ‘analytical’ and ‘critical’ conversation that might be “challenging to an adult mind.” She describes what happened when on one occasion a conversation about Buddhism was struck with a colleague.

I had a conversation about Buddhism with this woman, who works at my school at lunchtime.... I've gone on some meditation retreats and so forth, and she was talking about Buddhist philosophy—she's a Buddhist—and ... as we were talking...but the table around us became very hushed. And I find that's very common, very common.

Helen attributes the hushed tones to her colleagues’ “sense that something's going on over there.” While she acknowledges that there may be “a bit of paranoia on [her] behalf,” she can't help but notice that Buddhism and similar subjects do not constitute mainstream conversation at the elementary school level.

[W]e're not talking about, you know, being in Vegas for the spring break, and we're not talking about the new guy that you met and went and played baseball with his buddies. It's a very, almost a jocular, mainstream kind of culture that most people belong to; they're intelligent, worthy, conscientious people, you know I mean, honestly, I know that's not just a platitude. But you, the level, the style of discourse and the type of interests are frequently very different than my own [laughs]. You know, and I'm just sort of feeling that now, okay, you know, will I find a place where I feel really comfortable, will I continue to be, to feel like a bit of a pariah, sort of constantly... putting a zipper on my mouth.

While substitute teaching at the high school level, her experience was otherwise.

[T]eachers, for example, who are reading the latest things, who have the *New York Times*, you know, best seller list or book review list and the, the *Globe & Mail* book review list and have read half the books and have a point of reference, and they have an analysis ...and connections to their personal lives ... it's so engaging for me and it's so exciting for me and I feel like, ah, okay, now I can actually bring my whole self to the table.

Helen concludes that currently she's engaging in 'second guessin' and 'repression' which makes her feel as if she is "exempting a significant part of [her]self." She finds it "quite disturbing to be as sort of repressed as [she] feels a lot of the time...."

Lana

Lana is in her third year of teaching at a public high school in the area of special education. Her responsibility lies within an educational program directed at a group of five students with disabilities ranging from Fetal Alcohol Syndrome to Muscular Dystrophy. When asked about her understanding of autonomy, she replies:

[I]t's like having control and power over ... an entity within a larger institution. Having the power to make decisions, to run [my program] the way I think works, but within the guidelines of a larger institution.

While she "likes autonomy" she doesn't "want to be in control either" and this is why, she explains, she goes to the administration "with questions." She views the school principal as "in the position" of "constantly making decisions about what's important." As a result, "if there's a problem in the school, it comes back to them." Lana explains further that she "still want[s] the comfort of reaching out to someone who is ultimately in control" and "the fact that I'm writing things down suggests that I want to be backed up," she clarifies.

Lana's efforts to ask questions of the school administration have met with what she perceives as a "cold response" from school leaders.

My department head is sort of hidden away in her office, doesn't often answer a lot of my questions, is a very knowledgeable person but it's often hard for me to access that knowledge, which is again why I often go back to figure it out on my own.... I've had encounters with my administrator where I've had three points I wanted to speak with her about. And I've gone to her and gone through one thing and she's turned around and walked away before I've finished the other two. So...I do feel very alienated.... I didn't follow her because at that moment I was totally deflated.

Lana "found there were a lot of assumptions that [she] just knew what [she] was doing" and decides that "the school leaders need to be reminded that she is new."

It is really interesting because all this responsibility is given to me but I'm so lacking knowledge...and resources.... I'm a baby in that way, and yet I'm...running this program, and being told that I'm fine, and when I want to do something most of the time I'm being told, just go ahead... I found there were a lot of assumptions that I just knew what I was doing, that I knew what role everybody in the school plays....

On the one hand, Lana feels that her administration believes that she's "competent" but on the other hand, she feels that her particular area—special education—is "not that important" and "kids with disabilities aren't as valuable in the school" as there are other more important issues in need of attention such as "declining enrollment; wanting academic students to stand out."

And this has been one of my realizations lately, that I have good rapport with my principal as long as I'm not asking for something, asking for money or asking for more consultative time...because I can do what I want to do...I have the confidence of the administrators and nobody questions what I do... [I]f it mattered more to the school, it [my autonomy] would be less....

