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Abstract

The overall purpose of this qualitative study was to understand how teacher educators and teacher candidates involved in the "everyday" dynamics of learning to teach defined and evaluated effectiveness in teacher education. Interpretive methods of inquiry were used to gain knowledge of setting-specific images of effective teaching and learning.

Short-term case studies in three Curriculum and Instruction courses supported a discussion of the contextual features of each setting. Open-ended interviews with four educators and seven candidates illuminated the variety of meanings that each participant attached to their experiences of, and visions for, effective teacher education.

Findings were examined in relation to the relevant literature on teacher education. The limitations of traditional paradigms of effectiveness were identified. Conclusions indicate the need for greater emphasis on setting-specific strategies for change. Further research is needed to identify strategies that will support educators' and candidates' efforts to realize ideal teaching and learning models.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTERROGATING IMAGES OF EFFECTIVENESS

Because teaching is uncertain and no educational theory is complete, the unexpected will happen. Even the most coherent account will fail to explain some important events -- and many of our theories turn out to be false anyway. (Buchmann and Floden, 1990:3)

Each September close to six thousand teacher candidates meet with over five hundred teacher educators in Ontario's ten university-based, pre-service teacher education programs (The Royal Commission on Learning, 1995:14). In a very broad sense, this study works to illuminate a small part of what it means to teach and learn within this larger context of teacher education in Ontario. Based on findings from observations and interviews carried out at three faculties of education in Ontario, the following qualitative report describes the contexts, content, and events of learning to teach in Curriculum and Instruction courses. Additionally, this research explores the perspectives of four teacher educators and seven teacher candidates who were involved in the dynamic and sometimes complex realities of teacher education at Northview University, Valleyfield University and Bellhampton University.¹ With a focus on the personal experiences and perspectives of educators and candidates who were involved in these settings, this study works within an interpretive framework to provide a number of insights into the “everyday world” (Britzman, 1991) of learning to teach.

A particular aim of this study is to interrogate the traditional discourse on effectiveness in teacher education. In contrast to a pervasive discourse in the literature

¹ The names used in this study are all pseudonyms.
which supports an image of teacher education as ineffective, this thesis explores how knowledge about the day-to-day realities of learning to teach might contribute to a more textured understanding of effective teaching and learning in faculties of education. By comparing researchers' traditional images of (in)effectiveness with teacher educators' and teacher candidates' own perspectives on effective teaching and learning, I explore an alternative theoretical approach (and alternative images) to develop strategies for strengthening and improving teacher education programs. In particular, I highlight how the varied needs, expectations, experiences, and visions of a small group of educators and candidates might provide a foundation for the negotiation of new meanings and strategies in a movement toward a many-sided view of effective teacher education programs.

The key research question that has guided the development of this study is:

How do teacher educators and teacher candidates involved in the day-to-day realities of learning to teach define and evaluate effectiveness in teacher education?

The focus and purpose of this study were also directed by four questions that emerged during the course of my research:

1. How do the meanings of effectiveness shared by a small group of educators and candidates who were teaching and learning in three different settings support and/or challenge traditional images of effective teacher education?

2. How do individual understandings of effectiveness in teacher education impact on everyday meanings and practices in the field?

3. Which factors enable or constrain educators' and candidates' attempts to realize their visions for effective learning and teaching in faculties of education?
4. How might the details of educators' and candidates' experiences and visions for effective teacher education influence future directions for theorizing about meaningful teaching and learning in faculties of education?

Taken together, the foregoing questions locate the purpose of this research in a search for "everyday" understandings of effectiveness in teacher education. In the remaining sections of this introductory chapter, I highlight how studies directed toward an explanation of effectiveness in teacher education have been popular in the research into the initial training of teachers in Canada (e.g. Wideen and Holborn, 1990) and the United States (e.g. Newton and Brathwaite, 1987). In section one, I outline two theoretical trends in this area of the literature through an overview of both functionalist and interpretive approaches to theorizing about effectiveness. Sections two and three illustrate the pervasiveness of the traditional discourse on effectiveness that relies on functionalist paradigms to construct images for the reform of teacher education programs. The review of literature presented in these sections offers a critical overview of this central area of research and probes into the range of images resulting from researchers' tendency to employ traditional notions of "effectiveness" as a guiding principle in their examination of the dynamics of learning to teach. Section four investigates the contributions of interpretive and critical approaches to the study of effectiveness in teacher education. Drawing on an eclectic range of research, this section illuminates the value of an interpretive "search for meanings" that illuminates the diversity characteristic of individual understandings of effective teaching and learning in local faculties of education. Conclusions draw attention to the ways in which the tradition
of interpretive sociology has informed my own approach to the study of images of effectiveness in three faculties of education. In this final section I also describe the organization of the rest of this thesis.

**Theoretical Frameworks in the Study of Teacher Education**

There is a growing diversity of opinions concerning the nature of educational organizations and how they should be studied (Frank, 1986). There is also a growing range of ideas regarding how educational organizations should be run. The main focus in this area of research entails an investigation of how best to define and facilitate effective teaching and learning in schools, colleges, and universities. As noted by Britzman (1991), however, theorizing *tends* to emerge within the broad confines of two approaches: "a search for mechanisms and a search for meanings" (14). In her interpretation:

A search for mechanisms entails a functionalist account of how things work, or do not work. It is a concrete search that attempts to posit explanations for specific problems and to prescribe solutions. (Britzman, 1991: 14)

In contrast, a "search for meaning" begins with a different set of assumptions that emphasize interpretive styles of theorizing. An element which draws this second, eclectic group of styles together is their common focus on articulating the personal meanings that individuals attach to their contextually situated experiences of social phenomena (Britzman, 1991; Woods, 1983). As an organizing device, Britzman's distinction between "mechanisms" and "meanings" indicates a method for understanding two styles of theorizing that have also been predominant in the study of teacher education over the past fifteen years.

The diversity of theoretical perspectives that are frequently found in the literature
on educational organizations (Frank, 1986; Westoby, 1990) also characterizes the variety
of opinions (and consequent expectations) regarding how faculties of education should be
run. A certain level of debate also surrounds the question of how best to locate and
articulate images of effective teacher education. Nevertheless, the guiding principles
behind much of the research on teacher education reflect certain functionalist
assumptions about organizational effectiveness. The literature on effectiveness in teacher
education is characterized by a vigorous “search for mechanisms” to fix what a large
number of researchers view as the “unhealthy” (Wideen and Fullan, 1983a) or
“ineffective” (Troyer, 1986) state of teacher education in Canada and the United States.

While none of the literature reviewed in this chapter reflects a purely functionalist
style, much of the research on teacher education begins with a traditional set of
assumptions about effectiveness that “can be classed under the functionalist paradigm”
(Frank, 1986:118). Within this paradigm:

Organizations are seen as objective, real entities that can be
analyzed by organizational researchers who, in turn, can
isolate facts about the organization that will lead to
predictions about organizational performance. The
organizational world is stable, predictable,
manageable...organizations are composed of parts, each of
which can be rationally managed in order to make the whole
a more productive [or effective] unit. (Frank, 1986: 118)

In the literature written on, or from within the field of, teacher education, researchers
consistently indicate that faculties of education, as they currently operate, are failing to
provide meaningful and effective teacher education. In response to this finding there is a
tendency on the part of many researchers to draw on the organizational view described
above to organize their opinions of the best way to ensure that faculties of education will
become more productive units in the future. A recurring theme in this literature suggests that reform toward increased levels of measurable effectiveness can (and should) be achieved through the management of faculties of education as rational organizations (e.g. Cornbleth, 1986). From this perspective it is also assumed that teacher education programs can be amended according to "mechanisms" designed by others with the intent of ensuring order throughout the system as a whole.

Images of effectiveness that circulate within the literature on teacher education are predicated on, and perpetuate, the belief that faculties of education are in need of significant reform. In one influential view, researchers suggest that the "one best way" to ensure movement toward this goal is through the creation of productive organizational climates where a strong and lasting impact on teacher candidates can be guaranteed through the work of teacher educators in translating pre-set goals into measurable outcomes. The tendency to equate this highly mechanistic approach with reform has undervalued the contributions of setting-specific and individual directions for change. As discussed by Hargreaves (1994) in his analysis of school reform movements:

In the United States [and Canada], the tendency is to treat and train teachers like recovering alcoholics: subjecting them to step-by-step programs of effective instruction...or professional growth in ways that make them overly dependent on pseudo-scientific expertise developed and imposed by others. (Hargreaves, 1994: xiv)

Within this model, the symbolism of effectiveness makes an impact on all aspects of teacher education programs in presenting images of effectiveness for everything from the "appropriate" content of courses to reflections on the nature of how individual educators and students should participate in the dynamics of learning to teach. A key strategy
which facilitates movement toward this image involves the treatment of all programs and individuals within them as setting-specific phenomena - the rhetoric of “agreed upon expectations” for the training of teachers obscures the possibility of viewing each faculty as a unique organization of individuals who will enact effectiveness in ways that reflect the negotiation of organizational members' values and systemic interests.

From Deal’s (1990) perspective, the images presented through effectiveness research “may be more important as symbols than as facts” (202). As he notes himself, however:

> Our society presently places more faith in science than in ordinary knowledge or common sense. The conclusions of researchers have more value than the judgment of practitioners. (202)

The images presented through studies which rely on a traditional “search for mechanisms” have the power to shape both internal and external expectations for effective programs. This power to influence both practitioners and policymakers is guaranteed by the tendency for effectiveness research to incorporate an all-encompassing agenda for reform:

> These articles start with behaviours deemed desirable at the lowest level in the hierarchic educational system and then work backward - upward through the system to identify policies, programs and conditions at higher levels that could bring them about. (Cohen, 1985: 277)

Applied to the field of teacher education, this reform agenda indicates that all teacher education programs should conform to images of coherent programs where top-down management and agreement on the “appropriate” skills, dispositions, and knowledge of effective teaching pervade as organizing principles.
Despite the prevalence of the traditional discourse on effectiveness, an increasing number of studies have emerged over the past ten years to propose that there are **multiple ways of understanding effectiveness** in the context of educational organizations in general (e.g. Woods, 1983), and faculties of education in particular (e.g. Britzman, 1991). Given their location in a different set of theoretical frameworks which fall under the general rubrics of interpretive and critical studies, numerous researchers have challenged traditional organizational theories and suggested a more “loosely-coupled” (Weick, 1990) view of the ways in which external expectations will influence the internal workings of local schools or faculties of education.

Interpretive research is a relatively new area in the literature on teacher education (Tardif, 1985), but has enjoyed a long tradition in the sociology of education (Woods, 1983) and the sociology of organizations (Westoby, 1990). In both fields of study, interpretive accounts of schooling, most often at the elementary and secondary levels, emerged from two central standpoints - symbolic interactionism and interpretive phenomenology. While rooted in the earlier works of Mead (1934), Goffman (1956), Berger and Luckmann (1966), and Schutz (1967), interpretive inquiry became a leading approach in British sociology of education during the 1970s (Woods, 1983). In the North American context, similar trends toward the increased use of qualitative approaches followed in the 1980s and 1990s. The resulting images of schools and schooling, as summarized by Tyler (1990), stood in bold contrast to earlier functionalist perspectives:

> [I]nteractionist and phenomenological accounts...attempt to demonstrate that far from being a collection of segmented functions, schools are problematic and tension-ridden formations whose structural variations are best explained through the meanings, negotiations, and strategies of
individual actors. The school, in other words, can be conceived not as a given structure but as the product of the collective and often implicit accommodations among teachers, students, and administrators (as well as of parents, supervisory personnel, and ancillary staff). (27, emphasis added)

With participant observation as its central methodology, interpretive research has contributed rich sources of micro-level knowledge to sociological understandings of education through its focus on previously neglected areas such as “the contexts and cultures of schools and the perspectives, strategies, and careers of teachers and pupils” (Woods, 1983). As outlined in the following review of interpretive studies in teacher education, these methodologies and theoretical viewpoints have also begun to inform a sociological understanding of learning to teach.

From an interpretive standpoint, the “quick fix” perspective that continually asserts itself in the bulk of research on educational organizations is misguided because it often ignores how differences within and between educational settings engender diverse sets of needs and interests. By highlighting the importance of local and internal differences, numerous researchers have attempted to understand meanings of effectiveness from setting-specific (Knowles, Cole and Presswood, 1994; Howey and Zimpher, 1989; McCarthy, 1986) and/or subjective standpoints (Deal, 1990; Denzin, 1983; Tyler, 1990). Key findings that have emerged from this bottom-up “search for meaning” indicate that effectiveness cannot be captured in a narrow set of variables or an “agreed upon” mandate for reform.

With a focus on the diversity of orientations which inform different teacher education programs (Feiman-Nemser, 1990), and attention to how organizational
members' notions of effectiveness contribute to the dynamics of teacher education (Zeichner, Liston, Mahllos and Gomez, 1988), researchers have organized a set of images that stand in sharp contrast to the imagery of “unhealthiness” that is prevalent in much of the research on teacher education. In place of traditional images, they have suggested an image of educational organizations as dynamic and fluid environments (McLaughlin, 1987) characterized by diversity, considerable negotiation and individual rather than organizational evaluations of effectiveness. From this perspective, attempts to understand the meanings of effectiveness in teacher education entail a focus on how individual educators and candidates working with the day-to-day realities of learning to teach in particular contexts, construct their own notions of meaningful learning and teaching. Therefore, images of effectiveness are more likely to be found in setting-specific meanings which unfold within the dynamic contexts of each teacher education program rather than the external “hoopla” (Deal, 1990) that gets played out in research studies which attempt to promote “the one best way” to define and manage the future productivity of teacher education programs.

There are numerous ways to understand effectiveness in teacher education programs. Each approach draws attention to a different set of images that can limit and/or animate discussion of what it means to teach and learn in these settings. In all of this discussion, however, the general question remains as to why it is important to investigate scholarly images of effective teacher education. My response to this question lies in the following quotation which indicates how images have the power to shape the “identities and practices of teachers”: 
An image is a root metaphor whose fundamental elements capture, delimit and shape the identity and practices of teachers. It has the power to explain and orient the key assumptions and values that teachers live by and to influence why teachers do things in particular ways. (Thiessen and Pike, 1992:3)

As illuminated in the chapters of this study, it is important to question how the variety of images surrounding teacher education shape the identities of teacher educators and teacher candidates and how they influence the notions of meaningful and effective teacher education that each group brings to their meetings in classrooms at faculties of education. In other words, how might the images which emerge from traditional notions of (in)effectiveness structure the range of expectations that educators and teacher candidates enact in their experiences of teacher education? How might the alternative focus on a diversity of images of effectiveness impact differently on the range of "identities and practices" that both groups can take up in their understandings of learning, teaching and learning to teach? The following sections of this chapter and subsequent chapters in this thesis have been organized with these questions in mind.

**A Search for Mechanisms: Fixing the Problems of Teacher Education**

A search for mechanisms or concrete solutions to solve the problems of teacher education is characteristic of the traditional discourse on effectiveness. While researchers working within this discourse tend to rely on a common theoretical framework, they do not always agree on what the "problems" of teacher education are or on the mechanisms that are best suited for the reform of programs toward increased levels of effectiveness. In this section, I present a critical review of five issues that recur in the literature on
effectiveness in teacher education. In the course of this review I also highlight the controversies that surround researchers' attempts to resolve them.

**The Knowledge/Dispositions Debate**

A key debate in the scholarly literature on effectiveness in teacher education centers on the question of whether pre-service programs should focus on enhancing the **professional knowledge base** of teacher candidates or attempt to cultivate **desirable teacher dispositions** through attention to candidates' beliefs about learning and teaching. Researchers working within the "professional knowledge base" framework argue that candidates' understanding of subject matter knowledge will be their most important source of learning for effective teaching:

> Teacher education programs need to emphasize the structure of subject matter disciplines, ways to organize and deliver content to facilitate student learning, and methods of evaluating student achievement as part of the effort to strengthen student learning. (Book, Beyers and Freeman, 1983: 12)

In contrast, the "teacher dispositions" tradition indicates that effective teacher education can only be facilitated through attention to candidates' personal beliefs about the general acts of teaching and learning. From this perspective, direct attention to "appropriate" teacher dispositions should inform the goals of teacher education programs:

> General impressions suggest that when both professional educators and lay persons discuss teachers, especially in terms of whether they are "good" or "bad", they tend to refer to teachers' dispositions rather than their skills or even their knowledge...dispositions contribute more to teacher effectiveness than do skills or knowledge. (Katz and Raths, 1985: 305)

The debate surrounding the importance of pedagogical knowledge over personal
dispositions is directed toward the question of how best to ensure that teacher education programs will have an enduring impact on teacher candidates.

On both sides of the "knowledge versus dispositions" debate, metaphors of the "professor knows best" are promoted to support the notion that relevant knowledge or beliefs can only be developed in controlled learning environments. In order to ensure effective training, teacher educators are held responsible, on one level, for showing teacher candidates the importance of professional knowledge:

If we do indeed have a "professional knowledge base" in education, if we do know how children learn and how teachers can best facilitate that learning then we should be working to convince pre-service teachers that it exists and they need to learn it...This is our responsibility and our challenge. (Ciscell, 1987:80)

Another perspective demands that educators emphasize the "appropriate" dispositions of successful teaching:

If a teacher educator knows what teachers initially believe, he may take pains to discredit those initial beliefs, or to show how their plausibility is attributable to relationships not previously considered" (Floden, 1985: 28). This statement suggests that teacher educators should emphasize beliefs that (a) should be discredited, or (b) are held for inappropriate reasons. (Brousseau and Freeman, 1988: 271)

Overall, both sides of the debate maintain that it is possible to identify either a strict professional knowledge base or a set of appropriate dispositions. Each side also maintains that a focus on either dispositions or professional knowledge can be used to direct program objectives with the ultimate goal of having a measurable impact on candidates. Each version of effective teacher knowledge or dispositions is held up as the key to program effectiveness. In order for effectiveness to be guaranteed, however,
teacher educators must take up a position in what seems to be an insoluble debate. An implication of the knowledge/disposition debate is, in my opinion, the creation of an unsettling dichotomy. If a program is found to emphasize dispositions, it will be charged with neglecting the importance of the professional knowledge base of teaching. On the other hand, if educators take the approach of concentrating on professional knowledge they will have, according to a second set of theorists, compromised the level of effectiveness that could be achieved through direct attention to teacher dispositions. Notions of an interplay between both sources of information in learning to teach (Knowles, Cole and Presswood, 1994) are obscured for the purpose of ensuring adherence to an either/or position. As such, effectiveness appears as an elusive goal in teacher education.

**Teacher Educators and Effective Teacher Education**

The mechanistic line of reasoning characteristic of positions taken in the knowledge/dispositions debate cited above also characterizes a second area of inquiry that has received significant attention within traditional paradigms of effectiveness in teacher education. In an attempt to evaluate their contributions to effectiveness (or ineffectiveness) of teacher education programs, researchers focusing on teacher educators work in faculties of education tend toward viewing all teacher educators as an undifferentiated group. Within this framework, the personal qualities and abilities of teacher educators are consistently identified as barriers to the realization of coherent and effective teacher education programs. The skills and dispositions of teacher educators have been evaluated as counterproductive to the development of effective
organizational climates where the translation of pre-set goals into measurable outcomes can be guaranteed. Despite the fact that the research on the details and cultures of teacher educators' work is limited (Weber, 1986), findings that support negative evaluations of teacher educators' capabilities abound in the literature. As illustrated below, three areas of evaluative statements surrounding the work of teacher educators are identifiable in the literature. Each one carries with it a unique approach to constructing narrowly defined images of teacher educators as "incapable" in the task of facilitating effective programs.

Ineffective teaching

The first, and most critical image of teacher educators is found in an image of faculty members as "poor role models" in the university classroom. Teacher educators have been charged with spending too much time lecturing and too little time providing teacher candidates with opportunities "to try out a variety of teaching methods" (Wideen and Fullan, 1983a: 15). It has also been suggested that teacher educators offer contradictory messages through their instruction because they do not "practice what they preach". Cohen (1983) for instance, asserts that teacher educators' attitudes and practices are at the root of numerous paradoxes underlying ineffective teacher education programs:

...among the current paradoxes in teacher-education are lectures about discovery learning; proclamations of the virtues of small-group learning to a theater of 1000 students; the processing of students through identical programs while giving lip service to concepts about individual differences...and "education" courses which include formal examinations about open classrooms and open education. (Cohen, 1983:130)
In Cohen’s images of teaching and learning at faculties of education, the possibility that institutional constraints will have an impact on teacher educators’ work (Ducharme, 1993; Gideonse, 1989; Weber, 1986) is recognized to some degree. In much of the literature, however, possible constraints are ignored and the source of the above paradoxes are located directly in the capabilities of teacher educators. Troyer (1986), for example, suggests that teacher educators are knowledgeable about the research on effective teaching strategies but they do not employ them in the classroom. Instead, they rely on traditional methods of instruction:

> Considering the limitations of the lecture and discussion methods in teaching practitioner skills, it is interesting to note that teacher educators, those who should be most knowledgeable in pedagogy, rely so heavily on these instructional strategies. (Troyer, 1986:10)

There is an explicit assumption here that teacher educators’ instructional techniques may limit the potential impact of teacher education programs. Based on this presumption, teacher educators are told to enroll in professional development courses in order to “expand their range of instructional strategies” (Troyer, 1986:10) and are directed to place greater concentration on providing a variety of teaching and learning opportunities for candidates (Wideen and Fullan, 1983a:17).