She concludes that hers is a "fake autonomy" and that "it really doesn't exist."

The situation doesn't sit well with Lana for a range of reasons. First, because she sees herself "at the point professionally where" she

[C]ould be accessing a lot more that could benefit my students, now how do I go about this? Because I've tended to be doing things on my own and that's looked upon as really good, "she's got everything under control." So I feel a little bit alienated from that [pause] and I'm not sure why.

Second, she is frustrated that she has to get "this knowledge on [her] own," to "dig" in order "to find things out", information about "where people are getting their money from, or how can I get what I need" that she feels should be "out there," readily available to "young" teachers who "don't know and no one's telling us." Third, she is still trying to figure out "who would know" the answers to her various questions. She concludes that "there's a hierarchy" in the system so she'll "follow it." She finds, however, that within the school and school district, "people keep referring [her] to other people and no one is giving [her] the answers ... I don't get any straight answers." Lana has lots of questions related to her wish to teach students about sexuality, for example.

Who would know? Wouldn't a district person know the policy...often I'm surprised that there isn't a policy...I like to know who it will come back to...if it blows up...I don't want to cause a problem and have a parent complain and not be able to say, "I looked into it and the district policy says blah ..." I guess I'm not into creating any controversy.

Lana's concerns are related in part to accountability, and she has learned to "document everything." Moreover, she states, "I want to be safe. When individual lives of students are at stake."

I feel like if someone comes back and questions me, I can say, 'no, we talked about that. Remember you said you would do this and I did my part'. Because I do so much, I need to be taken care of as well, to show what I've done in order to problem-solve.... If worse comes to, you know, if it's really bad, I can contact my union...and say I've gone through the motions and I've got proof that I've done it.

Her concerns, however, are not only related to accountability. She respects policy and assumes that "intelligent people have come up with it... that there is thought and consensus that has gone with it." She realizes, however, that "asking too many questions" may result in others "looking into too many things" and "it's going to chop some of my freedom...."

In what follows, I identify three qualities of autonomy—exchangeable, bent, and burdensome—that are emergent, conflicted, and often contradictory within the teachers' narratives. I

explore these qualities pondering the pushes and pulls of autonomy and wondering about the profession's capacity for action.

Rendering Autonomy

Autonomy as Exchangeable: “It’s a trade off!”

Caught within the confines of the economic circle of exchange, Clare is offered a level of autonomy and self-regulation in return for compliance with performance standards. Teacher autonomy, in this instance, surfaces as a commodity that can be granted or withdrawn (Pitt & Phelan, 2005). Autonomy is conditional. Teachers risk losing autonomy should they display a “fatal flaw” (British Columbia College of Teachers, 2004, p. 5) of inadequate performance or poor judgment. Recall Marion.

The logic of the system of influence is that of production accountability. Clare is instrumental in the process of producing student outcomes within a logic of production accountability.

A teacher's input of labour (transmitting knowledge and skills to students and motivating them to learn) produces an output, a measurable 'amount' or number of units of student achievement, usually in the form of test scores. If output is low, teachers must step up their productivity either by working harder or by learning new practices or technologies (Madrone & Placier, 2000, p. 4)

The principle of performativity (Lyotard, 1984) translates in this context into maintaining the flow of activity toward a particular end: superior school ranking and concomitant client satisfaction. The prevention of disorder (in the form of very specific forms of professional development for teachers) and restoration of order (policy-making, administrative intervention) become central concerns in the maintenance of the system. Clare has been closely mentored within the context of the school. Mentoring leans heavily, however, in a particular ideological direction—the hailing of standardized tests as opportunities to showcase good teaching and amazing students. Instructionally, there is a striking resemblance to 19th century Australia during which teachers were seen as having “little academic knowledge and only trained to teach in the one ‘right’ way (Musgrave, 1984, p. 7). When pedagogy is reduced to one right way, “when a certain knowledge opens up the way in advance, the decision is already made, it might as well be said that there is none to make; irresponsibly, and in good conscience, one simply applies or implements a program” and teaching becomes the simple application of a knowledge or know-how (Derrida, 1992, p. 41, 45). While Clare appreciates the training she has received in the pedagogy of Language Arts (it has after all rendered her recognizably competent and successful at her school), it is unclear that she has been invited to engage in or escape from judgment.

Clare acknowledges the degree to which the “school mentality” dictates practice and policy. In Arendtian terms, it is as if “a band of iron” holds the school faculty so tightly together that it is as though their plurality had disappeared into “One Man of gigantic dimensions” (Arendt, 1968, p. 164). The One Man of “excellent test scores” leaves little room for “breaking with sameness or with the claustrophobic politics of locality” (Gambetti, 2005, p. 435). The attempt is to limit the sphere of difference among teachers, to marshal power in ways that attempt to impose particular desired outcomes, irrespective of who the people are who are shunted aside or violated in the process (Madrone & Placier, 2000).

And yet, contrary to such violation or the imposition of “one interest and one opinion” (Arendt, 1998, p. 46) is the social bond to which Clare testifies. A sense of belonging and school pride are powerful seductions despite their conditionality or univocal quality. Clare speaks proudly of her colleagues and students; she admires the accomplishments of her principal in bringing the school thus far. Arendt speaks of early Christian communities in which charity operated as the social bond. “Behind the “harmony of interests” stands always the “communistic fiction,” she writes (1998, p. 44. Fn.36). The crux of this argument is that the school staff must be conceived of as a single subject. Clare’s description of the principal as benevolent father, the vice-principal as the mother who manages relations and promotes school values, and the teachers who are often addressed as children, draws on the metaphor of family. Families are notoriously thought of as non- or a-political, writes Arendt, and it is here that humans become entirely private, that is, “they have been deprived of seeing and hearing others, of being seen and being heard by them” (Arendt, 1998, p. 58). There is little room for any reality other than the established one, and “it holds the monopoly on procedures for the establishment of reality” (Lyotard, 1988, p. 4).

Ambivalence, however, pervades Clare’s narratives. She questions “the school mentality” while reconciling the reality it presents.

[I]t is a lot of hoop-jumping and should...nine-year olds be hoop jumping and learning how to click A, B, C, or D, or should they be doing Math in groups with...who knows? ...I mean [vice-principal’s name] believes quite strongly in the importance of the FSA, or views the FSA as an opportunity to showcase good teaching and amazing students...what good students can do if you push them...I mean their writing is amazing but that is just one very small piece of their overall education.

Clare’s ambivalence stems not only in relation to what a teacher is for but also her sense of how she ought to be treated as a result. She had hoped to “make a difference” teaching in a public school but, she says, “Rich kids need teachers too!” She reminds me, however, that unlike public school, in independent schools like hers, the teachers’ responsibility is directed at parents and not at the children.

She takes exception to the ‘thoughtless’ behaviour of her principal. She is angry with rude and demanding parents. She is aggrieved by the manipulations of her vice-principal. Again she reconciles her reality with a two-fold response: in a disquieting parallel to the feminine stereotype, she learns to be manipulative and to locate the problem in herself—her lack of professionalism, her inappropriate speech and her spontaneous interaction with parents. Clare’s ambivalence potentially threatens the performativity of the system, but it is effectively managed by the benevolent authority of the school leadership, parental comments, and cautionary tales of colleagues who fell short and were duly punished. The centralized space of power is visible but has been transformed to some degree into an institutionally dispersed and normalizing regime of panoptic visibility. The purpose of visibility is the better cultivation and management of the school’s most precious resource, its teachers.

There is however, a sense of parody in Clare’s “scandalous stories.” Clare’s use of humour may suggest the courage to risk critique of her situation, to make public what was formerly private and unspeakable.

It is the power to laugh at oneself, one’s fears, one’s beliefs that liberates and keeps the flux in play, keeps us in movement with the flux, and keeps the openness to the mystery from becoming nostalgia and melancholy, malingering and moping (Caputo, 1987: 292).