**Ineffective work relationships**

A second recurring theme in the literature suggests that teacher educators compromise program effectiveness because of their inability to work collaboratively with other faculty members. Leskiw and Ruddell-Girhiny (1992), for example, maintain that conflicts emerge within faculties as a result of faculty members’ “differing loyalties... to
their respective fields of study" (64). As barriers to the effective implementation of programs, differing loyalties - established through professional experiences in areas such as Arts and Sciences at the university or classroom teaching in the field - are held by Wideen and Fullan (1983b), for example, to contribute to a negative climate:

...little agreement exists about what the goals are or what they should be, and where agreement does exist, there is conflict between what faculty do and what they would like to do. (67)

Researchers who argue that the effectiveness of teacher education is compromised by educators' "conflicting" orientations advocate the need for greater consensus through the development of collaborative rather than competitive cultures. From the standpoint of researchers such as Wideen (1985), however, teacher educators are highly individualistic (87) and thus, the outstanding cause of non-collaborative cultures can be located in the personal characteristics of the educators themselves. Framed within these terms, there appears to be a certain logic in suggesting that teacher educators are personally responsible for improving levels of collaboration in order that they might work in concert toward program effectiveness. Unfortunately, the specific ways in which this might be achieved are left unidentified in the literature. One exception involves Troyer's insistence that further research into understanding the characteristics of "professors of education" will have the direct (and linear) consequence of improved programs (Troyer, 1986:10).

The communication gap

A third area of the literature suggests that teacher educators are responsible for compromising the effectiveness of programs because of their inability to communicate, on an effective level, with teacher candidates. The "communication gap" theory indicates
that it is not so much what teachers educators say, but the language that they use when they communicate with teacher candidates which limits the impact of programs on candidates' perceptions of teaching and learning. Berrill and Leeking (1992), for example, suggest that:

The competencies of associate teachers and faculty supervisors are valuable...only to the extent that student teachers can use them to inform or mediate their own perceptions. (23)

Similarly, Rodriguez (1993) contends that candidates' experiences are marked by stress, frustration, and mis-communication because, "while the university speaks to students through the language of persuasion, student teachers listen with the language of perception" (217). In other words, educators draw on "university-sanctioned educational theories and values" while candidates work from standpoints which they perceive to represent the "realities" of classroom teaching (Rodriguez, 1993: 217). It is suggested that teacher educators may be communicating the "recipes" of teaching which stand in sharp contrast to student teachers' varied and unpredictable experiences during practice teaching placements. In order to bridge the "communication or language gap" teacher educators are encouraged to focus on the language used by teacher candidates to ensure that common understandings of the "realities" of teaching inform teacher candidates' journey of learning to teach (Berrill and Leeking, 1992; Rodriguez, 1993). The most vexing aspect of this argument is located in its emphasis on common understandings of teaching and learning. Within this model, there is an obvious assumption that all teacher educators and all teacher candidates communicate through distinct forms of language and therefore, all that needs to be changed are the styles of communication. If this is
achieved, candidates will perceive course work as worthwhile or meaningful, and teacher educators will have improved the degree to which their work establishes common notions of what it means to learn and teach.

**Teacher Candidates and Effective Teacher Education**

The traditional discourse on effectiveness in teacher education establishes a clear dichotomy between educators and teacher candidates when it implies that program effectiveness can be measured by the degree to which teacher educators' work in the classroom impacts on teacher candidates' understandings of teaching. The prevailing image in the literature indicates that teacher educators should take on the role of "experts" in the one-way transmission of knowledge to "novice" teacher candidates. As illustrated above, this framework emphasizes teacher educators' critical role in ensuring that the curriculum is directed by a particular image of teacher education. While the educator as "expert" image is most prominent, numerous researchers also attribute the characteristics of teacher candidates to their images of (in)effective teacher education. This area of the literature suggests that candidates' needs as learners are important elements in teacher education programs (Berrill and Leeking, 1992; Knowles, Cole and Presswood, 1994; Rodriguez, 1993; Tamir, 1991). Most often, however, candidates' beliefs about teaching and learning are evaluated as deficient: like the images that inform the analysis of teacher educators' work, scholarly images of teacher candidates commonly depict them as a undifferentiated group and focus on highlighting how their personal and professional perspectives work to compromise program effectiveness.

The most common image of teacher candidates suggests that they lack an
awareness of their own beliefs about teaching and learning (Brousseau and Freeman, 1988) and are unaware of the importance of subject matter knowledge:

Regardless of the reason, it is disturbing that pre-service teachers by and large do not perceive a strong need to obtain a knowledge base in pedagogy in order to become effective teachers. (Book, Beyers and Freeman, 1983: 10)

Teacher candidates are discussed, in aggregate, as being highly driven toward the accumulation of practical knowledge that is relevant and easily transferable to the day-to-day realities of classroom teaching (Book, Beyers and Freeman, 1983; Ciscell, 1987; Nixon and Bumbarger, 1984; Rodriguez, 1993). Given this finding, researchers assert that candidates make demands on programs and instructors which work against the goal of establishing common understandings of teaching through attention to the "professional knowledge base" of teaching and/or the development of "appropriate teaching dispositions":

Education course work which does not immediately address "know how" or "how to make do" with things the way they are appears impractical and idealistic. (Britzman, 1986: 224)

With the exception of a few (e.g. Rodriguez, 1993), the majority of researchers argue that the practice oriented perspective of teacher candidates is misguided and should be challenged by teacher educators. The ability of teacher educators to counter the practice oriented perspective of student teachers is, however, questionable:

Pressure from the students to provide them with information that is practical and will help them survive is far more compelling than the ideals they may have about what ought to be taught (Wideen, 1985: 89)

It is here that the discourse underlying images of effective teacher education turns into a
confusing array of opinions. Teacher educators are encouraged to work with the needs of their students while at the same time challenging those needs:

...teacher educators can indulge and gratify their candidates' concerns by providing what they claim to need in the way of specific guidelines and tips for teaching. On the other hand, teacher educators can resist candidates' dependency needs and encourage them to begin to take responsibility for their own learning and professional development...(Katz and Raths, 1992: 379)

The "teacher educator knows best" perspective is pervasive in this paradox which constructs an image of candidates as learning from the experts (Friesen-Poirier, 1992: 88). Unfortunately, however, "while it all depends on the professor", there is little support in the literature to indicate that teacher educators are up to the challenge given their conflicting or differing loyalties (Leskiw and Ruddell-Girhiny, 1992; Wideen and Fullan, 1983a; Wideen, 1985), limited repertoire of instructional strategies (Cohen, 1983; Troyer, 1986; Wideen and Fullan, 1983a) and their limited ability to communicate with students (Berrill and Leeking, 1992; Rodriguez, 1993). In these images, the skills and beliefs of both teacher educators and teacher candidates are evaluated within the limited framework of program effectiveness and found to be lacking. Reading the mechanistic arguments constructed around these images, one wonders whether any level of effectiveness is possible in faculties of education as they currently exist. In other words, are teacher educators or candidates capable of effective teaching or learning in teacher education programs?
The Theory/Practice Debate

A fourth issue that appears frequently in the literature on effectiveness in teacher education concerns the ways that tensions surrounding the value of theory and practice work to keep the goal of measurable program effectiveness at bay. At issue, within this area of investigation, are the variety of images that contribute to debates surrounding the meaning(s) and role(s) that practice and theory play in directing the process of learning to teach. The importance of the practice/theory debate is revealed by the volume of research that has been devoted to its resolution and the ways in which this issue tends to encompass numerous other areas such as the perspectives of teacher educators and teacher candidates, the nature of content and methods involved in programs, and opinions concerning the role of the university and schools in the initial training of teachers.

The central image that emerges through attention to the debate around the meaning(s) and role(s) of theory and practice is conveyed through metaphors of integration or, as in one case, a more creative use of the symbolism of marriage. The metaphor of marriage is of particular interest because it signifies a union between two formerly distinct parties. In concluding their findings from a province wide survey of faculties of education in Ontario, for instance, Fullan, Connelly and Watson (1990), describe theory and practice as two distinct entities. Then they move to suggest the need for theory and practice to be integrated to facilitate effective professional development:

*The marriage of sound educational theory to a thorough knowledge of the pragmatics of schooling to produce an intelligent, caring teacher interested in continued professional development, is implicit in all the profiles submitted. (Fullan, Connelly and Watson, 1990: 13)*
Notwithstanding the repeated use of the wedding metaphor, many of the images conveyed in the literature on teacher education continue to characterize the theory/practice debate as caught in a state of inertia. What stands out most sharply is the conviction that until the debate is solved, significant changes will not take place toward increased levels of effectiveness in teacher education programs.

The traditional discourse on effectiveness suggests that the integration of theory and practice is of paramount importance. In reading the literature, however, one begins to question whether this goal is attainable given the wide range of opinions concerning the specific meaning behind integration. One line of reasoning suggests that it is possible (and necessary) for teacher educators to reach consensus around a single set of theories and practices that will inform all aspects of a program (Wideen and Fullan, 1983b). From another perspective it has been suggested that the conceptual orientations of those working in the field of teacher education will influence the choice of theoretical-practical orientations (Feiman-Nemser, 1990) and therefore a number of perspectives will coexist within any given program. A third standpoint, as suggested by Miller and Taylor (1984), argues that current models for teacher education are informed predominantly by theory or practice and the persistence of this either/or dichotomy consistently puts barriers in the way of integration.

Miller and Taylor (1984) suggest that educators working in a practice-driven model evaluate the meaning of theory exclusively in terms of its relevance to the classroom. Thus, any notions of reform in teacher education are defined in terms of "...redesigning the theoretical elements since it is their relevance, utility and hence
legitimacy that are in question" (335). In contrast, theory-driven models emphasize the importance of fostering teacher candidates' ability to "demonstrate an awareness, understanding and appreciation of the theoretical underpinnings of sound teaching practice" (Miller and Taylor, 1984: 335). Within this model, practice teaching experiences are viewed solely in terms of their utility for testing theory. From the perspective of "theory driven" models, practical perspectives are held to "turn candidates away from the university and gradually alienate them from the intellectual roots of their profession"(Miller and Taylor, 1984:336).

Miller and Taylor's (1984) presentation of the theory/practice debate in teacher education is quite severe in that it suggests that entire programs will take on an either/or position and depreciate the value of the other perspective whether it be practice or theory. The severity of Miller and Taylor's argument clearly illustrates the strong tensions that are ingrained in the literature surrounding the images of teacher education as caught in a state of conflict between theory and practice. Fullan (1985), for example, questions whether the goal of integration is possible and yet he goes on to argue that "eighty years seems like a long time to get started on a problem so central to education" (209). Britzman (1991) and other theorists such as Diamond (1991) assert that the practice/theory framework is misleading and should be re-conceptualized in order that teachers can critically analyze both theory and practice. Finally, it has been argued that theory and practice are not empirically related and thus, they should be officially separated. In this model it is suggested that teacher education be conducted in a structure where university courses stress theory/knowledge in conjunction with a school-
based internship program where candidates can develop a practical/common sense understandings of teaching (Miller and Taylor, 1984:338).

A solution to the theory/practice debate is elusive due to the fact that while common agreement exists concerning the name of the problem, solutions put forth tend to be limiting in their scope. Each position in the debate is offered not as an option but as a fixed and exclusive position that should be applied to all programs. In almost all of the literature on effective teacher education, program effectiveness depends on resolving this key debate. Upon reading the literature, however, one wonders whether continued “debate” might not be more constructive than the linear and restrictive suggestions for resolution of this “problem”. As suggested by Britzman (1991), the dialogic relationships between “theory and practice, thought and activity, knowledge and experience”(55) are complex elements in every teacher candidate’s experience of learning to teach. Attempts to fashion single-minded notions of the meanings and roles of theory and practice in teacher education will only serve to obscure this complexity and result in perpetuating images of a dichotomy between theory and practice. Debate, on the other hand, will sustain a focus on the complexity of both the meanings and roles that theory and practice play in the dynamics of learning to teach.

**Articulating School-University Connections**

Issues surrounding the level of transferability between learning at the university and teaching in the school or classroom context characterize a fifth area that has received significant attention in the literature on effectiveness in teacher education. In this framework, the level of a program’s effectiveness is measured by the degree to which
lessons at the university can be directly transferred to classroom teaching. As in the practice/theory debate, attention to issues of transferability results in the construction of a dichotomy where university course work is viewed as ideal and practice teaching experiences are perceived as representing the “realities” of teaching and learning (Britzman, 1991; Bullough, 1982; Rodriguez, 1993; Tardif, 1985; Wideen and Fullan, 1983b).

The absence of structured university-school connections are presented as a fundamental problem by many researchers who view the lack of transferability as a key element in influencing the impact and therefore, effectiveness of programs:

The prime reason for severe criticism of pedagogical courses is the matter of transferability of knowledge from college courses to practices in the classroom. Many faculties leave the matter of transfer to individual candidates...Key questions are left unresolved...(Leskiw and Ruddell-Girhiny, 1992:64)

From the perspective of those who advocate the importance of direct and obvious connections, university course work should provide candidates with realistic and practical images of classroom cultures as they currently exist:

...just a few warning words and concrete ideas about how to implement the same interesting lesson to a group of less receptive students may have been enough to prevent the apparent and sudden realization that the school context is very different from the university setting. (Rodriguez, 1993: 218)

In fact, without the tools to deal with the differences between innovative practices discussed in university classrooms and the traditional organization of schools, some researchers feel that students will be “done a disservice” in programs (Hoy and Rees; 1977: 25).
Bullough (1982) suggests that teacher education is a field characterized by "schizophrenia" as a result of the absence of connections between school and university personnel. He goes on to argue that "... good training means more than helping students to fit in" to schools as they exist (1982: 211) and thus, stronger working relationships between schools and universities need to be established in order that both settings can share the responsibilities of educating teachers for change. Bullough’s framework indicates a direction toward a view of schools and universities working as equal partners in teacher education. And yet, the bulk of research which concerns itself with evaluating teacher candidates' experiences of practice teaching constructs a clear picture of schools as being in dire need of change and therefore, as inadequate settings for candidates to learn about effective teaching. Such arguments maintain the ivory tower image, holding up the university as a source of innovative practice where teacher candidates are provided with the tools for implementing change. Within this model, the role of classroom teachers in practice teaching schools is limited to the work of facilitating candidates’ attempts to realize notions of innovative practice that have been suggested in university-based programs. In this image of teacher education, the university's privileged status is reinforced, and schools are expected to comply with the images of teaching and learning constructed within the university setting. As such the ideal as opposed to real dichotomy is left intact and, as discussed by Katz and Raths (1992), "...teacher educators are pulled in opposite directions" (382). Their work will be evaluated as ineffective if they work to help candidates with immediate concerns of transferability (Bullough, 1982) or attempt to share their knowledge of innovative practices in hope that candidates will carry such
practices into the schools as novice teachers (Hoy and Rees, 1977; Rodriguez, 1993).

**Establishing Mechanisms: Restructuring Teacher Education**

Identification of particular "problems" tends to warrant single-minded or specific solutions. Thus, for instance if teacher educators are assumed to lack a full repertoire of effective teaching strategies they should enter into professional development courses. But when we consider all the identified "problems" associated with teacher education programs in aggregate, it would appear that programs, as they currently exist, are incapable of educating teachers and are in need of significant reform. The most critical area of the literature reviewed during the course of this study was a series of reports that evaluated the effectiveness of teacher education faculties from a systems approach and then recommended reform initiatives.

**Parameters for Effectiveness - An American Example**

In the United States, large-scale studies designed to investigate the organizational characteristics of faculties of education prevailed during the 1980s as concerns "about the quality of teaching...focused attention on the quality of teacher education" (Feiman-Nemser, 1990: 1). Reports such as *A Nation at Risk* (1983) relied on traditional metaphors of effectiveness and promoted the idea that coherence around a clear set of goals aimed toward developing the "appropriate" skills, knowledge and dispositions of quality teaching was the route to effective programs (Britzman, 1991). While less encompassing than nation-wide commissions, Howey and Zimpher's (1989) pivotal essay on the characteristics of pre-service teacher education programs provides a powerful illustration of the tone behind many reports on American teacher education during the
1980s and early 1990s. Largely descriptive, Howey and Zimpher's report includes a forceful list of "heuristic" parameters for defining effective teacher education programs. As illustrated in the following sample of Howey and Zimpher's framework, the use of traditional notions of organizational effectiveness as guiding principles behind program design and evaluation results in a highly restrictive and exhaustive list of recommended modifications for faculties to conform to:

- How does the nature of teaching and, the role of teachers, and the mission of schooling as viewed across faculty and by students define and impact the nature of the pre-service program?

- To what degree are clear and reasonable goals or dispositions found, with regard to faculty and students? Are the goals or objectives of the program attainable? And if so, what are the measures for successful completion of the program?

- What explicit considerations guide the nature of curriculum design, such as the scope, sequence, and degree of integration and articulation?

- What are the matriculation patterns of the students and does a structured pattern exist in which students take first one course and then another ultimately deriving from that matriculation pattern a sense of program?

- What forms and degrees of faculty collegiality exist both within the program and outside the program to other parts of the university and elementary and secondary schools, and in what ways do these degrees of collegiality contribute to effective programs?

- To what extent do designs exist for comprehensive program evaluation beginning with an assessment of specific qualities students enter programs with and then follow students through initial years of teaching to ascertain program effects? (1989: 267, emphases added)

Howey and Zimpher suggest that the above parameters are only "heuristic" devices. At the same time, however, it is difficult to overlook the fact that these six questions of
effectiveness are highly mechanistic and imply that effectiveness can only be achieved through the establishment of clear goals to be implemented on a specific time line and measured within strict parameters. Everything from specific features, such as the organization of courses within a program, to the very general (and difficult to measure) dynamics of collegiality and faculty/student dispositions are organized into quantifiable entities. The exclusive connection between program coherence and program effectiveness stands out in bold relief.

**Defining Effectiveness - Canadian Examples**

Reports similar to Howey and Zimpher’s had a notable influence on Canadian research during the 1980s - similar research paradigms and recommendations for reforms were made popular, for instance, through studies conducted by Wideen and Fullan (1983) and Wideen (1985). While Howey and Zimpher’s work has been offered as an example of the tone and content of effectiveness research in the United States, the following discussion of two principal Canadian reports serves as an example of the highly critical and reform minded style which has also dominated research on effectiveness in Canadian teacher education.

The two reports published in the 1980s to document the key features and issues of effectiveness in Canadian teacher education, relied largely on data collected through quantitative methods, and were designed to collect information on the structural features of faculties of education across Canada. Studies conducted by Wideen and Fullan (1983 a&b) and Wideen (1985) attempted to document “the nature and character of the institutions” as “a first and necessary step to problem solving and institutional
improvement" (Wideen and Fullan, 1983b:67). From the outset these studies explicitly emphasized issues of program effectiveness. Wideen and Fullan's (1983) four volume report, for instance, was designed to:

...provide information about relationships among the values, structures and strategies within faculties and the pressures and relationships with the environment. Such information would provide a basis for beginning to look at the **effectiveness of faculties as organizations**. In addition, we designed the instrument to collect data on the changes required and the perceived barriers to such change as held by faculty members. Questions of theory and practice, an issue we saw as critical in Faculties of Education, were also included. (1, emphasis added)

The result of these two major reports was the presentation of an image of Canadian teacher education as an ineffective enterprise characterized by negative climates and a sense of dissatisfaction on the part of both faculty and teacher candidates. Very few elements within teacher education programs were left unexamined in the search for concrete notions of how to change ineffective enterprises into capable organizations.

Like the issues-based research discussed in previous sections, Wideen and Fullan's report indicated that the quality of teacher education in Canada was being compromised by questionable instructional techniques, a lack of common goals and an absence of collaboration among faculty. In Volume One, Wideen and Fullan (1983a) reported that teacher candidates were unhappy with the limited amount of time they had to interact with faculty, dissatisfied with their coursework, and frustrated by the questionable teaching abilities of instructors. In turn, they concluded that faculty felt constrained by administrative activities, fiscal restraints and the "individualistic climates" of faculties (1983a: 42). They also noted that overall, "fifty-one percent of the
comments concerned the quality of the program and quality of its graduates” (1983a: 64). In most cases, Wideen and Fullan reported that the quality of programs were evaluated in highly negative terms. The root of such negative evaluations were found to lie in the conservative and isolated climates of the organizations studied.

In addition to conveying the particular views of teacher candidates and faculty, Wideen and Fullan (1983a) offered a number of general statements indicative of their opinion that faculties were in need of immediate reform. They argued that “faculties [did] not appear to be well equipped for change” in terms of implementing reforms suggested through earlier research reports (1983a: 53), and were not meeting the goal of integrating theory and practice:

Unfortunately, by integrating theory with practice most people seem to mean concentration upon practicalities to the exclusion of theory, analysis and critical thinking...The emphasis on practicality too often leads to a “Mickey Mouse” or "busy work” approach which degrades the faculty and the teaching profession as a whole. (1983a: 14)

More than any other issue, they repeatedly identified the lack of common goals as the cause of ineffectiveness in faculties of education:

Very little agreement exists about what the goals are or what they should be, and where agreement does exist there is conflict between what faculty do and what they would like to do. The faculty aspire to one set of goals yet achieve another. (1983a:67)

Thus, it was suggested that faculty work toward change through establishing common goals which would satisfy both the common aims of a given faculty and the expectations communicated by external stakeholder groups such as school teachers, educational administrators and the general public (1983a: 57). In conclusion, Wideen and Fullan
insisted that it was important for each faculty to establish a program "which provides a B.Ed student with a consistent, holistic view of the teaching process -- based upon the best theory and practice" (1983a:64) and incorporate a longer practicum to solve the elusive goal of integrating theory and practice (1983a: 23).