Clare sees the underside and falseness of her situation; she displays no desire to be hypocritical; she parodies the truth of her students’ economic position even as she attempts to mask it with a

description of their victim status as “over-scheduled” children. “I bet they have good Christmases though”.

Autonomy as Bent “My creativity is sort of...bent...by the powers that be”

For Helen, autonomy relates to creativity. Creativity speaks to the ability to use the imagination to develop new and original ideas or things. In the face of the Ministry of Education, however, she experiences her creativity as “bent,” having to at once yield to the force of program mandates and at the same time navigate her way with some intentionality. Acting comes face to face with having been acted upon.

In light of “the powers that be” teaching is perfunctory for Helen, that is, it is done merely as a matter of duty or custom without thought, attention or genuine feeling. The teacher is bound to an objective persona whose presence in the classroom is always functional; this contrasts sharply with the notion of subjectivity or identity “which is always contingent upon history, desires, and circumstances” (Britzman, 1991, p. 25). The real loss (and some would say danger), according to Helen, is that children are denied ‘sentient beings’ in the classroom.

I think the children feel safe when they know that the adult who is in the room is sentient, is happy to be there, and when they feel the adult in the room has some real affection for them. That they have a joke with them, a laugh with them, that they like to engage with them, that there’s a feeling of, perhaps not constantly but... some feeling of likeness and effervescence.

Helen wishes for moments that are not entangled with means-ends thinking; she wants moments when she can be with, rather than doing things to, the children. She wants moments when she can let her “intentions float down river.” She longs for opportunities to engage with her colleagues about ideas and their meaning for their individual and collective lives. Helen’s creativity is entangled in relationships with others.

Eros is the drive that impels human beings toward union. The desire for union and communion manifests itself in moments of joy, laughter, and pleasure—the pleasure of a shared interest like reading or the laughter resulting from a child’s spontaneous utterance. A shift from what is considered the normal state of classroom or staffroom order to that of erotic desire presupposes a partial dissolution of the binary opposition of teacher and student, and even teacher to teacher, oppositions that are central to a logic of professionalism. During erotic moments, boundaries are blurred and established patterns of relations are disturbed; these are moments of exuberance and excess for teachers and students, moments that are unreserved, lavish, and joyful. Georges Bataille (1986) suggests that eroticism smashes apart the self-contained character of individuals as they are in their normal lives. In Helen’s case, eroticism takes the form of a desire to break with established patterns of interacting in elementary schools—the perfunctory—which seem basic to a discontinuous mode of existence as separate and defined individuals (Phelan, 1997).

Helen understands, however, that to speak of her desire in relation to children is to evoke anxiety in herself and those around her. She is afraid of incriminating herself; she realizes that her own desire for mutuality with children may well be mistaken for something else. She hides her pleasure from her colleagues lest it be misconstrued. She is fearful that her touch may be framed as molestation, her emotional expression as professionally inappropriate. In “a culture that sexualizes intimacy,” she recognizes that a word or a touch can become obscene. Bataille (1986) reminds us that

obscenity is our name for the uneasiness which disturbs the physical state associated with self-possession, with the possession of a recognized and stable individuality.

Helen brings forward the relation between autonomy as self-possession and intimacy. Two decades ago, Sarah Freedman (1987) reminded us that this is the cost of the increasing professionalization of teaching as society encourages women to leave their homes to pursue real work, “work based on the male model that emphasizes rationality, order, detachment” (p. 458). Within this logic, the wolf in professional clothing lurks, requiring teachers to leave their desires at home—their love of literature in Helen’s case—and to practice forgetting them selves (Recall Helen’s complaint: “I can’t bring my whole self to the table”). While Helen longs for “the joy of conversation” (the joy of communication and understanding as well as misunderstandings and lack of communication)” (Benhabib, 1995, p. 98), mutuality evades her. Even in brief glimpses of conversation she experiences herself as a spectacle, an object of the collegial gaze, a disorderly woman who refuses to be “corralled” into mainstream popular discourse.