Volume One of Wideen and Fullan's report establishes an image of Canadian Faculties of Education as a set of organizations troubled by "tensions and dilemmas" (1983a: 68). In Volume Four (1983b) of the work, the metaphors of ineffectiveness take on an even more aggressive and negative character. An image of each faculty of education as "a loosely coupled organization" (1983b: 37) is presented based on their conclusion that programs lack effective leadership and are directed by a diverse set of "personal missions" (1983b: 37) Given their finding that the "loose coupling" of different elements in faculties of education leads to the absence of coherent goals, Wideen and Fullan offer a highly critical perspective on the nature of teacher education organizations:

> When one adds to this the data which we gathered on climate which was highly negative and individualistic and the tensions created by alternative pressures of the practical and the academic, the picture becomes one in which the organization is not only loosely coupled but loosely coupled in a very unhealthy way. (1983b:37, emphasis added)

It is with the image of "unhealthy" coupling that Wideen and Fullan conclude their report. They insist that until faculties of education become more tightly coupled around coherent goals, individual whims will pervade and faculties will be unable to achieve concerted actions toward improvement:

> ...concerted, institutional thrusts aimed at improving most aspects of teacher training will be necessary if faculties of education are to be worthy of the responsibility for preparing those who teach the young. (1983b: 43)
In other words, if administrators and faculty members are not capable of initiating change themselves, the changes must be imposed, managed and measured by external bodies, such as provincial Ministries of Education, to ensure that faculties of education can achieve effectiveness in the future.

The year 1985 saw the publication of yet another critical essay by Marvin Wideen. Given that he drew largely on the same data base used for his earlier reports (1983), it was of little surprise that the findings were similar. The distinguishing feature of Wideen's later publication, however, was its assertion that the greatest problem facing faculties of education in Canada was a "lack of institutional focus": the goals of programs were defined as "confused", the instruction as "rhetorical", the climates as "negative and suspicious", and the overall ability of the institutions to enable change, next to null (87-95). Wideen supported these evaluations in summarizing the results of his interviews with faculty members at ten institutions:

Interviews with teacher educators, however, do not usually reveal conceptual underpinnings supporting statements of objectives. When they do, they are usually individualistic and not shared on an institutional level, resulting in a confused array of opinions relating to the goals of teacher education. (87)

He then went on to ask a largely rhetorical question: "Given such diversity, are there any common goals in teacher education?" (87). Wideen's answer was, of course, no. Like the conclusions drawn in his earlier report, Wideen highlighted the severity of the problems and asserted his opinion that aggressive action was needed to mandate change so that the ideals of effective teacher education could be translated into reality. Wideen implied
that the imposition of coherent goals would solve the key dilemma of teacher education expressed by one faculty member as a situation where regardless of "...the fact that none of us know what we are doing, we all tend to do it in the same way" (89).

A sense that administrators and faculty members do not quite "know what [they] are doing" in their work at faculties of education is pervasive throughout much of the literature on effectiveness in teacher education. This image is intimately tied to a more encompassing image of faculties of education as "ineffective" or "unhealthy" organizations. Both images contribute to a recurring theme in the literature which suggests that teacher education programs are in need of reform. Regardless of whether individual researchers assert the need for particular areas of reform or far reaching program modification, the final image of teacher education as presented through the framework of effectiveness remains the same: teacher education as it currently exists is incapable of effectively educating teachers. As such, it is imperative that all teacher education programs respond to external calls for aggressive and immediate reform. There is a great deal of debate concerning the solutions to the problems which are seen to compromise the quality of programs. Within the traditional paradigm of effectiveness, however, differences of opinion are less significant than the pervasiveness of the effectiveness agenda for reform.

The negative images of teacher education supported by the traditional discourse on effectiveness are hard to ignore. Because the effectiveness discourse equates healthy organizations exclusively in terms of mechanistic models organized around images of coherent and measurable goals and outcomes, top-down models of control and evaluation
and common understandings of the “appropriate” skills, dispositions and knowledge of
effective teaching, to speak of anything other than effectiveness implies that one is
working within a model of ineffectiveness. Akin to images of a machine, all faculties of
education to conform to external images of efficiency and to be responsible for providing
guarantees of quality assurance consistent with the parameters outlined in the pages of
effectiveness research.

**A Search for Meaning: Effectiveness in the Eye of the Beholder**

The contexts surrounding educational organizations are regularly informed by
events which dramatize “the problem of educational ineffectiveness” (Deal, 1990: 200);
literature reviewed in the foregoing sections clearly indicates that faculties of education
are no exception to this rule. While a significant amount of theoretical and practical
energy has been devoted to the maintenance of traditional discourses which charge
teacher education with ineffectiveness, other studies have emerged to challenge this
negative image. In contrast to the drive toward fashioning a unitary image of
effectiveness for faculties of education, researchers working with interpretive
frameworks have suggested that there are “multiple ways of knowing” or understanding
the process of learning to teach (Britzman 1991). The notion of multiple perspectives
emerges from what Gray (1990) terms “a subjective theory of organizations” which
“provides a way of looking at organizations so that the uniqueness of individual
perceptions”, rather than system-wide features, is held in focus and becomes the major
concern of the researcher (143). Also described by Woods (1983) as an “interactionist”
viewpoint, researchers’ knowledge of the “multiple realities” (Schutz, 1967) that
participants bring to their interactions with other individuals and contexts can be developed if they concentrate on:

...the small-scale detail of interpersonal relationships, what people do, and how they react to each other,... the ebb and flow of everyday life. [The interactionist] takes nothing for granted about the importance of events, for that is decided by the people under study. This is their world, or more properly speaking, worlds, since there are many realities in school...(xi)

The key features which distinguishes subjective and context-specific approaches from traditional functionalist accounts are the styles of theorizing which emphasize how individual “realities” are “contingent upon context and upon the perspectives of others” (Britzman, 1991: 14-15).

As previously outlined, a key concept that draws together interpretive studies is the assertion that single-minded notions of effective teacher education do not reflect the dynamic character of programs and therefore, should not be imposed on local faculties of education in a mechanistic fashion. As illustrated in a powerful image suggested by Buchmann and Floden (1990):

Because teaching is uncertain and no educational theory is complete, the unexpected will happen. Even the most coherent account will fail to explain some important events—and many of our theories will turn out to be false anyway. (7)

This paradigm suggests that local and internal differences among faculties of education will have a strong impact on definitions of effectiveness in the context of each teacher education program. As a result, reform agendas which attempt to define a single set of images of effectiveness without attention to the local and internal variations are likely to fail because the practical implications of reform will have “different meanings in different
settings" (McLaughlin, 1987:175). In her review of American educational policy directives, for instance, Cornbleth (1986) indicates a means of conceptualizing how external interests for reform might intersect with internal needs in faculties of education:

...substantial reform of teacher education is not likely to come from national commissions or formal organizational sources. Where reform occurs, the initiative will most likely be local and from the organization. It will, of course be influenced by environmental factors (12, emphasis added)

Thus, the possible range of practices that might take place within each faculty of education will be the result a combination of internal and external images of effectiveness. In other words, the assumptions and values that are conveyed through the traditional paradigm of effectiveness can be influential by creating expectations for the organization and content of programs. They cannot, however, entirely dictate how individuals will construct their own images of effectiveness as they experience the day-to-day dynamics of learning to teach in local contexts. Researchers “can lay the groundwork, but the people in each school will dictate the words and deeds of what happens next” (Deal, 1990: 216). Therefore, a “search for meaning” around effectiveness in teacher education must take into account the needs, interests, interpretations, and experiences of both individuals and groups working on the front lines of teacher education.

The growing range of studies carried out within the “interpretive” tradition indicate that faculties of education are characterized by a diversity of perspectives and practices, a variety of constraints and opportunities, and a host of innovative and traditional features which coexist within programs (Fullan, Connelly and Watson, 1990; Feiman-Nemser, 1990; Thiessen and Kilcher, 1993; Zeichner, Liston, Mahlios and
Gomez, 1988). In emphasizing the interplay between the unique strengths and weaknesses of each program (and participants within them), researchers have challenged the notion that faculties of education can be evaluated exclusively as effective or ineffective. A small group of research studies have described how both teacher educators and teacher candidates experience a variety of enabling as well as limiting factors in their experiences of teaching and learning in faculties of education (Ducharme, 1993; Gideonse, 1989; Knowles, Cole and Presswood, 1994; Howey and Zimpher, 1989; McCarthy, 1986; Weber, 1986). Such descriptions indicate that, while each faculty of education may have to struggle with a number of constraints, it may also enjoy the benefits of a number of unique strengths. Contained within this image, is the assumption that effectiveness might best emerge through attempts to capitalize on setting-specific strengths while also understanding and working to diminish the impact of constraints.

In their efforts to construct a range of images that capture the many sided realities of teacher education, interpretive studies have initiated a shift away from the enduring dilemmas (Katz and Raths, 1992) or "problems" of teacher education to describe a broader range of factors which take into account the possible strengths as well as the weaknesses of particular teacher education programs. Within this paradigm of "possibilities", researchers have placed emphasis on charting the commonalities and differences among local practices and have made recommendations for setting-specific improvements that can be implemented in the unique climates of each faculty of education (Dempsey, Greger and Mutart, 1989; Martin, 1990). Shifting the focus away from aggressive system-wide reform to emergent site-based change has also directed an
increasing amount of attention to the range of perspectives that educators and teacher candidates bring to their understanding of teaching and learning in their particular faculties of education. Contesting the impression commonly conveyed through research which indicates that all individuals define teacher education in standard terms, it has been suggested that each program is made up of a "diversity of orientations as the perspectives of specific individuals are brought to bear on [seemingly] coherent instructional plans" (Zeichner, Liston, Mahlios and Gomez, 1988: 350). From this viewpoint, programs cannot be mandated into strict compliance within an externally created set of "effectiveness parameters" because:

...people hold different expectations for schools and teachers and because, in any complex human endeavor, there are always more goals to strive for than one can achieve at any one time. (Feiman-Nemser, 1990: 12)

Further, as highlighted through Tamir's (1991) study of teacher candidates' experience of teacher education:

...pre-service teachers participating in class in the same activity designed to communicate a particular notion of professional knowledge will differ from each other in the sense that they make of that activity and in what knowledge they acquire from that experience. (265)

In this interpretation, researchers have suggested that the traditional focus on organizational effectiveness commonly obscures how individual dynamics will impact on programs as they interact with formal expectations or goals. Despite attempts on the parts of many researchers to insist that faculties of education are responsible for the direct implementation of officially defined goals, the diversity of orientations and practices introduced by each unique individual will modify the goals in an imaginative
number of ways. As indicated by Denzin (1983) in his outline for an interpretive
phenomenological approach to social research:

Persons personalize structures by bringing their own unique
biographies and interpretive practices to bear on the task,
event or interaction at hand. (141)

Therefore, it is important to consider the possibility that teacher educators will make
varied choices about what and how to teach (Feiman-Nemser, 1990; Haigh and Katterns,
1984) and that teacher candidates will interact with such choices in a diverse number of
ways. In other words, “experiences of the same will be different” (Gray, 1990:143).

An image of teacher education as characterized by the multiple perspectives of the
varied individuals and groups who work in settings that are influenced by both external
and internal interests challenges traditional approaches which emphasize the rational
and predictable qualities of organizations (Hargreaves, 1994). Images which suggest that
effectiveness can be defined and facilitated through a “search for meanings” that underlie
setting-specific and individual interests and their interpretations of external agendas
tend to shift the focus away from coherence: they threaten a situation of chaos in which
“ideas and experiences decompose into disparate meaningless bits” (Buchmann and
Floden, 1990:3). One way to overcome the uncertainty engendered by an attempt to work
outside of the traditional discourse involves an effort to extend current notions of
effectiveness beyond their traditional location within mechanistic paradigms toward a
greater balance with interpretive efforts in the “search for meanings” of effective teacher
education. In an attempt to bring functionalist and interpretive styles of theorizing
together, it will be necessary to consider how meanings of effectiveness are negotiated in
multiple ways by individuals working together in settings that are unique and experience
time. The point may not be to mandate change through increased “pressures,
effectiveness and controls” (Hargreaves, 1994: 108) or to continue costly efforts toward
“single-minded definitions of learning and teaching” (Britzman, 1991:213). Rather, as will
be shown in subsequent chapters, it is important to interrogate traditional images of
effectiveness in teacher education in order to uncover how the study of participants’
everyday experiences of learning to teach enable us to understand how effectiveness
lies in the eye of the beholder. Diversity does not necessarily engender uncertainty,
instability, inefficiency, or for that matter ineffectiveness.

Plan for Subsequent Chapters

In the remaining chapters of this thesis, the findings of qualitative studies at
three faculties of education are introduced in an interpretive framework of “everyday
understandings” of effectiveness in teacher education. In particular, the results of my
interviews with four teacher educators and seven teacher candidates are organized
around the question of how educators and candidates working in the day-to-day dynamics
of learning to teach define effectiveness from their own personal perspectives. Working
with suggestions outlined in the literature that has focused attention on the “search for
meaning”, the following chapters challenge many of the traditional notions of
effectiveness. With an emphasis on holding the “uniqueness of individual perceptions” in
focus (Gray, 1990: 143) subsequent chapters illustrate how educators and candidates
understood effectiveness through their relationships to “the everyday lifeworld [of their
teacher education programs] and in the constitutive practices that [made] that world
meaningful and understandable.” (Denzin, 1983:130). To achieve these aims I draw significantly on the interactionist premise that meanings are emergent or “socially constructed” (Berger and Luckmann, 1969) and can be “mapped” (Woods, 1983) through study of the contexts of learning to teach and the perspectives of those who negotiate the meanings or “realities” (Schutz, 1967) of effective teacher education.

It is my aim to highlight the limitations of traditional approaches to theorizing about effectiveness. I do so by offering descriptive accounts which capture the diversity that I found to be characteristic of the contexts for teaching and learning in three university classrooms. In addition, I attempt to capture the uniqueness of personal perspectives held by the educators and teacher candidates who were kind enough to share their particular stories with me. Finally, I suggest how a combination of “mechanisms” and “meanings” might enable a broader range of images of effectiveness that will facilitate movement toward defining a many sided view of “identities and practices” that can be taken up in the dynamic process of learning to teach.

As already outlined, the findings presented in this study are the result of three qualitative case-studies in Curriculum and Instruction courses at Northview, Valleyfield and Bellhampton Universities. Notes on my use of qualitative methodologies in each setting are presented in Chapter Two. The findings from these studies are discussed in Chapters Three through Five: Chapter Three employs a framework suggested by Feiman-Nemser (1990) to illustrate the diversity of roles, activities and conceptual orientations involved in the dynamics of each course; Chapter Four, “The Educators”, investigates four seconded teacher educators’ experiences and interpretations of their work as teachers and learners in their respective faculties of education; Chapter Five narrates
seven teacher candidates' experiences of learning to teach and suggests the parameters of an ideal learning model that reflects the candidates' senses of effective teacher education. Chapter Six concludes the thesis by reviewing key findings of the study, and outlining my interpretation of teacher education as a process characterized by diversity, complexity and a considerable amount of negotiation. In closing, I discuss the implications of this study for future efforts in theorizing about teacher education through a combined search for the meanings and mechanisms of effectiveness.
CHAPTER TWO
STUDYING CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION COURSES

Introduction

A central aim of this thesis is to understand how teacher educators and candidates, working in the day-to-day dynamics of learning to teach, define effective teacher education from a personal perspective. To contextualize the findings which emerged through this focus, my work was also directed toward highlighting the dynamics of teacher education as they took place in the context of university-based faculties of education. From the outset, I felt that qualitative methodologies would provide the most valuable strategies to access local and/or “everyday” understanding of teacher education within unique contexts. The ways in which methods such as observation and in-depth interviews enabled personal contacts and an understanding of program contexts were key factors in my decision to opt for a qualitative rather than quantitative approach.

The particular research design employed to organize qualitative strategies in the context of this thesis was the case study method. As noted by Bell (1987), case studies provide opportunities:

...for one aspect of a problem to be studied in some depth within a limited time scale (6).

Working with this strategy, issues of effectiveness in teacher education were investigated through three short-term case studies at local faculties of education. My use of qualitative methods in the context of conducting case studies in Curriculum and Instruction courses at Bellhampton, Northview and Valleyfield are discussed in the remainder of this chapter.
Notes on Qualitative Methodology

Qualitative methodology is an umbrella term for what Ely et al. (1991) call a "mind-boggling" number of approaches and theoretical paradigms which find their commonality in "the primarily qualitative-as-descriptive nature of work", in contrast to "the primarily quantitative emphasis of positivist approaches" (3). A key element of studies conducted within the parameters of ethnographic research is located in a common focus which ties together the numerous approaches and theoretical perspectives:

Researchers who use this approach are interested in the ways different people make sense out of their lives. In other words, qualitative researchers are concerned with what are called participant perspectives. (Erickson, 1986 in Bogdan and Biklen, 1992: 32)

With an emphasis on "understanding social phenomena from the actor's own perspective", researchers explore "what people say and do, as a product of how people define their world" (Bogdan & Taylor, 1984: 2,8). Methodologies provided by quantitative approaches tend to emphasize the collection of "hard" data through survey techniques and other "measurable" data instruments, and stress the importance of processing data through statistical analysis. In comparison, qualitative researchers tend toward the collection of "soft" data:

The data collected have been termed soft, that is, rich in description of people, places, and conversations, and not easily handled by statistical procedures. Research questions are not framed by operationalizing variables; rather, they are formulated to investigate topics in all their complexity, in context. (Bogdan and Biklen, 1992: 2)

The central methods used in collecting data of a qualitative nature fall along what Bogdan and Biklen (1992) refer to as "the participant/observer continuum": at one end of
the continuum researchers may opt to take on the role of a “complete observer”, while at the other end research strategies may entail “complete involvement at the site” (88). In many cases, however, researchers conducting qualitative studies choose to “stay somewhere between these two extremes” (Bogdan and Biklen, 1992:88). A second strategy commonly used in qualitative research is interviewing. Like the continuum of participation and observation, qualitative interviews can be carried out in numerous fashions. As described by Ely et al. (1991), a researcher’s role in the setting may provide opportunities for both “informal” and “formal” interviews (57). Informal interviews tend to emerge in response to a situation within the setting and are conducted with “less prior planning than formal interviews” (Ely et al., 1991: 57). In contrast, formal interviews tend to be conducted away from the immediate action of the setting and are guided by a combination of structured and semi-structured interview questions (Bogdan and Biklen, 1992: 96). While some researchers employ interviews as a key strategy for collecting data, others may combine both participation and/or observation with informal and/or formal interviews.

In the context of my own work, I employed both interviews and observation (e.g. listening and taking notes on the interactions that took place before the formal beginning of the class). On occasion I also took part in group discussions or activities with teacher candidates. Through observation alone, I was able to get a general picture of the content, organization and contextual features (e.g. time) of each course. Occasional opportunities to participate (e.g. in a small group discussion on unit planning or a science experiment on heat) assisted in general understanding of how different groups and individuals
worked to interpret, evaluate and interact during what one student referred to as “hands-on” or active learning. It also provided many opportunities for informal conversations which assisted in my attempts to understand how candidates and instructors interpreted events and debated ideas in the classroom context. Finally, as discussed further in a later section of this chapter, the choice to sit amongst teacher candidates enabled me to establish a wider range of contacts than I might have if I had chosen to sit on the periphery of the classroom. In addition to observing and participating in a number of classroom events, I conducted in-depth interviews of an open-ended nature to develop an awareness of the participants’ personal experiences of the programs in general, and to work toward a particular understanding of how each interviewee might define “effectiveness” in teacher education. In all, I conducted four interviews with teacher educators and seven with teacher candidates. Data collected through observation and interviews provided unique pictures which reflected the diverse set of dynamics that I found to be characteristic of both the contextual and personal “realities” of learning to teach in the three courses.

In the following sections I describe how I gained access to each of the settings. I also outline the details of my role as an observer during my visits to the three university campus classrooms. Following this, I report on the nature of open-ended interviews conducted with a sample of four educators and seven teacher candidates who were kind enough to share their time and ideas with me. I then discuss the strategies employed to analyze or “make sense” of notes from my observations, documents, and interview transcripts, both during and after the term of my fieldwork. Finally, as this chapter
stands in preface to the presentation of results, I conclude with a brief review of the limitations of this study that I feel are important to an understanding of both the depth and scope of my research.

**Access**

The first challenge I faced in designing my research project involved the need to define the particular sites for my research. From my own experiences as a student teacher two years earlier, I was aware of the wide range of options offered by teacher education programs in Ontario. I also had to consider the limitations that my own location and schedule placed on the range of choices that I could make. While I was aware that any of the number of programs located in southern Ontario would provide unique settings to explore my research questions, I chose three sites where I had established prior contacts with at least one person in the setting. Having made this decision I then had to decide where to concentrate my focus within the organization of the programs at the three faculties. I considered the separation of options into the primary/junior, junior/intermediate or intermediate/senior panels and then worked to narrow this down further to choose between courses that concentrated on curriculum and program organization in general, subject-specific courses such as history or language arts, and courses on the models and foundations of education in Ontario. Finally, I had to consider the additional options created by the fact that all three departments offered programs at the main university campuses and at various satellite campuses.