Helen’s description of her experience with a particular group of children and a particular group of high school teachers is akin to the Arendtian idea that we create action/achieve freedom in the company of others. While the power imbalance between children and adults is evident and Arendt reserved action to the realm of interaction among adults, there is in Helen’s words an understanding that teachers “teach the child what the world is like...and this work is not just work but action, in the emphatic Arendtian sense, ‘of the disclosure of the who through speech and action’” (Benhabib, 1995, p. 135).

The pleasures of the body and mind and the subject’s sheer bliss in being alive unsettles the Cartesian, self-possessed speaking subject (Zerilli, 1995, p. 177). As the locus of radical vitality, the disruptive body (bodies of teachers) is the condition for non-sovereign subject of action. “If men wish to be free,” Arendt declares, “it is precisely sovereignty that they must renounce” (Arendt, 1993, p. 165). Arendt’s concern with my reading of Helen, however, might revolve around her own concern that the intensity with which life is felt, experienced through the body, can be so great that wherever it prevails it eliminates all other worldly reality (Zerilli, 1995); “[h]ere the body is symptom, the space where the Word fails” (p. 180). The Arendtian body is also “mute and shrouded in secrecy,” exhibiting “the curious mixture of uncanny, dangerous, forbidden, and sacred attributes that Freud associates with the fundamentally ambivalent structure of taboo” and which Helen associates with teaching (Zerilli, 1995, p. 171).

Autonomy as Burdensome

Lana’s interview transcript is punctuated with the words of her principal, “You can handle it!” Far from motivating her, however, the apparent trust in her judgment and the attribution of autonomy—you know what you’re doing—become burdensome. “I am a baby” is her evocation of innocence. In an effort to recoil from the impossibility of beginning and perhaps of teaching itself, Lana turns to knowledge as she ponders: Who would know? Who or what will authorize her beginning?

Lana wishes to be ethically responsible for her students, but she is learning that, in choosing responsibility for a world she did not make she has become dependent on others (Britzman, 2007). She is ever aware of her own ignorance of practices and policies, positions and places within the hierarchy of school and school district. She believes, however, that it is within the institutional bureaucracy that she will find security. “I don’t want authority,” Lana explains, “I rather to be a part of something.” The bureaucracy of the school and school district are curiously comforting; there is solace to be found in the presence of the school principal who will “take the blame” and “back her up” if something goes wrong.

Lana's anxiety of authorship is exacerbated when those in authority turn away, even when their absence seems predicated on their faith in her competence. She balks at what she perceives as their neglect and abandonment. She is learning that dependence on others is frowned upon. If being dependent is undesirable to school leaders, then being independent, free from the influence of external others, authorized only by one's internal sense of what is good, is equally undesirable to Lana. The very institution that can protect her can also punish her, after all. Her feelings of vulnerability are underscored by narratives of the unreal shared by colleagues with their resounding "what if you do X and Y happens?" She concludes that despite the appearance of genuineness, hers is but a "fake autonomy."

It would be easy to pathologize Lana as a typical beginning teacher in need of transformation and self-improvement through practical experience. To do so, however, would be to ignore the power of beginning and the manner in which Lana resists an account of herself as a sovereign individual who knows what to do and is able to be held accountable for her actions (Zerilli, 2005). She pursues knowledge of policy and position hoping to "exhaust what is unknowable," afraid to act from not understanding, asserting that the questions must have been previously thought about or even understood, that answers in the form of policies do exist, that it is possible to evacuate the uncertainty (Britzman, 2007). In making such comparisons, she prioritizes history and "the way we've always done it" potentially excluding the possibility of the new; tradition becomes the bridge between past and future thereby eliminating the likelihood of present action.

A logic of risk permeates Lana's conflation of freedom with security. When school leaders repeatedly fail her, Lana borrows the institutional strategy as she begins to document events, decisions and actions. If things go awry, she reasons, at the very least she can claim that she has done as she ought, according to duty or official obligation. Lana documents in order to protect herself from the precarious quality of encounters with others but also to legitimate her judgment in the face of a law the existence of which she only suspects. Lana's efforts at documentation also discipline her, re-regulating her actions through choice, micro-managing her relations with those around her, leaving little open to chance, to the new. Jerome Kohn believes that Kant's "dutiful agent takes no responsibility for the consequences of acts" (2003, p. xxii). Duty constitutes a minimalist relation and no responsibility: "It was not I as a person who... (2003, p. xxii)."