My initial intent was to study one Curriculum and Instruction course at both Bellhampton and at Valleyfield and two at Northview. I chose non-subject-specific
Curriculum and Instruction ("C&I") courses for the particular reason that they appeared to cover a wide spectrum of topics from a generalist perspective as compared, for instance, to a mathematics course which focused on a particular curriculum area within the primary/junior or junior/intermediate divisions. With a focus on general topics (e.g. unit planning or evaluation or assessment) within the larger category of program organization, I sensed that the Curriculum and Instruction courses might provide a setting where many of the debates surrounding notions of effective teaching and learning, as well general questions surrounding the broader evaluations of "effectiveness" in teacher education, might get played out. My choice to study "C&I" courses entailed some obvious compromises in terms of the nature of data that I might have collected through studying other courses. In my own experiences I was aware that many candidates (myself included) viewed "C&I" courses as more "practical" than foundation, models or psychology courses which tended to be classed as theory or issues oriented and less immediately applicable to practice teaching placements (see also Rodriguez, 1993). Therefore, data collected through this study represents one of the many possible stories that could have been told about the programs at each University. In the process of gaining access, one program coordinator, for instance, suggested that I might learn more about issues such as theory and practice through studying a foundations course, or more about innovation in teacher education through investigating a field-based program. In the end, however, I followed my initial inclination (and bias) in asserting that, for the time being, a focus on "C&I" courses at three university campuses would provide a starting point from which I could understand the dynamics of a particular area of teacher
education.

Having defined my focus, I moved to gain entry into the settings. With significant assistance from a former professor and one of my thesis committee members, I contacted program coordinators and a course instructor to request their permission to observe and conduct interviews with participants in the Curriculum and Instruction courses at each site. Initial contact was made over the phone and followed up by a written description of my research project and an explanation of measures to be taken in ensuring anonymity in the collection and presentation of data (Appendix A). At this time ethical reviews were also submitted to the designated committees at each Faculty of Education. Having satisfied the preliminary requirements I returned to research on the Ontario Government’s teacher education policies and waited for responses from the program coordinators.

As I soon discovered, the process of gaining entry into the four courses was to become the source of four very unique stories. Bogdan and Biklen’s (1992) notion that access involves a considerable amount of negotiation became a key aspect of my attempts to gain entry into each setting. As a researcher I experienced gaining access as a significant part of my study. Over the course of a month, I worked through various channels to establish contacts and gained access to three of the four sites that I had set out to study. While the coordinator of the program at the fourth site expressed an interest in my study, our mutual attempts to reach each other by phone for two months were unsuccessful. From this initial experience I gained a sense of the complexity of educators’ work, and how time (or lack thereof) was a central issue for each of the instructors or coordinators that I met during the first weeks of my study. Through my
attempts to access the four Curriculum and Instruction course settings, I also came to understand Bogdan and Biklen's (1992) comment that "the difference between the person who gets in and the person who strikes out is how long and how diligently he or she is in pursuit" (85). In the end, I was granted permission to observe and conduct interviews in one "C&I" course at Northview, Valleyfield, and Bellhampton.

**Observation**

As noted by Jacka (1994) in quoting Wolcott's description of educational ethnography, the "hardest question for the ethnographer...[is] What is it that you look at when you conduct your research? The answer is, of course, "it depends"(65). I entered the three classrooms with Denzin's (1983) theories of interpretive interactionism in mind. He suggests that qualitative researchers aim toward the study of "meanings, motives, intentions, emotions and feelings" experienced and organized by interacting individuals within particular settings (1983: 129). In addition, he emphasizes the importance of attempting to understand and document the details of individual experiences of the "everyday world" (1983:129).

Denzin's framework provided an ideal approach for my initial visits to the field. Given that my role was largely one of observation, however, the depth of understanding suggested by Denzin proved to be quite difficult in the context of my own work. The number of participants in each setting ranged from forty to one hundred and twenty which made observations of and contact with individuals very difficult. The size, physical set-up and formal rules of the classrooms that I visited also limited the degree to which I could interpret the wealth of events taking place in each setting. The short duration that I spent with each group meant that while I did establish meaningful contacts with many
teacher candidates, my role as an observer was largely exploratory rather than interpretive. By watching, listening, occasionally participating and speaking with teacher educators and candidates in the setting, I was able to gather a collection of "snapshots" describing the forms of learning and teaching in the three university classrooms. Data collected through participant observation indicated the "bare outlines of lived experience", and hints of "the interactions, intentions and experiences of individuals" within them (Denzin, 1983:135).

My role as an observer in the three courses described in this study took place over the course of two and a half months. During this time I collected data from each course session that was scheduled to meet on campus (two of the three sites had regularly scheduled off-campus school visits). I observed in each course for an average of five three-hour blocks. In two settings I was formally introduced by a course instructor and had an opportunity to present the purpose and nature of my research to the whole class. At Northview, I was not introduced, and therefore experienced the challenge of walking into the classroom and informally establishing contact with teacher candidates over time. For this context, I found my past experience as a student teacher to be a excellent means of establishing rapport because it provided a common point of interest and opportunities for some lively conversations around comparing our experiences.

Given that my research was conducted in the context of three university classrooms, I assumed that notetaking would be an acceptable means of recording the various events and conversations that took place. I was quick to discover, however, that most students did not take notes and therefore my constant scribbles made my role as an
outsider very obvious. Keeping in mind Bogdan and Biklen's advice that it “can be a strain [for individuals or groups] to continually feel like they are being watched” (1992:91) and my commitment to observing rather than intentionally influencing people in the setting, I quickly decided against this “up-front” strategy for recording my observations. In addition, much of the instruction that I observed was interactive so I was constantly involved, with varying degrees of participation, in a variety of activities and small group discussions. In place of a notebook I took advantage of those times when instructors handed out papers to students to make some quick notes. I then recorded summaries of my observations directly after I left the setting. In the evening after my visit to the field I wrote up expanded notes from the summaries and concluded each set with a journal entry. Using a journal format suggested by Ely et al. (1991), I recorded questions that I wanted to ask teacher educators or candidates, noted general impressions of themes and issues and commented on points of commonality and difference among the courses that I was observing.

My final set of observational notes included impressions on space, time, goals, activities, actors, and expressions of how individuals experienced or evaluated the events that took place in the setting (Ely et al., 1991:48). I recorded the details of conversations, interactions between teacher educators and candidates, the nature of activities assigned by instructors, and the ways in which candidates worked through these assignments. I also collected information on other courses that candidates were participating in, recorded candidates’ comments about their practice teaching experiences, and noted the specifics of extra-curricular activities that were discussed in class and/or advertised on
bulletin boards in the surrounding hallways. Finally, I made note of conversations that I had with instructors at the end of class. These conversations tended to focus on each of the instructor's own ideas concerning how they evaluated the events that had taken place during the class. Separate files were also established to collect the large number of handouts received from instructors and student presentations during class sessions.

**Interviews**

... interviews are at the heart of doing ethnography because they seek the words of the people we are studying, the richer the better, so that we can understand their situations with increasing clarity. (Ely et al., 1991:58)

While observation provided images of the structure and classroom dynamics involved in three particular Curriculum and Instruction courses, open-ended interviews conducted over the course of my study provided opportunities to collect insights into the “multiple realities” of teacher education expressed through participants' personal accounts. In other words, interviews allowed me to gain a sense of the world of teacher education through the eyes of educators and candidates themselves (Ely et al., 1991:58). Face to face conversations with four educators and seven candidates provided insight into the diverse ways that a set of individuals interpreted the details of “everyday” events in each teacher education program. With an emphasis on allowing interviewees to direct the conversations, the scope of interview data crossed numerous themes in describing personal views and experiences of the three particular courses under study. At times I also used direct questions to probe for the interviewee's personal visions of and expectations for teacher education in general.

All of the interviews recorded in this study were voluntary and conducted on site
at the three faculties of education. In one case time constraints meant that our interview had to be conducted over the phone. The four teacher educators interviewed were course instructors in the three courses that I observed. Interviews with teacher candidates were arranged based on a number of contacts that I had established through informal exchanges in the classroom context. Through informal discussions - which became an integral part of my observation notes - I had an opportunity to outline the purpose of the interview and the potential of the research with each participant. I also provided each candidate with a written summary of the general topics that might be covered. This letter also served the purpose of providing participants with a written guarantee of anonymity.

I outlined their option to receive a transcript of the interview, and their right to request any add to, omit or clarify any of the information that they had shared with me (a copy of this letter is included in Appendix A). In all, six transcripts were sent out after I finished my research. None of the participants has contacted me to request changes.

To facilitate the interview process, I developed two interview schedules: one to be used with teacher educators and another with teacher candidates (Appendix B). From the outset, however, I intended for these schedules to be used only as a guide - a starting point from which emergent themes could be developed and discussed in a less structured or more open-ended manner. In many cases discussions that took place as I walked with a participant to a classroom or office served as the starting point for our interview. Over the course of the interview, however, I also attempted to cover key areas in relation to the instructor’s or candidate’s experiences at the faculty.

My interviews with teacher educators focused on three key elements: an
understanding of their background experiences, reasons for entering the field of teacher education, and their experiences as teacher educators in the particular courses that they taught as well as within the context of the program and department as a whole. In the course of our interview I also worked to understand each educator's personal goals as an instructor, their personal understandings of the goals of teacher education in general, their personal experiences of working with teacher candidates, and their perceptions of how candidates felt about their experiences. Finally, questions of where they saw their role as teacher educators in the future and what changes they might make to the course/program based on their personal philosophies of teacher education were introduced in the closing segment of each interview.

Interviews with teacher candidates followed a similar pattern, with attention to experiences prior to enrolling in the program (i.e. undergraduate degree received), reflection on what they expected of the program before they started, and personal perceptions of the goals of the program. I also asked candidates to describe the highs and lows of their experiences in the program, and to reflect on their opinions of the strengths and weaknesses of the program. In closing, I worked to direct the discussion toward reflection on how they felt about their future role as teachers.

The length of the interviews ranged from forty-five to ninety minutes depending on the amount of time that a participant could find in their schedule. All interviewees consented to the use of a tape recorder. Except for one participant who noted that she felt somewhat intimidated by the presence of the recorder, the taping of interviews did not appear to interfere with the flow of conversation. From a personal perspective, I found
that the use of this device allowed me to take on a less formal role, gave me greater freedom to work with emergent themes and facilitated conversation at a comfortable pace. The interviews were transcribed using general guidelines described by Bogdan and Biklen (1992). In particular, each transcript began with a heading to identify the interviewee, the time and place of interview, and the program where each participant was working or studying (Bogdan and Biklen, 1992: 129). In addition, I summarized any previous conversations that had taken place between myself and the interviewee in the classroom context and recorded notes around the participant’s initial response to my research topic. Finally, I summarized any information that had been discussed before I turned the tape recorder on to capture, for instance, ideas shared as we talked “informally” on our way to a classroom where the interview was to take place. All transcripts were single spaced and margins were adjusted to allow sufficient space in the left margin for coding. In typing up the interviews I included my questions and comments as well as those offered by the interviewee. Even though some of the interview segments appeared to be “off-topic”, I chose to include all conversation. As I moved to the stage of data analysis and my focus underwent a number of shifts I understood the value of this decision!

**Data Analysis**

To analyze is to find some way or ways to tease out what we consider to be essential meaning in the raw data; to reduce and reorganize and combine so that the readers share the researcher’s findings in the most economical, interesting fashion. The product of analysis is a creation that speaks to the heart of what was learned. (Ely et al., 1991: 140)

The main approach that I used to synthesize the wealth of information I had collected in
the field was to develop key themes that emerged from a broad list of categories established through initial readings of observational notes and interview transcripts. Following strategies set out by Ely et al (1991) in their summary of Bussis, Chittenden, Amarel and Carini (1978), I generated over thirty categories for each of the three sets of notes and an average of twenty for each of the eleven interview transcripts. Working with these I began a journal to list my initial impressions and then returned to the data to explore the possibilities of refining the original list of categories by noting the frequency at which each category appeared. While it was tempting to jump to conclusions based on initial impressions, I returned to the data for a third reading to record “verbatim narrative to link the raw data to the categories” (Ely et al., 1991:151). At this time I also wrote summary statements to reflect my own perceptions of key themes in each set of data. During this stage my focus was on integrating my impressions of each interviewee’s personal perspective and the details of each setting into a conceptual or thematic map that I could use to compare the data. Using key themes, I returned to create journal entries which summarized the ways in which each person’s narrative reflected the themes and compared them in terms of commonalities and differences. The end result of this process was a collection of case studies and narratives to reflect the uniqueness of each setting and participant, as well as a thematic map which drew common events and personal perspectives together into a collection of key statements.

To facilitate the movement from analysis to writing, I undertook a final review of the data and color coded each set according to established themes. Following this process I made additional copies of the data and then “cut and pasted” to organize relevant sets
into groups of data. Data from my own observations were organized into six key themes; the narratives of teacher educators suggested six key themes; and those recorded with teacher candidates generated seven themes. In the next step of analysis, I drew on my knowledge of key themes in the data to return to a review of literature collected over the course of the study. In my final review of the literature I undertook to use the same framework for analysis that I had applied to my review of observational notes and interview transcripts. In other words, I worked to develop a thematic understanding of the issue and/or theme of "effectiveness" in teacher education as represented in the general literature on teacher education in the North American context.

**Limitations of the Study**

This study presents “snapshots” (Bascia, 1994; Woods, 1988) of three core Curriculum and Instruction courses. It also describes the perspectives of a small sample of participants from each setting. As images of particular settings, it is important to emphasize that the following presentation of results is not meant to be read as representative of all teacher education programs or the range of people that were involved in the particular courses that I studied. In the context of this study, time and timing were key elements in influencing the nature and scope of data collected through my research:

...in all educational establishments time is a complex, often overbearing and frequently referred to fact of life. But time is not just a matter of data in its own right; it also bears on the interpretation of other data. (Ball, 1987, 163)
Further, as noted by Bascia (1994):

"Snapshot" research has its limitations: Time plays as critical a role as location in fixing and delimiting organizational studies. (13)

I began my research in late February of 1995 and thus entered the settings at a time in which educators were beginning to "tie up loose ends" and candidates were heavily involved in the completion of course assignments before the final week of classes in the first week of April. Both candidates and faculty spoke of how they were feeling "stressed out" and pressed for time. It was noted frequently by educators and candidates that the events and emotions I was observing were strongly connected to the specific stage of the year. Had I conducted this study at another time of the year, emergent themes might have been quite different.

In addition to the timing of my observations, the data I was able to collect were limited by the amount of time that I had to participate in the field. I made many contacts with candidates and spoke frequently with instructors on my visits. I was keenly aware, however, that my key role in the settings was as an observer of the basic structures surrounding the dynamics of the classroom. In other words, I predominantly collected images of instructors in front of the classroom lecturing or interacting with students and of students participating in assigned activities. A great deal of the dynamics that I sensed were going on within the classrooms was out of my reach. As such, I have borrowed the term "snapshots" (Bascia, 1994; Woods; 1988) to indicate that while this study is focused on the diversity of images connected to notions of "effectiveness" in teacher education, the generalizability of such notions is very much like images portrayed in photographs -
there is always more than meets the eye!

An additional element which places limitations on this study involves the fact that all of the teacher educators interviewed were working on two or three full-time secondee contracts or a one year part-time contract. As secondees or part-time instructors, the teacher educators discussed in this study do not hold tenure or tenure track positions. Additionally, two of the four educators were in their first year at their respective programs, while the remaining two were finishing their second year. The perspectives included in this study, therefore, reflect those of faculty who are relatively new to university-based teacher education. They also reflect the ideas and experiences of a group that maintains strong ties to their respective positions as administrators or teachers in the field. While it is difficult to generalize, it might be suggested that seconded instructors bring a particular perspective to teacher education given their backgrounds and orientations toward school and school board settings. Finally, it is important to acknowledge that their temporary positions do not tend to include expectations surrounding scholarship - a point that has been identified as a key tension for many tenure and tenure-track professors working in faculties of education (Ducharme, 1993).

My recognition of the fact that all four educators are secondee instructors is in no way meant to imply that their insights and experiences are less meaningful than those of a tenured professor. Instead, this recognition is meant to direct attention to the fact that the “population” of teacher educators includes a range of positions that include part-time contract positions, secondments, tenure-track and tenure positions for full and associate professors. As highlighted in a recent report by the Ontario Ministry of Education (1995),
secondees make up on average thirty percent of teacher educators working at Faculties of Education in Ontario. The fact, therefore, that the educators interviewed for this study were on secondment indicates that this study is not representative of the full range of educators working in university-based teacher education.

A final limitation which returns to issues surrounding time constraints involved the degree to which themes in the data have influenced the topic and organization of this study. Pitman and Dobbert (1986) discuss the limitations of short-term fieldwork by noting that it:

...may need to depend more on prior theory formulation to get the job done than long-term research, which has the luxury of many months to allow themes and issues to emerge. (97)

A key element of this study has involved a critique of current traditional approaches in defining or delimiting images of effectiveness in teacher education. Asking the audience of this study to read these traditional images of teacher education against images discussed by individual teacher educators and teacher candidates is in part, recognition of the ways in which prior theory formulation influenced my analysis of the data. My choice to understand teacher education by focusing attention on the diversity of ways in which candidates and educators might define effectiveness became a guide to my reading of the data collected through this study. This strategy opened up numerous possibilities but also influenced my decisions to omit other themes in the data that might have been relevant in another context. Through inductive analysis of data collected in the field I have worked to maintain the authenticity of events and perspectives. It is important to acknowledge that numerous limitations are also set on this data by the fact that this
study (like all studies) was both conducted and analyzed by “a person with a point of view” (Richardson, 1990: 27).

**A Personal Point of View**

The particular point of view that lingers in the background (and occasionally in the foreground) of this study is based on my own experiences as a teacher candidate in a three-year concurrent education program from 1989 to 1992. It is also located in a series of events that became significant moments in my adventures as a graduate student. Two events at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education influenced my choice to revisit teacher education as a researcher. First, I was introduced to Britzman's (1991) critical study of the process of learning to teach. Britzman's questions - “what is it like to learn to teach?” and “what does it mean to those involved?” (1991:10) - rekindled memories and sparked many new interests in my own thinking about teacher education.

A year after reading Britzman's work, I enrolled in a qualitative research course and discovered an opportunity to investigate these new interests. I returned to the Faculty of Education that I had attended as a student and conducted what was to become the pilot study for the research presented in this thesis. My particular focus on interrogating images of effectiveness grew out of this preliminary project when I overheard a student question “why can’t they give us something good?”. As acknowledged by the title of this thesis, this question has had a strong influence in shaping the direction of this study. In many ways, it allowed me to alter my own viewpoint momentarily to consider the possibility that one student’s notion of “good” learning might
not be the same as another student's or, for that matter the same as an instructor's\textsuperscript{2}. From the beginning of this study this consideration has become my personal contribution and point of view in understanding what it means to learn to teach.

\textsuperscript{2} Thank you to Professor Acker for her comments on considering teacher educator's understandings of learning to teach.
CHAPTER THREE
SNAPSHOTS OF LEARNING TO TEACH

Teacher education programs, whatever their focus, will inevitably undergo changes from the point of formally stating goals and purposes to the enactment of the program in university and school classrooms... (Zeichner, Liston, Mahlios and Gomez, 1988: 350)

Introduction

I have argued that by relying on traditional paradigms of effectiveness, many descriptions of teacher education construct negative images of faculties of education. Wideen and Fullan (1983b), for example, maintain that current programs are unhealthy and in need of reform in order to make faculties “worthy of the responsibility for preparing those who teach the young” (43). Working with traditional notions of organizational effectiveness, this discourse on teacher education emphasizes the necessity of coherent programs, measurable goals and outcomes, top-down models of control, and the need for common understandings of the appropriate skills, dispositions, and knowledge base of teacher education.

As discussed in Chapter One, metaphors of order and efficiency pervade in the traditional discourse on effectiveness. In presenting images around these metaphors, researchers tend to look exclusively at organizational level phenomena but entirely ignore middle level features such as courses within programs. In addition, they are rarely concerned with diversity among the people who teach and learn in faculties of education. A third limitation emerges from researchers' tendency to overlook how time and space influence the contexts of each program. By presenting a generalized view of teacher education programs, effectiveness research obscures the day-to-day events that take
education programs, effectiveness research obscures the day-to-day events that take place within the particular environments of local faculties of education.

In this chapter I attempt to work beyond the traditional frameworks of effectiveness research to add to the growing number of studies (e.g. Martin, 1990) which focus on a qualitative understanding of the settings, participants, content, and programmatic contexts of faculties of education in Canada. To support this aim, I have followed Feiman-Nemser's (1990) framework to organize descriptive accounts of teacher education in the particular contexts of the three Curriculum and Instruction courses. Feiman-Nemser (1990) suggests that an understanding of teacher education programs is best achieved through attention to the numerous features which contribute to their organization:

Like any teaching situation, the preparation of teachers involves the interaction of four elements - teacher, student, subject matter, and milieu. A comprehensive programmatic framework would attend to each common place stipulating the roles of teacher educators and teacher/learners and the nature of the content and contexts for learning to teach. (12)

Organized around five key themes, the following “snapshots” of learning to teach at Northview, Valleyfield, and Bellhampton attempt to capture the interaction of these “four elements” in the day-to-day events that took place during my visits, as an observer, to each setting.