And yet another reading of Lana might suggest an Arendtian actor who wishes to compare her judgments to those of others (colleagues, parents, policy-makers, administrators) in order "to escape the illusion that arises from the ease of mistaking subjective and private conditions for objective ones" (Hinchman, 1996, 496). Lana is left feeling somewhat isolated and alienated because she feels little sense of relationships to others and of a reality assured through them (Arendt, 1998). She has come face to face with "the liberal notion that agency represents unconstrained action" (Dillabough, 1999, p. 389) that seems to drive her administration, but she desires independence *within* a community of practice.

Compelled by a desire to act in the best interest of her students, Lana dramatizes the space and practice of freedom, the power of beginning. Even as she seeks out the consolations of knowledge, she ruthlessly pursues new modes of association between her colleagues and herself. She conjures ways of inviting disciplinary specialists and their academic students, all of whom typically live their educational lives at a distance from special needs students, into relation. Many bake sales, dance and yoga lessons later, she is feeling less alienated but still anxious. She has rendered herself visible and in doing so she has become vulnerable to interference by others.

Returning to the Question: What Teaching Does to the Profession?

Exchangeable. Bent. Burdensome. Autonomy, within the (il)logics of production, professionalism, and security, seems to refuse the risk that action is. The link, as stated previously, between natality and action is not assured (Levinson, 2001). Newcomers to the profession find themselves belated not only in relation to the past but in relation to others in the present. In the portraits we glimpse some interesting responses to the problem of belatedness: the social pariah, the parvenu and the conscious pariah.

The social pariah learns “to embrace ... what-ness as given and unalterable” (Orlie, 1995, p. 345). For many teachers, the institution of schooling has an “always already there” quality to it. Clare defers to her “school mentality,” and her role within it appears so fixed that there is little possibility of unsettling this world and of bringing something new into it (Levinson, 2001). When necessity and utility reign, teachers may be resentful, but there is little outlet for that resentment.

The parvenu has no sense of history; she feels too new (Levinson, 2001). Lana has to fit herself within a particular institutional articulation of her responsibility. The parvenu sometimes dismisses the relevance of what she is, either ignoring it or treating it as so plastic as to be susceptible to willful transcendence. Lana displays the tendency to cover over “the abyss of pure spontaneity” with “the device typical of the Occidental tradition...by understanding the new as an improved re-statement of the old” (Arendt, 1978 in Zerilli, 2005, p. 68). Lana is desperate to legitimate her work by anchoring it in tradition, in this case in the form of policy.

The conscious pariah “politicizes what she appears to be” and “accepts at least partial responsibility for what she has been made to become... She endeavours to transmute her self because she discerns its conventional and artificial character; she describes the social rule that registers the meaning and significance of what she appears to be. By acting with and against the social rules that would determine her, she engenders a self (Orlie, 1995, p. 346). Helen’s transcript is full of stories where, in her words, she “toppled the applecart” or “rocked the boat.” However, “three tidal waves” later, she feels disaffected from teaching, resentful of colleagues who “won’t name the elephant in the room” (the misogyny that conditions teachers’ identities and possibilities); Helen is considering a change in profession.

Feeling starkly accountable, yet often dramatically impotent, teachers—may quite literally seethe with ‘ressentiment’ (Brown, 1993 in Orlie, 1995). Resentment, writes Orlie (1995) is “a predominant reaction of late modern subjects to the weight of the past and the apparent foreclosing of futures, to the diminishment of action’s power in the present and the prevalent strategies of responsibility designed to master our selves and the world” (p. 344). Such a situation leaves the profession mourning with Hannah Arendt the loss of certain ontological dimensions of human existence—action, the shared public world, the self as performance (Villa, 1992).