This chapter provides for an understanding of the programmatic contexts within which the dynamics of learning to teach were experienced by each of the participants, who will be introduced in Chapters Four and Five. Section one outlines the general features of larger pre-service teacher education programs at Northview, Valleyfield, and
Bellhampton. Section two documents the official objectives of the three courses which resulted from a review of course syllabi given to me on my first visit to each setting. Taken together, the programmatic features and the range of course objectives provide a general context for a review of the diversity of classroom events discussed in later sections. Classroom events are contextualized further in section three through a description of the ways that time and space impacted on the dynamics of each setting.

In section four, the teacher educators and teacher candidates whom I met during my visits to each site are introduced. In addition to highlighting the unique characteristics of both educators and candidates, I describe the vast range of roles and activities that I observed each group participating in. Organized around the two sub-themes of “It All Depends on the Professor” and “A Considerable Amount of Groupwork”, these sections aim to uncover a possible set of images for understanding how learning to teach gets played out in university classrooms. Also integrated into these sections are references to the nature of the content taken up during class meetings. While content is not discussed in detail, references to the wide range of topics and activities that I observed indicate the breadth of skills, knowledge, and strategies that candidates encountered in their experiences of learning to teach.

The “snapshots” of learning to teach that are presented in this chapter are the result of my limited access to the full range of dynamics that took place during class meetings. Thus, while my findings indicate a diversity of roles, activities, and conceptual orientations, they do not include an evaluation of the efficacy of the events observed (Howey and Zimpher, 1989). In place of evaluative categories, data have been organized
to present what Denzin (1983) refers to as "the bare outlines of lived experience" (141) in the classroom. The aim of this chapter is not to evaluate the features of each course within the framework of program coherence. Instead, the data are organized to support the possibility that teacher education programs are characterized by a diversity of perspectives and practices, a variety of constraints and opportunities, and a combination of both innovative and more traditional features (Fullan, Connelly and Watson, 1990; Thiessen and Kilcher, 1993; Zeichner, Liston, Mahlhos and Gomez, 1988). In contrast to the image of teacher education programs as "unhealthy", my terms as an observer uncovered the details of three settings that were, from my perspective, characterized by an exciting pace of events within which teacher educators and teacher candidates negotiated an understanding of both the contexts and concepts involved in their unique experiences of learning to teach.

**The Programs: Organizing "Effective" Teacher Education**

As noted by Fullan, Connelly and Watson (1990) all pre-service teacher education programs in Ontario "...include the foundations courses and practicum as outlined in Regulation 269, Section 1, (k) and (l)" of the Ontario Education Act (22). Sections (b) to (e) also require programs to include:

- the study of teaching methods designed to meet the individual needs of pupils,
- the acts and regulations respecting education,
- a review of Ministry curriculum, and
- at least 40 days of practical experience (in schools).

(The Royal Commission on Learning, 1995: 14)

In addition to these requirements, the organization of programs may take on numerous configurations in organizing the delivery of additional subject matter related courses. For
instance, all three of the programs described in this report offered students courses which focused on mathematics and language instruction. Candidates also participated in non-subject specific Curriculum and Instruction courses where topics such as planning and evaluation were covered. Similar courses were offered to teacher candidates through the three programs; however the relationship between courses in the overall organization of the programs varied.

The programs at Bellhampton and Valleyfield took on similar configurations in their organization given that they were offered, respectively, at the main and satellite campus of the same university. Each program was administered through an independent faculty of education office but was also part of a larger pre-service teacher education program. In both settings, teacher candidates were in the third year of a three year concurrent program. As concurrent education students, teacher candidates were expected to maintain full-time standing in five courses with three courses in the Faculty of Arts, Science or Fine Arts and two courses in the Faculty of Education. Thus, candidates balanced their work in other faculties with a full-year Curriculum and Instruction course, a half course in the Foundations of Education in Ontario and a half course in educational psychology.

At Northview, students were enrolled full-time in a one year teacher education program and had attained their undergraduate degrees prior to commencing studies for their Bachelor of Education degree. In this context, a Curriculum and Instruction course was offered in conjunction with subject matter courses such as mathematics and language arts, foundations and models of education courses, a school law seminar and an
educational psychology course. In contrast to Valleyfield and Bellhampton, where candidates attended two three-hour faculty of education classes each week, teacher candidates at Northview typically attended courses for three to four full days (8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.) a week.

In addition to university-based course work, teacher candidates in the three programs generally spent one day a week involved in practice teaching. For each practice teaching day teacher candidates were expected to fully plan and implement all activities in the classroom. In addition they were encouraged to establish a system for evaluating pupils' work in planned activities as well as reflecting on their own practices. Practice teaching days were accompanied by either a series of two week blocks throughout the year or a four week block at the end of the year. Each of the programs was also concerned with providing stronger connections between university and school based learning. At Bellhampton, teacher candidates attended school-based seminars where teachers at their practice teaching schools shared information on topics such as planning for special needs students. During my observations at Valleyfield, teacher candidates also discussed a field trip to a school where teachers were working to perfect an arts-based integrated curriculum. At Northview, practice teaching experiences were augmented by additional school-based days, where candidates were provided with opportunities to observe and work with associate teachers and then to gradually take on more responsibilities in the classroom over the course of the term.

In addition to the above differences in the organization of the programs it is also important to note that the candidates whom I observed at Northview were enrolled in a
program offered to candidates for certification at the junior-intermediate level (grades four to nine), while at Bellhampton and Valleyfield candidates were enrolled in courses at the primary-junior level (kindergarten to grade six). Given this distinction, it was interesting to observe that the nature of the Curriculum and Instruction courses, while periodically speaking to different grade levels, tended, from my perspective, to focus on non-age specific notions of pedagogy which candidates could use to apply to a broad range of contexts. For instance, students at Bellhampton were asked to discuss and outline their personal philosophies of education as they would apply them to their first classroom regardless of grade. In another context at Northview, students undertook a broad-based investigation of various school board curriculum guidelines on social studies - these guidelines covered social studies curricula from kindergarten to grade nine. A focus on different grade levels did result in occasional discussions of the specific differences of teaching pupils in grade one compared to pupils in grade nine. I assumed that further study of the social, emotional, and physical needs of different age groups was also likely to be taken up in courses such as educational psychology or in the context of subject-specific courses such as mathematics in the junior/intermediate grades. Thus, while the courses were directed toward different levels of certification, I also found a number of commonalities in that each focused on the discussion of a wide range of topics within the general guidelines of learning about curriculum, planning, evaluation and instruction.

**The Courses: Planning for “Effective” Teacher Education**

One of the key documents that I collected in each setting was a copy of the course outline that had been distributed to teacher candidates at the beginning of the year. The
value of these outlines in relation to the context of learning to teach in each Faculty is located in their potential to illuminate how the teacher educators may have envisioned the framework of their courses prior to implementation. It is important, however, to recognize that:

Teacher education programs, whatever their focus, will inevitably undergo changes from the point of formally stating goals and purposes to the enactment of the program in university and school classrooms, ... (Zeichner, Liston, Mahlios and Gomez, 1988: 350)

Thus, the following review of the stated objectives for the three courses is presented as a heuristic device for gaining an initial sense of the foci informing each of the courses. For the purpose of honoring guarantees of anonymity, the particular statements of each outline have been organized, in the main, into common key themes.

In the opening statements of all three course outlines, course instructors defined their visions for “Quality Teacher Education”. At Northview, quality was promoted as being achieved best through a focus on “team work and collaboration”, while at Bellhampton and Valleyfield emphasis was placed on “quality” learning through the development of an understanding of teaching as “a highly personal craft”. Beyond these distinctions, all three course outlines were organized around similar goals or objectives that were promoted toward the realization of “successful teaching”. In the more general image of “success”, each outline emphasized both personal development and collaborative learning. In this case the distinctions which characterized initial statements of course foci become quite ambiguous.

As an overriding theme, course outlines communicate notions of learning to teach
as a process of personal and professional growth where an integration of theory, knowledge, skills and key attitudes contributes to the development of personal philosophies of successful learning and teaching. Within this general framework, eight related aims are introduced in terms of the key characteristics that teacher candidates will be encouraged to develop through their work in the courses. The images of “successful” teaching are as follows:

Teachers
- are reflective practitioners,
- employ inquiry approaches and action research,
- see themselves as life long learners,
- have a strong understanding of curriculum and ministry guidelines,
- can work with the diverse personal needs of all students,
- model and practice cooperative learning in the classroom,
- value team-work and collaboration in their professional development,
- work toward becoming change agents in classrooms and schools.

Because they were written up as formal course objectives, the images conveyed through course outlines appeared to be quite rigid. Like the bulk of traditional images which surround teacher education, they indicate measurable sets of knowledge, skills and dispositions to be taken on by teacher candidates. Observed in action, however, the specified outcomes of each course were implemented in unique ways as they became part of teaching and learning encounters. As illustrated in the remaining sections of this chapter, the Curriculum and Instruction courses at Bellhampton, Northview and Valleyfield provide vivid examples of how the formal objectives of any course will be mediated by factors such as time, space, and the dynamics that arise when the unique characteristics of teacher educators and teacher candidates are brought together in the classroom context.
The Settings: Images of Time and Space

In addition to formal guidelines set out by the organization of a program or the stated objectives of a course, courses are shaped by both time and space. As discussed by Ball (1987) for instance:

...in all educational establishments time is a complex, often overbearing, and frequently referred to fact of life. (163)

Furthermore, the physical setting will influence the ways in which different “social actors” conduct themselves. Classroom actions and interactions, for instance, will be significantly different from possible interactions in the staffroom or student lounge because of the norms or conventions that are typically associated with each space (Ball, 1987:162). In the context of the current study, it may be suggested that the work of teacher educators and teacher candidates at each site was characterized by particular classroom contexts marked by time and space. In other words, time and space shaped the ways that individual actors within the settings negotiated the “formal” or “official” objectives of each Curriculum and Instruction course. It is my finding that space provided less of a challenge to classroom events and dynamics than did time. This, however, may be the result of the fact that I was able to experience space beyond the boundaries of the classroom while time was intimately tied to the degree to which I could understand the nature of the courses through my own perspective as an observer.

The designated classroom setting for each of the courses was located in the larger setting of three university campuses. At Bellhampton and Northview, a specific area had been marked as “The Faculty of Education” while at Valleyfield the course took place in a classroom that was at a significant distance from the Education Office, and shared with
courses in the Faculty of Arts and Science. Like most of the university classrooms that I had experienced as a student, none of the rooms showed any signs of being used specifically for teacher education courses. Except for one classroom where a poster advertising a workshop on fairytales for faculty of education students was posted, the walls were bare. Desks, chairs and equipment such as overhead projectors were the only permanent features of the classrooms. As such, it was difficult to determine the type of activities that might take place in the classroom based on the physical features alone.

Posters and notices issued for teacher candidates were reserved for halls and stairways surrounding each faculty of education. Posted items included everything from student-planned social gatherings, extra-curricular professional activities and official notices such as timetables and teaching placement lists. Bulletin boards provided rich sources of information on conferences, jobs, teaching resources available through educational publishing companies, and notices for further studies posted by graduate schools. Exploring the environment outside of the formally assigned classroom provided a rich source of information concerning other events that took place around those that I actually observed. The fact, however, that no one else stopped to read the postings indicated to me that the "real" action might be taking place in the classroom.

In most cases the classroom designated for the three courses seemed an obvious choice - the number of students appeared to determine the size of the classroom. At Bellhampton, however, where one hundred and twenty students were involved, the logistics of space was a constant problem. Typically this class was split into two groups of eighty and forty, but on a number of occasions the whole group worked together using
only half of the large room. This meant that everyone had to crowd into a space designed for approximately fifty people. On other occasions the whole room was used; at such times candidates had enough space but complained of not being able to see or hear what was going on at the front of the classroom. In general, none of the three classrooms seemed to lend themselves well to the types of activities that took place. For instance, group activities were conducted in a lecture style classroom at Northview, a class discussion took place at Bellhampton in a room furnished with round tables where half of the class had to turn their chairs around to face the facilitator, and at Valleyfield a class on dance was facilitated in a space where movement meant constantly bumping into chairs and tables or other students. Despite these constraints, I noted on numerous occasions that both students and instructors actively and willingly modified the space to meet their needs. Apart from one occasion when a group of students voiced their frustration with constantly having to move desks and chairs, there were very few complaints concerning the general features of the classrooms or their physical set-up.

Time appeared to take on greater meaning than space for both students and instructors. Each class lasted an average of two and a half hours and was scheduled to meet once a week. While candidates at Bellhampton met for class in the morning, classes at Valleyfield and Northview met in the afternoon and many students came to class after only a fifteen minute lunch break following their morning class. Each class was officially scheduled to meet within these time frames. As a result of a variety of circumstances, however, two of the three courses underwent numerous schedule changes as the term neared its end in March. Candidates requested more time to work on large group
assignments in class, a class was canceled to facilitate students' participation at a
conference, a school-based day was rescheduled to accommodate a special guest speaker,
and on a number of occasions scheduled topics were moved to another day because
students requested more information on a topic that had been introduced in previous
classes.

While time appeared in many cases to be flexible to these unanticipated events, I
noticed time was a recurring theme for both teacher educators and teacher candidates.
During my visits at each site, I constantly encountered participants' concerns that there
was not enough time to get everything done. Candidates at Bellhampton and Valleyfield
questioned whether everything could be done in three years, while those in the
consecutive program at Northview asked whether they could learn to teach in a year.
Teacher candidates felt that they did not have enough time to finish their assignments
while instructors spoke of a lack of classroom time to complete the lessons that they had
planned to deliver. On a number of occasions I observed instructors interacting with
students to see if they needed more time to discuss or work with a new concept. If
candidates indicated that they did need more time, instructors attempted to modify the
day's agenda to extend an activity so that students could finish their discussion or
activity and most importantly (as expressed by instructors) to allow candidates' the time
to share all of their ideas with other students. Canceling or limiting a coffee break was a
strategy commonly used by instructors to make more time.

A second time related issue in each setting may have been connected to the fact
that my observations occurred during the last few weeks of class. During my visits I
witnessed a growing sense of anxiety generated by a sense that time was running out. Candidates strongly expressed an awareness that they still had many unanswered questions that they wanted answered before the course came to a close. In turn, teacher educators indicated that they wanted to provide time for candidates to investigate their questions but that they were also restricted by their own (and Ministry) guidelines for covering topics that had to be taken up in the remaining weeks of the course. In one instance an instructor whom I spoke with informally suggested that the anxiety experienced by teacher candidates around time was a result of their “survival mentality”. In his opinion the immediacy of surviving in the classroom led candidates to expect that they would learn everything that they needed to know to become first year teachers. When I measured the validity of this interpretation through informal discussions with teacher candidates, I received two types of responses. One response indicated that candidates viewed the process of learning to teach as a time to ask questions and look for the answers. Therefore, it was not that they expected the program to provide all of the answers but that they at least wanted time to discuss their questions. A second line of response was to confirm a sense that for the moment they were trying to survive by looking for specific information. Candidates noted that if they could “survive” they would take the time, after the program ended, to reflect on everything that they had learned and to look further for answers to their outstanding questions.

**Enacting “Effective” Teacher Education**

**“It All Depends on the Professor”**

As illustrated in Chapter One, the work of teacher educators is surrounded by a
discourse which questions their abilities to teach effectively, to reach consensus on the
goals of teacher education, to overcome the individualistic and competitive cultures in
faculties of education, to work against the pragmatism of teacher candidates, and to
communicate the essential knowledge and attitudes of effective teaching. Within this
framework, it is presumed that teacher educators' sole purpose is to have a strong and
direct impact on teacher candidates and to ensure that all new teachers enter the field
with the same stock of knowledge and skills. This limited perspective obscures the
myriad ways in which teacher educators carry out their work both inside and outside of
the classroom. Data collected through this study stands in strong contrast to the
traditional images of teacher educators' work. During the short period of time that I
spent observing in the three classrooms, I was frequently aware of the rate at which the
instructors took up a variety of roles in their encounters with both students and their
colleagues.

The four teacher educators that I came to know through my visits to each setting
came from a diverse set of professional positions in the field. At Bellhampton, Paula came
to her role as a course instructor from a position as a school board administrator; Karen
had worked in a similar position but had taken leave to complete two years of graduate
studies prior to joining the faculty. Before taking on his role as a teacher educator at
Northview, Jeff had worked as a classroom teacher and a coordinator for a special
education program at a local school. Janice had spent many years teaching at the
primary and junior levels before she left to pursue her work as an author of teacher
resource books; for a number of years she had also worked in the field of in-service
teacher education. As discussed previously in Chapter Two, three of the four instructors were on secondment from their respective school boards for two to three year terms and the fourth had a part-time contract. Where Paula, Karen, Jeff and Janice defined their current positions as instructors in Curriculum and Instruction courses in unique ways, they also shared a number of common roles. From my perspective as an observer, I noted the extent to which Paula, Jeff, Karen and Janice incorporated a diverse set of administrative and instructional responsibilities into their roles as teacher educators.

Teacher educators in all three courses facilitated information-sharing on set and emergent curriculum themes through lectures, group activities, hand-outs, class discussions, reviews of school board and ministry curriculum documents, the analysis of case studies, advisory or study group meetings, individualized and large or small group assignments, and activities designed for students to connect learning in the university context with practice in the field. My observations went beyond Howey and Zimpher's (1989) finding that a “considerable diversity in instruction” is characteristic of most faculties of education:

While the lecture/discussion format understandably remains a staple of instruction, the faculty and students whom we observed were involved in a range of other activities as well, including peer and micro teaching, engaging students in systematic observations and recordings in schools, involving them in diagnoses and studies of pupils and completing research reports.(264)

Each two and a half hour session that I observed in each of the three courses was notable for the movement between different methods of teaching that incorporated a diverse set of opportunities for learning.
In their teaching encounters, instructors worked with students as a group, interacted with small groups, and occasionally worked one-to-one with a candidate. Through the various types of instruction described above instructors discussed a wide range of topics such as dance, children’s literature, art, science, programming for special needs students, strategies for teaching reading and writing, phonics, classroom management, and learning models for social studies. In addition, instructors shared ideas for resources, discussed recent events connected to Ontario’s new Common Curriculum (1994) and The Royal Commission Report (1995), and discussed the job market for new teachers. On a number of occasions instructors took on a disciplinarian role and informed candidates, for instance, that their attendance at class meetings was mandatory and not optional. In each case the instructor described how time was limited and therefore it was imperative that candidates attend every class. Finally, instructors acted as role models in demonstrating theories of cooperative learning, whole-language strategies, and student-centered teaching.

In the classroom all four instructors were actively involved in soliciting feedback from students and providing a clear context for the elements of each class meeting. It was common to hear instructors asking students if they understood an idea or offering to meet with students after class if they had any outstanding questions. The role of clarifying expectations around course assignments was also key in all three classes. The rationales, marking schemes and details of what to include in assignments commonly occupied what I labeled the “housekeeping” section of classes, typically taking place at the beginning of the class. During this time instructors also made announcements and
discussed any changes in the course schedules.

In addition to their roles in the classroom Paula, Karen, Jeff and Janice described a number of other professional commitments such as research or writing curriculum-related books, connections to the field in terms of working to develop new programs, or participation in in-service programs. All four instructors also spoke informally of staff meetings: faculty meetings, program team meetings, course team meetings, and other meetings to facilitate events such as workshops or seminars. At one time or another reference was made to their research interests and/or work in establishing school-university partnerships. When I first began my research I also noticed numerous conversations about work on admissions committees where instructors were involved in reviewing written applications or taking part in an interviewing process for potential candidates. Finally, all instructors spoke to some degree of their contact with practice teaching placement schools in the capacity of practicing “public relations” to maintain positive contacts with the schools or visiting schools to observe and evaluate candidates’ work in the classroom.

Based solely on five visits to each classroom, this description clearly illustrates that the teacher educators’ work is characterized by numerous roles both in and outside of the classroom: instructors manage, negotiate, clarify, encourage, inform, interact, offer assistance, model and offer opportunities for candidates to learn in a number of contexts. While instructors were occasionally involved in direct instruction at the front of the classroom, this strategy remained the exception rather than the rule. The work of the four teacher educators, as it was played out in the classroom, was dynamic and stood in
sharp contrast to the one-way transmission of learning from professors to students that is frequently suggested in the traditional discourse on effective teacher education.

"A Considerable Amount of Groupwork"

Like the varied professional experiences that teacher educators had before becoming faculty members in their respective programs, the teacher candidates whom I met in each course had entered teacher education with a wide range of prior experiences. In the course of my fieldwork I met students who had completed, or were in the process of completing, undergraduate degrees in sociology, archeology, philosophy, commerce, and physical education. I met one student with a masters degree in statistics and another who had his masters in mathematics. Many of the candidates had prior work experience in nursing, social work, computer technology and what one candidate referred to as "domestic science". Through informal conversations, teacher candidates frequently spoke of the struggles they were facing in trying to balance full-time school with family responsibilities or a desire to "spend more time" with their kids. Finally, many candidates discussed how the cost of attending school full-time meant that they had to juggle school with a part-time job. I gained a sense that while teacher candidates had anticipated a heavy workload, many were "burning the candle at both ends" as the term neared its completion in March.

As an observer, I spent most of my time in the three classrooms sitting with teacher candidates. From this position I watched as students interacted before, during and after the scheduled class times. I noticed how teacher candidates integrated their social and academic interests together in their relationships both during and after class.
In some cases candidates met specifically to discuss group projects and worked together to arrange a meeting time or to outline the division of tasks for a group project. At other times conversations were less formal and schoolwork or practice teaching experiences were the topics of social conversations. On one occasion, for instance, I listened as two candidates “compared notes” on their experiences of working with the same associate teacher during their practice teaching placements. Finally, candidates found time to tell jokes, arrange to meet for lunch or coffee, to discuss personal events, and to organize social gatherings. During an animated conversation about country music and line dancing I was invited to join a group of candidates on their weekly Friday night outing to a line dancing club. In all three classrooms the interactions between candidates appeared to be quite fluid despite the set pattern of seating arrangements. As I sat and watched the activities going on around me I noted that while candidates tended to sit in the same location they also moved around the room to share resources with each other, discuss issues that they had encountered with a professor or during practice teaching assignment, to request or offer assistance on an assignment, or to ask for an opinion on an activity that they had planned for their practice teaching day.

During class time, candidates took on many different roles. They listened and/or took notes during lectures and participated in the host of activities and discussions facilitated by course instructors. In many cases I noted how candidates were very active in asking questions or offering ideas during segments of the class when instructors were discussing a topic or issue. While course instructors set the general agenda, there were also many opportunities for candidates to contribute to learning encounters within the
classroom. In various contexts such as study groups or small group projects, students were able to identify and develop their own interests. The impact of students' ideas on the formal objectives of the course was quite significant, as candidates introduced a wide variety of topics such as:

A) Strategies for
   - Enhancing Student Awareness of Ecosystems,
   - Incorporating Canadian Historical Fiction into a Unit,
   - Developing Classroom Management Strategies,
   - Introducing Humour as a Unit Theme,
   - Developing a Diverse Approach to Art in the Classroom,
   - Modifying Anglophone Curriculum for French-Immersion Classrooms,
   - Teaching Vocal Music,
   - Integrating Computers into the Classroom.

B) Theoretical and Practical Considerations in areas of
   - English as a Second Language Instruction,
   - Media Literacy,
   - Sex Fair Teaching,
   - Conflict Resolution in the School Yard,
   - Team-Teaching Schools,
   - Multi-Age Classrooms,
   - Computer Literacy,
   - Establishing Learning Connections between Home and School.

When added to the range of topics introduced by course instructors, the contributions made by teacher candidates made for a very dynamic learning environment. In all, learning to teach as it was acted out in the context of the three Curriculum and Instruction courses was characterized by the dynamic interaction of theories, skills, and forms of knowledge from which candidates within each context could draw on in their "personal and professional development" as "successful teachers".

While I observed teacher candidates interacting in a variety of learning contexts, it was difficult to overlook how often the theme of groupwork appeared in my notes as I
recorded the day-to-day events that took place in the classrooms. On my first visit to Valleyfield a teacher candidate turned to me and said, “as a whole we spend a considerable amount of time on groupwork”. Over the course of the following two months I came to understand the meaning of this comment. Even in one course where a student noted that the instructor “lectured” too much, I had many notes referring to group activities and group presentations. Students typically worked in groups of four to six people, but in one case groups of twenty-five students were formed to create three class handbooks on classroom management. Groupwork tended to emerge in two contexts. In one form, students were assigned to groups to work on activities with a set objective and in a second, groups were organized to discuss an open-ended question. In groups structured by set objectives, candidates studied unit plans to identify points for integration, worked together to use a number of basic dance steps to create a group dance, and brainstormed ideas on the challenges of supply teaching. Open-ended contexts allowed for candidates to discuss their opinions of school board curriculum guidelines, to work together in sharing ideas for unit plans, and to investigate program planning or their personal philosophies of education. Other open-ended contexts involved numerous opportunities for students to meet to identify issues that were of importance for them in the context of small groups.

Groupwork appeared to provide time for students to actively discuss and/or try out different theories and strategies that were presented in class. Instructors described the purposes of groupwork, depending on the context, as opportunities to share ideas, to verify, apply, create, respond, evaluate, question, critique, or plan. Despite the rationale
discussed by instructors, however, candidates seemed to have mixed feelings about their experiences in these contexts. On the one hand, candidates valued opportunities to work and share ideas with others in groups. At the same time, some candidates found groupwork overly time consuming given the variety of perspectives, learning styles and expectations for or interpretations of an activity or assignment. Despite these struggles, candidates in all three courses appreciated the opportunity to experience groupwork in the university classroom since they felt it would be beneficial for working with both students and colleagues in the schools. As an observer, I noted that while groupwork seemed to engender numerous frustrations, it also provided a context within which candidates could interact with ideas and integrate academic, social, professional and personal perspectives.

**Conclusions**

The above "snapshots" of teaching and learning in the context of Curriculum and Instruction courses illustrate the variety of roles, activities, and conceptual orientations that were played out in the classrooms during my visits. The data also capture the wide range of instructional contexts that both groups participated in to investigate a variety of topics. Finally, descriptions of the programmatic context of the courses indicated how features such as time, space, class size, the length of programs, and program organization shaped the day-to-day events in all three settings. While data were organized mainly into common themes, some notable differences - such as the length of programs, areas of certification, class sizes, and general program foci - were also discussed.
The data presented in this chapter illuminate the dynamic nature of learning to teach in the context of three university classrooms. As suggested in my introductory statements, these dynamics cannot be captured through the frameworks provided by the paradigms of effectiveness research. The traditional discourse does not, for instance, acknowledge the ways that teacher educators actively negotiate their roles in the classroom by soliciting feedback from teacher candidates. Similarly, it also neglects to recognize the rich and extensive contributions that teacher candidates make to classroom events. In recording the activities and interactions between educators and candidates in each setting, I became keenly aware that the dynamics of learning to teach are much more complex than the simple implementation of pre-set objectives. In classrooms with one hundred and twenty, ninety-five or thirty teacher candidates, I sat and watched the ebb and flow of activities as the elements of time, space, content and individual actions interacted to create an exciting array of events from which my understanding of the process of learning to teach might be gathered.

In this chapter I have discussed the contexts of learning to teach at Bellhampton, Valleyfield and Northview. The following chapters present data collected through interviews with teacher educators and teacher candidates involved in the day-to-day events within the settings described above. These narratives emphasize how each educator and candidate has interpreted these and other events in their experiences of learning to teach. The narratives of four teacher educators and seven teacher candidates further illuminate how the dynamics of a setting can be understood and evaluated in many different ways as individuals articulate what it means to teach and learn and to negotiate their own definitions of effective teacher education.
CHAPTER FOUR
THE EDUCATORS

Different orientations and approaches exist because people hold different expectations for schools and teachers and because, in any complex human endeavor, there are always more goals to strive for than one can achieve at any one time. (Feiman-Nemser, 1990:12)

Introduction

In Chapter One, images of teacher educators' work as they are presented through the traditional discourse on effectiveness were discussed. This review illustrated that opinions about teacher educators' capabilities to facilitate effective programs are overwhelmingly negative. Teacher educators' self-interest, their lack of professional development in areas such as innovative instruction, their unwillingness to work collaboratively, and their inability to challenge the pragmatic perspectives of teacher candidates are consistently presented as barriers to the development of effective programs. The traditional discourse asserts that teacher educators have played a pivotal role in obstructing the implementation of official agendas for change in faculties of education, and therefore, in schools.

In her analysis of the differences between researchers' and teachers' perspectives on "the role of unions in teachers' professional lives", Bascia (1994) indicates that scholarly paradigms have tended to overlook the importance of local district and school-based contexts in teachers' evaluations of union participation (2). Similarly, I found that researchers' tendency to rely on narrow images of organizational effectiveness in teacher education frustrates attempts to understand how meanings of effectiveness emerge in the
context of local faculties of education. From the images of effectiveness in teacher education presented in Chapter One, it is difficult to infer how teacher educators themselves might understand their work in faculties of education. The recurring focus on system wide features of effectiveness obscures the possibilities that teacher educators will:

...personalize structures by bringing their own unique biographies and interpretive practices to bear on the task, event or interaction at hand. (Denzin, 1983:141)

Further, in working exclusively from a mechanistic standpoint, scholarly accounts deny the reality that the work of teacher educators is more complicated than the simple implementation of deliberately set goals. The absence of teacher educators' perspectives in traditional paradigms of effectiveness in teacher education obscures the degree to which setting-specific and personal understandings might impact on everyday meanings and practices within the field.

By presenting everyday understandings of teacher education from the viewpoints of four teacher educators, this chapter illustrates the powerful influence that setting-specific and personal perspectives can have on definitions of effective teacher education. The presentation of data gathered through open-ended interviews indicates the degree to which teacher educators' work is shaped by their professional backgrounds, practices, visions, and classroom experiences in both school and university settings. In numerous cases, the data also indicate the influence that external notions of effectiveness have on each educator's attempt to describe their work, to articulate their interpretations of the current "issues" in teacher education, and to describe their visions for positive change.
In the sections to follow I frequently refer to Paula, Jeff, Karen and Janice as teacher educators. In and of itself, this is an appropriate term and yet, as seconees on one to three year contracts, this particular group of educators represent a subset of teacher educators. In reading the following narratives, therefore, it is important to keep in mind that the data reflect the experiences and visions of educators that are relatively new to their careers as teacher educators and have just recently left positions in other educational settings. As highlighted throughout the chapter, each educator often draws on her/his practical experiences in the field as a frame of reference for describing their current positions in faculties of education. This orientation is likely to be different from, for example, the theoretical or academic orientations that may influence tenured or tenure-track educators' perspectives. Given their non-permanent status it may also be suggested that the four educators interviewed are likely to experience their work differently than tenure or tenure-track educators who work with an added set of expectations surrounding scholarship and committee work (Ducharme, 1993; Gideonse, 1989).

While not organized intentionally to present the viewpoints of seconees, the emphasis toward this particular group introduces some depth of insight into a particular set of orientations in teacher education. The four narratives offer an opportunity to understand the unique perspectives of educators who are in a process of discovering what it means to teach in the context of university-based teacher education programs while also maintaining connections with their various positions in the “field”. The collected images described in this chapter allow for a preliminary glimpse of the dynamics involved
in the dual roles of both teaching and learning within the contexts of three Curriculum and Instruction courses. Images also indicate how on-going attempts to understand and enable meaningful teacher education are based in the dynamic meeting of educators (in whatever capacity) and candidates in classroom environments.

The remainder of this chapter is presented in three sections that are organized around the commonalities and differences of four educators' experiences of the day-to-day dynamics of teacher education. Section one introduces Paula, Jeff, Karen, and Janice through four narratives which describe each educator's background, their interests in joining their respective faculties, the variety of ways they describe and experience their work, and the unique visions of meaningful teacher education each brings to their work. Section two moves to present thematic descriptions of three key issues that impacted on all four educators' attempts to realize their personal definitions of effective teacher education in practice. These descriptions illustrate how Paula, Jeff, Janice, and Karen each worked to negotiate their role in settings characterized by diverse sets of student needs, debates concerning the value of educational theory and practice, and tensions generated by attempts to facilitate connections between the university and school contexts. Contrary to scholarly accounts of similar issues, this section suggests a complex understanding of these so-called "irreversible dilemmas" (Katz and Raths, 1992) by attempting to illustrate how each one is defined differently by each educator and is seen to impact on their work in different ways.

The chapter closes with a summary of ideas surrounding a key theme that emerged in each of the interviews: the salience of both teaching and learning to
educators' work. Given the complexities of their work, the educators discussed how their experiences with students and schools impacted on their personal notions of effective teaching and learning. A sense of "learning from experience" and an openness to change were key features in the educators' description of their work. Taken together, the sections of this chapter strongly suggest that the work of educators, particularly those that are new to the field of teacher education, defies mechanistic definitions by its diversity, complexity, and location in settings characterized by a number of unique understandings of learning, teaching, and learning to teach.

**On Being a Teacher Educator**

**Paula: Breaking down the Boundaries**

Paula came to teacher education from an administrative position at a large school board where she was working to facilitate a new program of school-based change. In her term as an administrator, Paula had little contact with faculties of education unless a student was placed in one of her board's schools. During her ten years of classroom teaching, however, Paula worked with teacher candidates from a variety of faculties of education in southern Ontario:

So I had student teachers even in my first year which I know you shouldn't do but they were assigned to me and I didn't know then that I shouldn't have had them.

At the time of our interview, Paula was completing the second of a three year term as a course director and program coordinator. For Paula this dual role was a source of satisfaction, given that it allowed her to utilize her skills from both her teaching and administrative experiences. She described the interactive nature of teaching as that
which kept her “grounded”. Thus, while she enjoyed the administrative part of her work, she also noted that “it would be important to me to always have a teaching component as part of my role”.

Paula’s interest in becoming a teacher educator had developed over time through professional and social contacts with educators and administrators who worked in faculties of education. While Paula was familiar with, and interested in, teacher education, she had never seriously considered applying for a seconded position with a faculty until Bellhampton posted openings for three year secondee contracts. With encouragement from a co-worker, who insisted that the job would be “perfect” for her, Paula reconsidered her interest in teacher education and applied for the position. From the beginning of her term at Bellhampton, Paula felt that she had a lot to bring to the position. At the same time, she understood her three year term as a learning opportunity:

...I tend to operate sometimes conceptually at a level that separates me from people that I...I have to keep working to get to the grassroots and to make sure that everything is very specific and relevant. So I felt the opportunity to come to the university would be a good one for me because I thought, “this will challenge me”...I find that I gain and learn from each new experience. Plus I felt that the experiences I had already gave me something to offer to teacher candidates...

Paula spoke of her history of working with teachers as the key experience that she had to bring to her role as an educator. She described how this work with teachers who were involved in learning new ways to approach areas such as instruction had become “almost second nature”. In her years of experience in working with teachers, Paula had developed a belief in approaching all learning situations as co-learning contexts where “the sharp
distinction between teacher and learner ought not to be there”. This belief also strongly informed Paula’s work as a teacher educator.

The themes of change, co-learning, and the interaction between conceptual and concrete ideas that Paula brought to her role as a teacher educator strongly informed the ways that she described her work in the Curriculum and Instruction course. When I asked Paula to describe how she felt about her role after two years of experience, for instance, she placed a great deal of value on the teaching component of her work and considered it to be the “real stuff”:

I think because it is interactive, because of the opportunity to watch candidates grow, to help them where you can... I find that whole interaction with people who are in the learning process very exciting and I learn from that too. I am a strong believer in co-learning...We all have to admit that we are learners in some situations and the teachers in other situations.

A key element in Paula’s approach to teaching was centered in her belief that teaching and learning encounters had to be “a mutual benefit thing”. Thus, she spoke of making sure that ideas were presented on a meaningful level so that teacher candidates could understand the personal relevance of each topic.

Paula worked to ensure the mutual value of teaching and learning through four strategies. The first was by talking with students and inviting their feedback to events and topics in the classroom. The second was making sure that each idea presented in the classroom was supported with an example:

...each time I have to work to bring it to the level of practice. You saw me...when they asked about long-range planning and I started talking about developing concepts and I thought “oh, I need to use an example” so they know what I am talking about.
Third, Paula discussed the importance of modeling suggested practices in her own approaches to teaching she described how a number of changes had been made in the structure of the course, because the approach used in previous years had created a situation where course directors “were modeling what we criticize our candidates for doing”. Finally, in addition to informal feedback, Paula spoke of the need for course directors to provide time for students to set their own agenda in the classroom:

...people need an opportunity to talk about what they are doing and how it is going with them and to find out from others, things that might be helpful.

In all I developed a strong sense from Paula that a focus on mutual benefits in the classroom was representative of a belief in mutual respect as a key element of learning and teaching.

One of the key challenges that Paula encountered in her attempts to ensure that classroom events were mutually beneficial was the number of teacher candidates in her class at Bellhampton. Because Paula worked with up to one hundred and twenty candidates, she needed to negotiate between her own definitions of ideal and real practices in the classroom. While her ideal image centered around time for “one to one interaction”, in reality her focus was taken up by the management of the whole group:

...I found that frustrating last week. I think they were having a great time in their groups but I found managing the 100 or 120 - one person to sort of try to manage the groups and make sure all the interactions were effective and stuff and that everybody could see everybody else...I was spending all of my time trying to organize people where I think that there needs to be a more flowing of being there. (emphasis added)

The meeting of one hundred and twenty students in the classroom also meant that it was
difficult for Paula to predict the relevance and impact of her work. She noted that she had to work with the reality that "...because it is such a big group and such a diverse group, what one group doesn't like another group thinks is wonderful". Paula felt that overall the group was very positive in their evaluation of the course but repeated a few times that, because of the wide range of candidates' expectations, "you never know for sure how they will respond". Despite the frustrations resulting from the number of candidates, however, Paula remained true to her beliefs in the ideal of co-learning and the importance of personal relevance.

In addition to asking Paula to describe her work, I asked her to define her understanding of the key goals or elements of a teacher education program. I expressed my assumption that she saw the balance of theory and practice as a key goal. In response, however, she corrected me and offered an alternative vision which highlighted her focus on the connections between teacher education and school-based change:

I don't know if that would be the paradigm that I would use...I think what is important to me is that we turn out as many innovative practitioners as we can. I believe that we need drastic change, that there are wonderful committed people out there and outstanding things happening in schools but we are still way behind the times. (Emphasis added)

Paula spoke strongly of her commitment to "bottom-up" change directed by classroom teachers. Connected to this vision was Paula's sense that in both university and school settings, teachers "need to have meaningful roles in change", and need to be recognized as "knowledge workers, not just robots" that are programmed to implement change from above. Contrary to traditional images which emphasize top-down models for the management of reform in teacher education, Paula spoke of the importance of breaking
down the boundaries between different sectors of the education system in order that opportunities for change could be revealed:

...we all have to work together for school improvement. Whether you are working for a university or a school board, or a school or a classroom you are all working for the same thing and that is to make schools the best places that they can be for the kids.

Paula frequently spoke of eliminating existing boundaries such as the boundary between theory and practice or those established by top-down reform recommendations. From this standpoint, her role as a teacher educator was intimately connected to assisting teacher candidates to become active agents in school-based change where innovative practices grew out of sharing and learning in numerous contexts. In opposition to an image of educators as the "experts", Paula's focus was not on telling candidates what needed to be changed. Instead, she described her role as providing candidates with the tools to identify and effect change in directions that made sense within the context of setting-specific conditions and practices.

Paula supported the notion that educational change could take on many forms depending on local contexts. This focus on diversity also appeared to inform her ideas about teaching. While the traditional discourse on effectiveness suggests that all candidates should graduate with a common set of understandings about teaching, Paula emphasized the value of allowing teacher candidates to see each issue or topic from a number of different perspectives. She also spoke of her sense that teacher educators should provide a lot of options with "just some very basic and clear sense of what the learning has to be". In addition to providing options, Paula discussed the value of
different settings for learning:

I think learning can take place in a lot of places and we have to break down some of those boundaries and identify themes that are important and then find the places where we can learn together about those themes in education.

Finally, she brought the perspective of multiple ways and sites for learning back to the theme of innovative practice, and suggested that the only thing certain about teachers' work was its uncertainty:

...there are so many different ways to learn that I guess we have to prepare our future teachers to be able to cope with change and know that it is going to be a part of everything that they do. But more than just cope with change and that is to manage it. Manage it by learning, by inquiring and by learning more.

In her definitions of teachers' work, Paula qualified her earlier statements by indicating that school-based change resulted when the perspectives of researchers and policymakers were contextualized by the needs of teachers themselves in localized contexts. In her role of assisting candidates to become change agents, therefore, she was attempting to provide candidates with the skills that they might need to negotiate external recommendations with local realities in their future roles as teachers.

Paula's emphasis on breaking down boundaries and opening up multiple options and sites for learning to teach stands in contrast to assertions made by many researchers that effective teacher education can only take place when all teacher education programs adhere to a core curriculum of pre-set goals directed toward unitary images of effective teaching. Paula's beliefs in co-learning also challenged the commonplace belief that teacher educators need to assume the role of "experts" to have a strong and lasting
impact on candidates. Within this framework, Paula envisioned educators and candidates working together to negotiate the meanings of both traditional and innovative educational practices. Finally, while Paula supported researchers’ findings that teacher education programs should support movement toward school reform, she also indicated that pre- and in-service teachers’ ability to deal with change would emerge through the discussion of multiple perspectives. Furthermore, she insisted that change at all levels of the education system must originate with teachers or teacher candidates themselves - not through top-down mandates which construct an image of teachers as “robots”. From her perspective, teacher education was about challenging and empowering new teachers to become active in making “schools the best places that they can be for kids - I think we have to create more possibilities for that to happen...instead of what I would call teaching to the middle, you know, along a program”.

Jeff: Learning Should be Fun

Jeff’s current position as a course instructor and co coordinator of the junior/intermediate program at Northview began after years of contact with faculties of education - as an associate teacher for fifteen years, an in-service course instructor, and an earlier term as a pre-service educator. Of all the experiences, Jeff spoke at length of his experiences as an associate teacher, where he had encountered “varying levels of success with the staff” at faculties of education. In this role he had worked to assert that the relationship between faculty members and classroom teachers should be one of negotiation rather than the imposition of the university’s agenda. He also maintained that the university should provide a greater level of support to classroom teachers who
were doing the university a service in working with teacher candidates. Jeff's experiences as an associate teacher had fueled his interests in becoming a teacher educator. As illustrated throughout his narrative, they also continued to guide his work with teacher candidates and associate teachers in his role as a faculty member with Northview's junior/intermediate program.