There is also a politics of memory implicit in the portraits of autonomy that I have presented here, however. These teachers’ reflections take us beyond nostalgia for an integral public realm but keep alive a memory of an agonistic public sphere, enabling us to see as significant, those practices and spaces that might otherwise be overlooked. Helen’s lunch-time conversation about Buddhism, Clare’s developing friendship with Marion, Lana’s growing network of connections become potential sites for spontaneous action, islands of freedom (Arendt, 1993). Mabel Jones’ death may be read, as it was historically, as something to mourn, OR it may be memorialized as one teacher’s omnipotent wish to be the cause of her own origin and originality (Pitt, 2008). In such moments, teachers become a little less private, no longer deprived of seeing and hearing others, and a little less interchangeable. They have a chance to appear, in the Arendtian sense, and as such their words and actions can be witnessed and narrated by others; in this manner, they become human.

The result of living between mourning and memory is, perhaps, the cultivation of an ethos that avoids claiming more for teaching than this practice can bear but that also eschews the alternative of somber withdrawal (Villa, 1992). Bearing witness to the stories of Clare, Helen and Lana has reminded me that autonomy in teaching is hard-won; “it does not freely bloom, insistently nudging its ways through the cracks of dominant forms” (Bordo, 1993, p. 199).

References

- Alvesson, M., & Skoldberg, K. (2000). *Reflexive methodology: New vistas for qualitative research*. London, UK: Sage Publications.
- Arendt, H. (1968). *The origins of totalitarianism*. New York: Harcourt, Inc.
- Arendt, H. (1993) *Between past and future: Eight exercises in political thought*. NY: Penguin Books.
- Arendt, H. (1998). *The human condition*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Bataille, G. (1986). *Eroticism*. San Francisco: City Lights.
- Benhabib, S. (1995). The pariah and her shadow: Hannah Arendt's biography of Rahel Varnhagen. In B. Honig (Ed.) *Feminist interpretations of Hannah Arendt* (pp. 83-104). University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Bordo, S. (1993). Feminism, Foucault and the politics of the body. In C. Ramazanoglo (Ed.) *Up against Foucault: Explorations of some tensions between Foucault and feminism*. New York: Routledge Press.
- British Columbia College of Teachers (BCCT) (2004). Standards for the competence and education of teachers. Vancouver, BC: BCCT. Retrieved July 19, 2007, from <http://www.bcct.ca/default.aspx>
- Britzman, D. (1991). The terrible problem of knowing thyself. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, 9(3): 23-46.
- Britzman, D. (2007). Teacher education as uneven development: Toward a psychology of uncertainty. *International Journal of Leadership in Education: Theory and Practice*, 10(1): 1-12.
- Canovan, M. (1992). *Hannah Arendt: A reinterpretation of her political thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Castoridias, C. (1994). Psychoanalysis and politics. In S. Sonu & M. Münchow (Eds.), *Speculations after Freud: Psychoanalysis, philosophy and culture* (pp. 1-12). New York: Routledge.
- Caputo, J. D. (1987). *Radical hermeneutics: Repetition, deconstruction, and the hermeneutic project*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Coulter, D. (2002). What counts as action in educational action research? *Educational Action Research*, 10(2): 189-206.
- Derrida, J. (1992). *The other heading: Reflections on today's Europe* (P.A. Brault and M.B Naas, Transl.). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Dillabough, J. (1999). Gender politics and conceptions of the modern teacher: Women, identity and professionalism. *British Journal of the Sociology of Education*, 20(3), 373-394.
- Fournier, V. (1999). The appeal to 'professionalism' as a disciplinary mechanism. *The Sociological Review*, 47(2): 280-307.
- Freedman, S. (1987, Fall). Who will care for our children? Removing nurturance from the teaching profession. *Democratic Schools*: 7-27.
- Furlong, J., Barton, L., Miles, S., Whiting, C; & Whitty, G. (2000). *Teacher education in transition: Reforming professionalism?* Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.
- Gambetti, Z. (2005). The agent is the void! From the subjected subject to the subject of action. *Rethinking Marxism*, 17(3): 425-436.