Through his efforts to redefine his role as an associate, Jeff had developed stronger ties to staff at Northview and, over time, "they started inviting [him]... to do workshops for teachers in their night school courses". After a number of years, Jeff was invited to be part of the admissions team - an experience which provided an opportunity for him to speak one-on-one with the director of the program about his interest in taking on a larger role at the faculty. This conversation was key to Jeff's entrance into the field of teacher education:

So I guess they figured "well here is an associate who has bought in so let's put him on the team...we sat and talked for about forty-five minutes and I had the job. He said, "I want you on staff" and I was just blown away and thought "well, I will just wait and see what happens."

Due to cutbacks, Jeff's one-year contract with the faculty was not renewed so he returned to classroom teaching. During this time he had moved to a new school board, and just after he had received a promotion as coordinator of a special arts program, he accepted Northview's second offer to return to work as a teacher educator on a two year contract.

From the beginning, Jeff felt that his work as a teacher educator would provide opportunities for both personal and professional development. In our interview he discussed how he had decided to apply for a Doctorate of Education program so that he
could apply for a tenure-track position with the Faculty. In addition to the personal meaning that the position took on for Jeff, he discussed how his past experiences as a classroom teacher and as an associate teacher with Northview’s practice teaching program had provided him with experiences to develop qualities that would enhance his role as a teacher educator. Jeff indicated that he had taken his role as an associate teacher very seriously. He described how he had been very supportive of teacher candidates while also acknowledging that his was a mentoring and evaluative role and therefore he had to “act on” any problems that arose in the classroom. Based on his past experiences, Jeff felt that he had a great deal to offer in terms of his knowledge of teacher education in both the school and university context. In addition, he described himself as a generalist which enabled him to be flexible enough to work in any area of the program:

They knew they could throw any subject at me and I would teach it. That is the other thing, I am one of these generalists so that if it boils down to next year that they want music and phys.ed, I will do it.

Throughout his career as a classroom teacher, Jeff had taken courses in French, guidance and special education. He had also completed his junior specialist and Master’s of Education. At the time of our interview, Jeff had just signed his contract for a second year term with the faculty. He noted that he would probably be working with another team and working with different courses. While he would miss the relationships that he had established with his current team, he was up to the challenge - “...I don’t mind. I would do anything, give me the job and I will do it.”

Jeff spoke of his experiences as a teacher educator in very positive terms:

...it has been a tremendous job. I like it. That is probably why I am here so early and stay so late.
He described his approach as "easy going" and noted that he liked "to use humour a lot in my life and in my classes". It was important for Jeff to feel that he was encouraging a positive climate in the classroom:

...why shouldn't you be able to enjoy learning? That is my whole philosophy, that you should be able to enjoy it.

Jeff also spoke strongly of the need to take the time to negotiate meanings or understandings with students:

...when I speak with the students I will say “can you tell me more about that? Where are you coming from with this idea?” and then I ask them to work back through their thinking.

He indicated that communication with candidates was important to him in his role as an instructor. In order to maintain an on-going sense of rapport he worked to establish relationships with teacher candidates so that he could always “keep in touch”. Jeff used the knowledge he gained from conversations with candidates to make changes to the class schedule in order to clarify or extend activities or to introduce new topics that were not part of the formal agenda but of interest to students. To facilitate the communication process, Jeff had introduced daily response sheets to monitor candidates’ learning and to keep track of any outstanding questions that they had after participating in a discussion or activity. Jeff emphasized that he learned a great deal through reading candidates’ responses. He took pride in recognizing that he read ninety-five response sheets a week as part of his commitment to staying in touch with candidates’ perspectives:

In each one of my classes I read every single one of their responses that they write. So I spend hours doing that. But I think in my own mind that it is probably the most powerful tool - that they get this ongoing dialogue.
Through informal conversations in the classroom and our formal discussion during the interview, Jeff emphasized his belief in teaching through negotiation, where candidates' beliefs and expectations strongly informed his approach to planning for instruction in the classroom.

To enhance relationships with candidates, Jeff drew strongly on his recent experience as a classroom teacher. He used this experience to emphasize his approach to teaching, which he described as the “impact of theory and practice together”. He also described his assumption that his knowledge of the classroom spoke to the level of credibility that he had established with candidates:

I think also, and in no way putting other people down but they listen to what the practitioner has to say if they have been in the field recently. I have just come out of the classroom this year...so they know that this guy has been right there in the front lines.

Jeff also noted that his previous experience as an associate teacher allowed him to provide candidates with a clear sense of their role in the classroom during field placements. Noting that he felt frustrated by candidates' tendency to quantify the amount of time they were to spend teaching in the associate classroom, Jeff worked to promote a sense that it was a matter of personal development and contingent on what the associate teacher felt was best. At numerous times throughout our interview Jeff expressed his belief that the associate teacher was “the boss” and would know what was “best” for candidates in their placements. From his perspective, teaching placements could not be quantified, and the agenda could not be set by the university.

For Jeff, time was a key frustration in his work as a teacher educator. He described how he typically worked from 7:30 a.m. to 4:00 or 5:00 p.m. each day. Despite
this time commitment, Jeff still struggled with a tension between the work required of him in his role as a member of a program team and the tasks connected to the personal goals he had set out for himself as a course instructor. The issue of time was compounded by numbers - a total of ninety-five candidates in the course. Jeff spoke of how his role as a team teacher allowed himself and his colleagues to share the workload and emphasized how this set-up created a situation where he was able to feel more “comfortable” in his role. Jeff also took pride in the fact that even though he was working with large numbers, he managed to approach each group with a unique perspective based on his belief that each group tended to have “a personality of its own” and candidates wanted to become involved in the classroom in different ways. Like Paula’s experiences of her work, Jeff worked to endorse differences within the class and to provide openings for these differences to impact on the nature of classroom content and dynamics - “[it] is interesting, things come out very different and with each group I will express it differently”.

In discussing his experiences, Jeff frequently referred to his strong belief in the enjoyment of both learning and teaching and emphasized that he worked to model this belief in the classroom. At the same time, however, he believed that his style was not for everyone and described how he encouraged candidates to develop their own approaches. This theme emerged again when I asked Jeff to describe some of his thoughts on what the key objectives of a teacher education program might be. Like Paula, Jeff felt that candidates should have opportunities to explore a number of perspectives:

Well I hope they are exposed to a lot of different models because it tells them that there are a lot of successful ways of teaching and that their styles can vary. I think that this is
important. By the same token there can be a lot of
frustration because they are saying “well, what should I be
like?” and that is good too because I don’t want them to be a
copy.

For Jeff, one of the key elements of teacher education was an exposure to new ideas that
candidates could use and adapt to their personal styles. He felt strongly that the
development of individual approaches took time and could be enhanced only through
experience. Jeff believed that it was important for candidates to establish a sense of their
personal beliefs in order for them to learn to evaluate new ideas in terms of whether they
could enable their development as successful teachers.

In addition to defining his personal goals as a teacher educator, Jeff shared his
views concerning the influence of external expectations on his work as an educator at
Northview. Unlike Paula, Jeff felt that external recommendations for reform had a
strong influence on educators’ definition of the goals for their programs or courses. He
noted, for instance, how Ontario’s Royal Commission on Learning (1995) had forced
faculty members to rethink their approach to the definition of goals for the program. In
particular, Jeff described how the issues of recertification and accountability, which had
emerged in the Commission’s report, meant that “as a faculty we are going to have to be
damn sure that all of these people are well prepared”. While we never did discuss the
implications of this statement, Jeff indicated that he had always felt that this was a
legitimate expectation for faculties of education. He also implied, however, that it took on
new meaning when imposed on his work by an external source. Given his belief that
recommendations from Ontario’s Royal Commission Report would result in many
changes to Northview’s program, Jeff sensed that he was no longer “100% sure what the
goal [was] from the perspective of the faculty as a whole. On an individual level, however, he was able to present an image of what his own goals were in interacting with candidates:

...my goal for the students - and I think I am articulating this for all of us - is that we are bringing out well educated educators who can articulate what they are doing, who can also ask good questions of themselves, and grow as learners themselves because teaching is a lifelong learning experience as far as I am concerned...and on top it can take the theory and put it into practice and take the practice and find out the theory of it - the sound basis behind it.

In contrast to Paula, who emphasized candidates’ growth as innovative practitioners, Jeff appeared to organize his goals around assisting candidates to become “accountable” practitioners. In this sense, Jeff indicated that candidates needed to understand teaching as a lifelong learning experience so that they could respond to reform in a knowledgeable manner. From Jeff’s standpoint, the process of “learning to teach” was characterized by both personal and professional growth - two elements which also factored highly into his own narratives of classroom teaching in the school context and his varied experiences as a teacher educator in the university context.

In contrast to the highly mechanistic images supported by the traditional discourse on teacher education, Jeff’s narrative draws attention to the interactive quality of teacher educators’ work. On a personal level, Jeff brought together his past experiences as a classroom teacher, associate teacher, and facilitator of in-service workshops to clarify his current position as a course instructor and coordinator in the program at Northview. In this role, Jeff noted how the interaction between his perspectives as a practitioner in the school setting and an educator in the university
setting was a key element in his work. Further, Jeff drew on the metaphor of negotiation to describe his relationships with teacher candidates. He described his approach to instruction as one in which his own perspectives of effective teacher education were mediated by candidates' perspectives through his attempts to establish open communication. Despite the constraints introduced by time and class size, Jeff remained committed to his belief in a negotiated curriculum in order that all candidates could understand that there are many ways to become a successful teacher. Finally, Jeff's narrative hinted at the ways in which an educator's own goals in working with candidates were defined through the combination of personal visions, understandings that emerge by virtue of being a faculty member, and expectations that are placed on faculties of education by external bodies such as the Ontario Ministry of Education. Like his belief that there are a number of ways to become a successful teacher, Jeff's description of the ways in which his work was informed by a diverse set of interacting elements suggests that there are also numerous ways to realize one's role as a successful teacher educator.

Karen: "You learn, you learn from that"

Like Paula and Jeff, Karen entered the Faculty of Education at Bellhampton from a background as a classroom teacher and educational administrator. Following her experiences of classroom teaching, Karen moved into a consultancy position with a large school board. Karen described her consultancy work as personally fulfilling:

I loved the consultancy, I loved the pace, I loved the stimulation of working with the consultants - the collaboration that went on was just phenomenal.
At the same time, however, Karen identified a sense “that there was going to be a period of time when I needed to invest in myself again”. Thus, she took a leave of absence and entered into graduate work at the Master’s level. Her Master’s completed, Karen contemplated a return to her prior position. Once again, however, she felt that she still needed to do more professional development so that she could “in turn become richer in what I had to offer” to her role as a consultant. Her desire to learn more strongly influenced her decision to pursue her interests in teacher education.

In her early years as a classroom teacher and administrator, Karen’s contact with faculties of education was minimal. In later years, however, she became involved with in-service programs and facilitated a number of workshops at the pre-service level. From these experiences she developed a sense that she “wanted to become more involved” in the field of pre-service teacher education. Like Paula and Jeff, Karen felt that she had a lot to offer to her role as a course instructor. At the same time, she felt that she would gain a great deal for herself on a personal and professional level. On a personal level, her work in the university context provided a setting where Karen felt she could further her learning:

\[
\text{I think it's because the university values learning... Whereas in boards of education, I hate to say this, but continued education at the graduate level is not valued... it's almost not permitted within the boards of education the way they structure and place demands on your time. Whereas in the university it really is valued... It certainly is nurtured, there is no doubt. And that is wonderful.}
\]

In terms of what she had to offer, Karen felt that, with her background as a general curriculum consultant, she had been hired as a “gap filler” to teach a course that involved
an overview of a wide range of curriculum and instruction topics:

The program up until third year is very specific - the models and foundations courses, the language arts, the math - and then this year it is everything else and everything else kind of happens to be my realm of expertise.

Like Jeff, Karen was able to draw on her breadth of knowledge around a wide range of curriculum areas to assist teacher candidates in their understanding of the integrated primary/junior curriculum. She was able to offer her expertise of general teaching strategies and her subject knowledge in areas such as music, physical education, health, social studies and outcome-based learning. She also brought with her a keen sense that her central role as a teacher educator was “to support candidates in whatever role” she took on.

At the time of our interview, Karen was completing the first year of a three year term at Bellhampton. When I asked Karen to describe this first year, she spoke predominantly of her relationships with students. Whether Karen was visiting a school to observe candidates in their practice teaching or instructing in the university classroom, her focus was on creating positive learning environments by attempting to balance her own needs with those expressed by teacher candidates. In this context of co-learning, Karen sensed that it was important for her to be proactive in her interactions with candidates. Throughout the year she had placed a great deal of emphasis on communicating her own expectations clearly as well as working to solicit feedback from students concerning their own expectations. Like Paula and Jeff, however, Karen described how her commitment to communication with teacher candidates was mediated by the limitations of time and the vast number of expectations that emerged in a
classroom of one hundred and twenty candidates:

It seems to have everything to do with what their expectations are and whether their expectations are the same as mine and the same as the university's. I do find some dilemmas there...the university sets a certain understanding of expectations but they are somewhat vague. There is very little paperwork on exactly how, what, and why. This is then interpreted by me in many different ways...I mean for the program - "what must happen here this year?". It is also interpreted by me in terms of time that is available and other responsibilities at the university that take my time... and then the candidates have their own body of expectations largely based on their previous experiences.

A combination of numbers, time, and administrative guidelines for her work meant for Karen that classroom events "don't always work the way you think they are going to". Thus, even though Karen began each class with a set of objectives, she had also come to realize that flexibility was an important aspect of her role in the classroom:

...it is just like teaching a class...with those large numbers when you are doing time management and you are estimating that "this will take twenty minutes and this will take fifteen, it never works that way and you have to make a lot of decisions.

As a result, Karen constantly took stock of the flow of activity in the class through observation and communication with candidates. Through these "monitoring" strategies, Karen was able to make changes right away in the classroom or take mental notes so that changes could be made for future classes.

Karen recognized that candidates entered the classroom with diverse learning styles and would therefore take up different topics and themes in varied ways. She spoke, for instance, of how she had identified collaboration between teacher candidates as a key strategy to be developed through the course. For Karen, candidates' learning around
collaboration at the pre-service level was something she felt that they would use in the "real world" of teaching. In reading candidates' work and observing their activity in the classroom, however, she had realized that there were "many ways that collaboration could take place". In some cases she felt that the value of collaboration had not been taken up by some students. On the other hand, she sensed that a number of candidates were "strong behind the scenes":

When you think about people and whether they collaborate or not it is a very hard thing to determine. Because maybe they are being passive, maybe they are pulling things together but not taking an active role and yet this is still collaborative.

Through our interview I developed a strong sense that Karen was challenged by the number of expectations and approaches to learning in the classroom. A key learning experience for Karen in her first year of working with such a large class, was her "preoccupation" with establishing a balance between her own objectives and the needs of candidates:

...I lose credibility when there is a big discrepancy between what their expectations are and what I deliver...But not having had this experience before I didn't know some of their expectations. To do it another time I would deal with their expectations as I set out my own expectations.

Although Karen appeared to have struggled with this issue throughout the year, she also indicated that it was a positive experience. In other words, it was not a challenge that fell outside of the expectations she had set for herself in defining her key role as being one of "support" for the candidates.

In attempting to balance her own expectations with those of candidates in the
classroom, Karen also discussed how on-going communication with her colleagues at Bellhampton was a central element of her work. Given that the classroom was on occasion quite unpredictable, she noted she spent a great deal of time conferring with the other teacher educators with whom she shared classroom responsibilities. In this sense she felt "very informed" about the direction she felt was necessary to facilitate meaningful teaching and learning encounters. Through conferences with the course team, Karen had worked to personalize learning and to provide different contexts for students to "dialogue" together, as well as time for them to express their own sense of the value of the learning that was taking place. With a note of frustration, however, Karen concluded:

There are certainly many ways that you could increase communication if the numbers were different.(12)

The strength of diversity through numbers was the most prominent theme running throughout Karen's description of her work as a teacher educator. To work with this challenge, Karen drew strongly on her beliefs in learning through experience and her commitment to communication, collaboration, and the process of negotiating expectations. With these strategies, Karen felt that she could establish a sense of balance in the classroom as she interacted with both her colleagues and teacher candidates.

In the course of our interview, Karen noted with satisfaction that she shared many common or "overlapping" visions for education with another educator that she worked closely with in the classroom. I took this opportunity to ask her to describe what some of the common visions entailed in relation to their roles as teacher educators. In response Karen discussed how they had both placed a lot of value on the inquiry process as a tool for teacher development and school improvement. In encouraging candidates to
identify their own areas of interest and then involving them in inquiry-oriented action research, both Karen and her colleague hoped to provide candidates with the tools to discover innovative approaches to school-based change. Connected to a number of other visions that had informed her approach to the course, the inquiry-based learning captured Karen’s belief that candidates needed a space to identify and pursue their own areas of interest, in addition to topics set out in the formal objectives of the course. A second key element of Karen’s approach to instruction involved an emphasis on working to support teacher candidates in becoming “reflective practitioners”. For Karen, it was important that teacher candidates worked to “...think on their practice, that they think about thinking and that they think about learning”. Thirdly, both Karen and her colleague worked to emphasize their belief that candidates needed to “value or begin to value the role of theory in their teaching practice”. Noting that they expected this area to be a “battle” in their work “because candidates tended to tune out when we cover the theoretical aspects of a topic”, Karen described how she hoped that, through their persistence, they had instilled this in candidates. Finally, as discussed above, a significant focus in the course had been on the development of collaborative cultures amongst teacher candidates.

Karen also identified critical thinking as a central theme in her work. With laughter she discussed how she felt that candidates were critical thinkers in the classroom context in terms of evaluating her course. While Karen did not elaborate on this point she did refer to the fact that teacher candidates were quite vocal in discussing their expectations for the course as well as what they expected from her as a course
instructor. In one case, for example, a number of candidates had voiced their frustration that while Karen provided them with written evaluations in their practice teaching reports, she did not provide them with a grade. As noted by Karen, assigning grades for candidates' performance in the classroom was not part of her "mandate", and yet she still had to grapple with candidates' demands that she take on this role. Karen felt that differences between her own and candidates' expectations occasionally created tensions in the classroom. Despite these possible conflicts, she encouraged candidates to share their feedback as part of the communication process, and recognized how this strategy was one way of supporting candidates to become critical thinkers. Karen defined critical thinking skills as one aspect of teacher candidates' development as change agents. In this broader sense, Karen's emphasis on critical thinking was strongly connected to her beliefs that school improvement had to originate from teachers' own perspectives in school-based collaborative action toward change:

...we don't want them to go out and perpetuate that egg carton where everyone is in their little room. If we are truly going to continue to improve education then we have to talk, we have to come out, we have to be with other people.

Like her own perspectives on adapting to new circumstances by conferring with co-workers and candidates, Karen emphasized the value of reflection, analysis, collaboration, and action as key learning points for teacher candidates in their own experiences of learning to teach.

In speaking with Karen I became keenly aware of how her personal notions of effective teacher education were mediated by factors such as time and the diverse number of expectations that she had to work with in teaching a class of one hundred and
twenty teacher candidates. Like Jeff and Paula, Karen placed a great deal of emphasis on communication as a key strategy for negotiating her position as a teacher educator. While Karen spoke of some of the constraints that she had experienced during her first year as an instructor at Bellhampton, she also described the satisfactions that she had enjoyed. Karen's role as a teacher educator provided her with an opportunity to fulfill a personal goal of professional development in areas that extended beyond her position as a school board curriculum consultant. At the same time, however, Karen emphasized how her role as an educator was to support the efforts of teacher candidates in their development as teachers. From this standpoint, Karen drew on her past experiences and personal visions of effective teaching to work with candidates in enhancing their knowledge of a wide range of curriculum areas. She also emphasized her role in encouraging candidates' growth as critical and reflective teachers who valued collaboration as a means toward effecting innovative school-based change.

Running throughout Karen's narrative is a sense that attempts to realize effective teacher education are the result of the ongoing interaction between different elements of the program at Bellhampton. In addition to the different expectations of each educator and candidate, Karen's work was contextualized by time, class size, institutional agendas, the nature of the content, and - to some degree - the fact that this was her first year as a full-time teacher educator in the university setting. With all of these points combined, Karen's narrative illustrates the notion that effective teacher education cannot be achieved through a rigid and hierarchical structure. Instead, Karen's experiences and visions indicate that personal, professional and programmatic effectiveness emerge over
time in the context of a dynamic interplay between people, places, and events.

Janice: “Telling Their Own Stories”

Of my contact with the four teacher educators included in this study, I spent the least amount of time interacting with Janice. Janice was working as a teacher educator at Valleyfield on a part-time basis; she did not have an office on campus and traveled quite a distance to and from work. From the outset of my fieldwork, I had anticipated that our contact would be limited to quick meetings before or after class. Because Janice’s “case” differed from other secondee and tenured/tenure-track faculty, however, I felt that her perspective might contribute further meaning to the practices of teacher education.

Janice balanced her role as teacher educator with a successful career as an author of professional resource books for teachers. Prior to her work as an author, Janice spent many years as a classroom teacher in several school settings, and then branched off into her own career as an author. An exciting aspect of Janice’s career as an author was the opportunities it afforded her to present in-service workshops to teachers. At the end of her first year as a pre-service teacher educator, Janice discussed how surprised she had been in discovering the differences between working in pre-service and in-service settings.