- Gordon, M. (2001). *Hannah Arendt and education: Renewing our common world*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Hinchman, L. (1996). Autonomy, individuality, and self-determination. In J. Schmidt (Ed.) *What is enlightenment?* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Honig, B. (1995) Introduction: The Arendt question in feminism. In B. Honig (Ed.) *Feminist interpretations of Hannah Arendt* (pp. 1-16). University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Kohn, J. (2003). Introduction. In Hannah Arendt, *Responsibility and judgment* (pp. vii-xxix). New York: Schocken Books.
- Labaree, D. F. (1992). Power, knowledge, and the rationalization of teaching: A genealogy of the movement to professionalize teaching. *Harvard Educational Review*, 62(2): 123–154.
- Levinson, N. (2001). The paradox of natality. In M. Gordon (Ed.), *Hannah Arendt and education: Renewing our common world* (pp. 11–36). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Lortie, D. C. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Liotard, J.-F. (1984). *The postmodern condition*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Liotard, J.-F. (1988). *The differend: Phrases in dispute*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Madrone, T. R., & Placier, P. (2000). The fabricated world and the secret lives of teachers: Accountability, policy and the work of Hannah Arendt. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Studies Association, Vancouver, British Columbia.
- Musgrave, P. (1984). Accountability in Australian schools: Past, present and future. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 22(1): 5-14.
- O’Byrne, A. (2005). Pedagogy without a project: Arendt and Derrida on teaching, responsibility and revolution. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 24, 389-409.
- Orlie, M. (1994). Forgiving trespasses, promising futures. In Bonnie Honig (Ed.) *Feminist interpretations of Hannah Arendt* (pp. 337-356). University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Phelan, A. (1996). Strange pilgrims: Nostalgia and disillusionment in teacher education reform. *Interchange*, 27(3-4): 331-348.
- Phelan, A. (1997). Classroom management and the erasure of teacher desire. In Joseph Tobin (Ed.) *Making a place for pleasure in early childhood education* (pp. 76-100). New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Pitt, A. (2008). Reproducing authority: Revolts against transmission. In A. Phelan & J. Sumsion (Eds.), *Critical readings in teacher education: Provoking absences* (pp. 187-200). Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Pitt, A., & Britzman, D. (2003). Speculations on qualities of difficult knowledge in teaching and learning: An experiment in psychoanalytic research. *QSE: International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 16(6): 755-776.
- Pitt, A., & Phelan, A. (2005). Paradoxes of autonomy in professional life. Grant proposal submitted to the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.
- Pitt, A., & Phelan, A. (2008). Paradoxes of autonomy in professional life: A research problem. *Changing English: An International Journal of English Teaching*, 15(2): 189-197.
- Poole, W. (2007). Neo-liberalism in British Columbia education and teachers’ union resistance. *International Electronic Journal for Leadership in Learning*, 11(24). <http://www.acs.ualgary.ca/%7Eiejll/>
- Prentice, A., & Theobald, M. R. (1991). The historiography of women teachers: A retrospect. In A. Prentice & M.R. Theobald (Eds.), *Women who taught: Perspectives on the history of women and teaching* (pp. 3-33). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

- Seidman, I.E. (1991). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Smyth, J., & Shacklock, G. (1998). *Re-making teaching: Ideology, policy and practice*. London: Routledge.
- Stronach, I., Corbin, C.O., McNamara, S., Stark, S., & Warne, T. (2002). Towards an uncertain politics of professionalism: Teacher and nurse identities in flux. *Journal of Education Policy*, 17(1): 109-138.
- Villa, D. (1992). Postmodernism and the public sphere. *The American Political Science Review*, 86(3): 712-721.
- Wilson, J. D. (1991). 'I am ready to be of assistance when I can': Lottie Bowron and rural women teachers in British Columbia. In A. Prentice & M.R. Theobald (Eds.), *Women who taught: Perspectives on the history of women and teaching* (pp. 202-229). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Zerilli, L.M.G. (1995). The Arendtian body. In B. Honig (Ed.), *Feminist interpretations of Hannah Arendt* (pp. 167-193). University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Zerilli, L.M.G. (2005). *Feminism and the abyss of freedom*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.