Describing her work in the classroom, Janice emphasized how she strove to “balance theory and hands-on application” through a focus on demonstrations and group-work as key strategies in the classroom. Janice indicated that her role as an educator was strongly informed by attention to “modeling the things teacher candidates could do in the classroom”, such as cooperative learning strategies and methods for implementing
the Common Curriculum. Underlying her demonstrations or modeling was a strong belief in integrated learning with a key focus on literature and language development.

Janice felt that her key role as an educator was to "increase [candidates'] awareness" of different models of teaching so that could "come to grips with learning and teaching". Like Paula, Jeff, and Karen, Janice indicated that awareness could best be achieved by allowing time for candidates to identify the personal relevance of learning through reflection or "telling their own stories as a vehicle for learning". Key to Janice's approach was a belief in the value of engaging candidates in reflections on their current teaching practices as well as their past experiences of learning:

If I taught the course again I would begin by asking students to think of anything that they know how to do. I would have them write about it, share their ideas of how they learned to do it and then relate their own learning style to the theoretical models of learning.

For Janice it was important that teacher candidates understood how their own experiences of learning influenced their approaches to teaching. To facilitate this understanding, Janice encouraged candidates to explore connections between their learning in course work at the university and their experiences of practice teaching in associate schools.

An outstanding issue in Janice's description of her work centered around her sense that the teacher candidates were weak in terms of their professional and personal development as teachers. From her standpoint, "deep thinking [was] not a characteristic of this group". She was frustrated by her sense that the candidates did "not see the importance" of what she was doing and were, therefore, employing traditional teaching
methods in their practice teaching. From Janice's perspective, "all that candidates see in their practicums...are pupils doing seatwork" and this made it difficult for them to see the value of such topics as integrated and whole-language models which she was introducing through activities in the university classroom context.

To encourage students to experiment with less traditional methods, Janice made a point of establishing one-to-one contacts with each candidate in the classroom to discuss their ideas about lessons and resources for university assignments and practice teaching placements. Through these interactions, Janice hoped to provide candidates with specific examples of how to integrate children's literature into their teaching themes as well to suggest resources that they might consult to develop units on topics such as science and technology. To facilitate the communication process further, Janice had provided time at the end of the first term for students to identify topics that they wanted to take up in the remaining months of the course. Working with candidates' feedback, Janice had modified the program to include focused lessons on drama, technology and evaluation. Janice noted how her attempts to establish personal contacts and to modify the program based on candidates' needs had helped her to clarify her role in the classroom. At the same time, however, the time involved in this aspect of her work meant that Janice was working well beyond the hours specified in her part-time contract. Thus, while helping candidates to develop confidence with new models of teaching was a source of personal satisfaction, the time this required created a level of personal and professional frustration.

During our interview Janice was quick to respond when I asked her to describe
her ideal image of a teacher education program. In addition to encouraging candidates to value an approach of integrated learning, Janice emphasized her belief in the interaction between personal and professional knowledge:

My goal is have the students develop their own story, to understand how they learned and to reflect on the process of learning. Emphasis should be on reflections of how the human learns and not the nuts and bolts of math.

The image Janice discussed in most detail was that of the teacher as a reflective practitioner. Over the year she had tried to model this strategy. If she were to return for a second year, however, she would articulate the process of reflection more clearly by starting the course with reflections on the learning process in general and connecting this learning to investigations of learning in schools. Janice believed that this approach would encourage candidates to ask questions about theory and practice, to conduct research based on their questions, and as a result to become more comfortable in their knowledge of teaching and learning. Janice stressed that “only when they start to ask their own questions will they begin to learn”. She also noted, however, that “they” cannot expect “pat answers to the questions”. The key element of teacher education was, therefore, providing a setting where candidates could ask questions, increase their awareness, and hopefully become more comfortable with their personal and professional development as innovative and reflective practitioners.

The tensions communicated by Janice during our interview make it a challenge to place her narrative in relation to those shared by the three other teacher educators introduced in this chapter. Janice spoke of issues similar to those which I discussed with Paula, Jeff and Karen. For instance, Janice discussed the frustrations that she
experienced with time and considered the impact of candidates expectations on her work. From Janice’s personal standpoint, however, these issues appeared to be unresolvable. In her position as a part-time instructor, Janice did not get paid for the time she spent working beyond the scheduled three-hour class period. Thus, while she felt that making contact over the phone with each of the thirty candidates was important for assisting them in their planning, she was also cognizant of the fact that her efforts would not be recognized by the department. Additionally, Janice described the frustration she had experienced in her attempts to negotiate an understanding between her own objectives for the course and what candidates expected of her in her role as an instructor. Janice’s ideal model for teacher education endorses the importance of ensuring that learning is personally relevant to candidates, and yet she appeared to be disappointed by nature of candidates’ expectations. Janice maintained that candidates could only learn when they began to ask their own questions. At the same time, however, she communicated her sense that candidates did not know which questions to ask. Janice’s images of candidates centered around her perception that they relied on traditional teaching strategies and were overwhelmingly focused on the “nuts and bolts”, or recipes, of teaching.

It has been a difficult struggle as a researcher to make sense of Janice’s descriptions of her experiences as a teacher educator. After years of what she described as “highly successful” work with in-service teachers, Janice seemed to be disappointed with her first year as an educator in the pre-service context. Janice’s ideal of implementing a program which emphasized the integration of candidates’ personal experiences with theories of teaching and learning had not been realized. In addition, she
identified tensions that were introduced by what she saw as the traditional nature of teaching in the schools with the innovative nature of the content that she was presenting at the university.

Like Paula, Jeff, and Karen, Janice drew on her personal notions of effective teacher education to assist teacher candidates in their development as teachers. In a very real sense, however, the incongruities between Janice's ideal images of effective learning and actual events in the classroom became exaggerated over the course of the year. Through our short conversation, I perceived that Janice's experiences of teaching at Valleyfield had invoked both personal and professional struggles. The gap between her efforts and perceived sense of the outcomes was wide, and she communicated an acute awareness of how constraints such as time had impacted on her work. The fact that Janice's class of thirty was much smaller than Jeff's, Paula's or Karen's might have meant that Janice experienced candidates' expectations in a more immediate sense. Further, while the other three educators worked as part of a program team, Janice worked alone and did not enjoy the benefits (such as an office and contact with other faculty) of full-time status. Janice persevered on her own through a difficult year of teaching at Valleyfield. Despite the frustrations, however, she remained committed to her visions of effective teacher education. At the time of our interview she was waiting to hear if her contract would be extended for a second year. With the assertion that "next year I will do things differently", Janice was able to envision the potential for both her own and candidates' success in the coming year.
The foregoing narratives illustrate the particular ways in which Paula, Jeff, Karen, and Janice described their experiences of, and visions for, their work. This discussion also hinted at some of the frustrations that each educator dealt with in the context of their personal philosophies, practices and interactions with candidates. The personal meanings that each educator attached to their work was the most outstanding feature of my conversations with Paula, Jeff, Karen, and Janice. I was also aware, however, of a number of common issues that emerged as being significant to the dynamics of all four educators’ experiences. These issues remain grounded in individualized experiences and interpretations, but they also hint at the possibility that similar issues may cross the boundaries of local or individual practices.

The Significance of Candidates’ Expectations

So, it’s quite an interesting little conundrum because on the one hand you are saying to them that everything is important and then on the other hand they are saying “yeah but I need the practical stuff to survive”. And you say “yes you do but you need the theoretical too”. (Jeff)

Jeff’s description of the tensions that emerged in the context of his interactions with teacher candidates hints at a dilemma that all four educators spoke of during our interviews. In particular, each discussed the degree to which the significance of candidates’ needs or expectations impacted on their work in the classroom. Paula, Jeff, Karen and Janice each characterized their own definitions of effective teacher education as being mediated by the diverse number of expectations that candidates had for meaningful learning in the university context. In contrast to the traditional discourse
which supports the notion that a teacher educator's key role is to shape the knowledge, skills and dispositions of teacher candidates, each educator characterized their work as involving negotiation between their own and candidates' expectations. While it was challenging at times (given the issues of time and class size) to work with candidates' varied expectations, each recognized the degree to which the perspectives of teacher candidates contributed to their own perspectives and practices.

The needs communicated by teacher candidates involved messages about content, learning contexts, and roles that they expected the educators to assume in the classroom. After reading mid-term student evaluations, Paula, for instance, felt that the classroom climate "was extremely positive" but the candidates had strongly suggested "that they wanted really practical applications - the stuff that classroom teachers do". Like the teacher candidates in Jeff's course, candidates conveyed a sense that the course was too heavily weighted toward theoretical issues. In describing her own experiences, Janice spoke of how candidates had asked for more practical ideas on integrating drama, art and technology into language-based teaching units.

In addition to emphasizing their desire for practically-oriented content, candidates indicated that they wanted opportunities to work in a variety of learning contexts. Karen, for instance, spoke of how candidates had expressed an interest in experiencing different styles of groupwork in the classroom. Groups tended to be organized around common teaching schools but the candidates also wanted to work with common grade groups so that, for instance, everyone who was currently in a grade six placement would be grouped together for a discussion or activity. On a similar note, Janice described how she had
worked to incorporate numerous approaches to cooperative group learning into the university classroom. She felt that this strategy had been well received by candidates. Paula noted how feedback from candidates had influenced her feelings regarding the organization of activity in the classroom. Following a small group activity on teachers as change agents, candidates had approached Paula and told her that they would have liked to have had an opportunity to hear the ideas generated by other groups. As a result, Paula decided that "next time we have to put up [all of the ideas] and we have to get everybody talking".

As well as their expectations for practical ideas and opportunities to experience different contexts for learning, teacher candidates voiced their opinions concerning the roles they felt instructors should take on in the classroom. Karen, for example, described how she saw her role as one which focused on providing candidates with "guidance on improvement" and yet:

...what they seem to really want me to do is to evaluate them, which is really interesting because in no way is that part of my mandate.

In a different light, Jeff spoke of how different learning styles in the classroom influenced the roles that he took on:

Things come out very differently and with each group I will express it differently because I know...I get a sense that there is one group that is very vocal so they want to get involved in a different way and there is another group that is very quiet so I have to draw them out a little more...

Both Jeff and Janice described how feedback from students had led them to make changes in the course syllabus so that their own images of the course could be negotiated
with those of candidates, and modified to include topics not formally scheduled in the original outline. For instance, Janice replaced a session on special education with one on evaluation strategies. Class agendas were also modified to allow for the extension of topics taken up in earlier classes. Jeff, for instance, discussed how a class on unit planning had been extended from one to two class sessions because candidates indicated that they still had a number of outstanding questions regarding the organization of units from an integrated curriculum perspective. In most cases, instructors followed the original course schedule in covering key topics. At the same time, however, they indicated that there was room for modifications along the way as events unfolded over the year.

Paula, Jeff, Karen and Janice all discussed their occasional frustration with the impact of candidates' needs on their roles. In response to candidates' requests for more practical ideas, for example, Paula commented:

"...it is a real conundrum for us, this whole balance between the theoretical and "what do I do in the classroom tomorrow?". And that is a frustration I think generally in working with teachers. You have to make sure that as soon as you introduce something theoretical that you give very specific examples.

In her description of working with both pre-service and in-service teachers, Paula hinted at the possibility that teachers' desire for an understanding of "how does this apply to my work in the classroom" had a strong impact on student-instructor relationships in the arena of teacher education. Thus, while Paula interpreted candidates' requests for practical ideas as an occasional frustration, she also recognized the source of such expectations and worked to integrate this perspective into her own work. Jeff, Karen, and Janice also described their efforts to work with candidates' needs as a balancing act. At
the same time, however, the words that they chose to describe their work indicated that candidates' expectations had become an integral part of their personal philosophies of teacher education. Paula spoke of ensuring personal relevance and opening up opportunities for candidates to set the agenda, Karen described the number of variables involved in negotiating expectations between herself and students, and Jeff emphasized his strong belief in a negotiated curriculum through individual and group feedback:

You learn from them what they are thinking about and their approaches so that you can adapt your program to meet their needs. They learn from you because you have now adapted to their needs and they can understand where you are coming from...it is a collegial model that I really believe in.

Even Janice, who felt that candidates' expectations were misdirected, described how she had attempted to listen to their ideas and made an effort to reach a compromise between their needs and her own sense of what would make for the most effective program. Each of the educators worked to create a balance between their own and candidates' needs and expectations. As such, they appeared to be open to negotiating their positions in the classroom context to break down the boundaries between student and instructor roles.

The Conundrum of Theory and Practice

The "theory versus practice" debate plays largely in the literature on teacher education and has so far been described as a challenging aspect of teacher educators' work in university classrooms. Themes in the literature tend towards arguing that the distinction between practice and theory does not exist and therefore, should be discounted in teacher education programs. In contrast, my interviews with Paula, Jeff, Janice, and Karen illustrated that there are numerous ways of contextualizing the issues
around theory and practice. Further, as illustrated below, each educator ascribed different meanings to their definitions of theory and practice. As a consequence, they also offered a variety of approaches to lessening the boundaries that were seen to exist between the two interrelated sources of information for learning to teaching.

For Jeff, distinctions between theory and practice were located in the differences between learning in the university and the realities of the classroom. He hypothesized that candidates' frustration with their coursework might be located in their struggles with reconciling the "out there" with the "in here", where the "in here" might represent learning from educators who had been out of the field for an extended period of time, and therefore might be perceived as being out of touch. During our interview, Jeff spoke of how he perceived subject matter courses as practical while courses such as educational philosophy were framed as theoretical:

I think that when you come down to actual subject matter such as math, or science or social studies or the program organization of how you put a program together, they see these as incredibly valuable right off the bat as practical tools. Whereas philosophy, as much as it is very important they might not ultimately see the importance of it but will regret it later on if they missed it because that is part and parcel of their personal teaching technique and methodology.

While Jeff made these clear distinctions between theory and practice, he also emphasized that for him teaching was a "methodology which grew out of the impact of theory and practice together on an individual's teaching technique". From this perspective, Jeff noted that his courses were not theory- or practice oriented but, "kid oriented", and thus, meaningful learning in both realms could be best facilitated by talking about the relevance of a theory to the classroom environment and discussing how that theory might
“come into practice with the children in real learning situations”. The issue was not one of theory and practice but rather the connections between teachers, students, theories and practices in particular contexts and local practices of teaching and learning.

Paula acknowledged candidates’ desire for more information on practical applications when she noted, "I guess we all need that when we are learning”. And the same time, however, she had two concerns with the impact of this perspective on her work. First, she worried that a focus on current practice would not give candidates the knowledge or tools to grow as innovative practitioners:

...when we give them “stuff”, like the stuff that we have used in classrooms or stuff that teachers are currently using, it represents that kind of practice, it doesn’t represent breakthrough practice. And if we do too much of that I am afraid that they are going to fixate at that level and there it is.

Second, she felt that a limited perspective on the value of connections between theory and practice would impact negatively on candidates’ future careers as teachers. She predicted that once candidates were able to get past the day-to-day survival in the classroom, they would come to the question of “who am I really in teaching?” and at this point “they are going to come back to what they remember about any kind of theoretical perspective”. Thus, if candidates did not have an initial awareness of a variety of perspectives, they would be at a loss for understanding the ideas that inform both traditional and innovative approaches to developing effective classroom programs. For Paula, the means by which she could ensure that candidates were not limited by these two possibilities was to engage them in what she referred to as the “inquiry process”. By providing candidates with inquiry strategies, she hoped that they would discover their
own strategies for opening up the boundaries between theory and practice and traditional
and innovative ideas about teaching and learning. As summarized by Paula herself, "...I
would like to break through that boundary of theory and practice. I think it is much
more complex than that" (emphasis added).

In her first year as a teacher educator, Karen gained a sense that candidates
found learning most meaningful when she, or a guest speaker, “spoke from a theoretical
perspective but then showed what it looked like in practice”. During a class on
integrating art into a literature-based language program, for instance, a guest speaker
discussed research on the effectiveness of encouraging students to express their
understanding of a story through cooperative-based art activities. Following this, the
guest involved candidates in a series of art-based reading response activities that they
could use with students in their own classrooms. Like Paula, Karen recognized the need
for a balance; she emphasized her efforts to present concrete examples to enhance
candidates’ knowledge of general topics such as integrated learning and the “theoretical
perspective or foundation of topic areas” such as special education. For Karen, learning to
teach was grounded in what she referred to as “the zigzag of theory-practice” and thus
she felt it was important for candidates to “value the role of theory in teaching practice”.
From Karen’s perspective, her role was not to impose this value on candidates, but rather
to teach from a perspective that challenged the dichotomy between theory and practice.
In doing so she hoped that candidates would make their own discoveries about the role of
both fields in their own images of teaching. While Karen was committed to this strategy,
the impact of the tensions between theory and practice were evidently quite strong on her
role as an educator. This point was illustrated clearly when she noted how she had expected that her attempts to define the "zigzag of theory-practice" would be "quite a battle".

From Janice's standpoint, the boundaries between theory and practice began to lose their strength when candidates had time to "muck around" with different ideas and strategies, began to increase their personal comfort levels, and then moved to a higher level by theorizing around new questions that arose out of practice. As noted earlier in this chapter, Janice defined the purpose of teacher education as the development of an understanding of how individuals learn rather than the "nuts and bolts of math". In working to share this image with candidates, however, Janice emphasized that it was not her role to lecture or reprimand students for their perspectives. Instead, she worked to encourage an awareness that teaching was not grounded in the certainty of strategies or informed by "pat answers", but enhanced by an ongoing process of asking new questions and searching for new answers that would, in the long run, be articulated in connections between theory and practice.

Making Connections

In some way, each of the educators spoke about the connections between their work at the university and teacher education in the school context. With the exception of Jeff, all felt that stronger relationships between university-based learning and what is typically referred to as practice teaching was a desirable goal. Each, however, had a different definition of this relationship and a different understanding of the ideal roles to be included in school-university partnerships. The nature of this relationship varied from
descriptions of schools and associate teachers as servicing the university, to a suggestion that all parties involved could work together for the benefit of educational improvement, and finally to an opinion that associate schools and teachers made strong contributions to the quality of teacher education programs.

Jeff spoke very positively of the contributions made by associate teachers to teacher education. He noted with enthusiasm that “[associate teachers] are the unsung heroes in the whole business as far as I am concerned”. In defining the school-university relationship, Jeff drew strongly on his own experiences as an associate teacher:

...having been one for fifteen years I know how hard they work. I mean you have enough to do with writing report cards, parent interviews, learning about the Royal Commission and outcome-based education and those things. So all of this stuff is factoring in and the teacher is just going crazy and then you put two student teachers in the room on top of it all...So you have to recognize that these people are doing a tremendous service and I tell them that.

For Jeff, it was important for the university to support associate teachers and to affirm that when candidates were in their classroom they were the “boss”. On-going contact with associate teachers was a key element of the work that Jeff had defined for himself. Thus, while he was not directly responsible for the practicum component of his program, he spent time visiting schools with the practicum coordinator to make sure that associate teachers knew that they could contact him at any time to discuss problems or concerns.

From his perspective, this was the most effective method for fostering a sense that the schools and university were working together as a “real team”.

In describing the connection between schools and the university, Karen also took up the themes of communication and support. From her perspective, strong relationships
between associate schools and the university would allow for the university "to positively impact on school communities". I initially understood Karen's reference to the metaphor of "impact" as an indication that she felt that the university could impose its agenda on schools. As she continued to discuss her ideas about the relationship, however, I understood that she was referring more to the university supporting the host of initiatives for change that arose in the local context of different associate schools. Karen was working to articulate a school-based model where school staff worked with teacher educators and candidates to implement change or "even just to listen" to the different perspectives on change. Later on in our conversation, Karen discussed an image of the university taking on the role of nurturing teachers' work in the schools, and recognized that this role had to be defined by teachers themselves:

...there is certainly a lot of knowledge and information here that could and should be shared with the schools. Having said that, there is also very definitely the issue that [teachers] do not have the luxury of time that we have here...teachers are definitely swamped. They are busy people. They are very capable people and very intelligent people but they don't always have time to be nurtured nor are they nurtured.

Thus, for Karen, her ideal role in working collaboratively with associate schools was to foster relationships of mutual support, with her particular role being one of a resource person in the areas of curriculum and professional development.

Like Jeff, Paula drew on her past experiences in working with schools as an administrator in defining her image of how the university and schools might work together in teacher education. The theme of mutual benefit which ran throughout Paula's descriptions of her experiences as an administrator and a teacher educator were also
significant in her perspective on this issue. At the same time, however, Paula spoke of moving beyond the current organization of university and field-based teacher education toward a model where teachers, school administrators, teacher educators and teacher candidates worked together to “bridge the gap between schools and universities”:

...we have to find ways to bridge that gap somehow so that we can learn to work effectively together for school change. We have a lot of learning to do in order to do that. I have tried with a couple of my schools this year for students to get involved on a school improvement team...it is when those kind of things happen that I think that the university is offering a really valuable service to the school at the same time that the schools are offering a service us and the teacher candidates.

Bringing together learning in both the school and university contexts - as well as breaking down the image of universities as the realm of theory and schools as the realm of practice - was one means through which Paula attempted to “create maximal learning for people who are wanting to become teachers and for people who are already teachers”.

The goal as described by Paula was to eliminate boundaries and to align foci in order that all players in the field of teacher education could meet together in learning situations. In this context she felt that everyone “could discover each other’s strengths and needs and resource each other” and ultimately, look for new opportunities related to the school, the classroom and the community. In short, the goal was to broaden the perspective to increase the possibilities of mutual benefits through school, university and community partnerships.

In comparison to Jeff, Karen and Paula, Janice was most critical of the school-based learning that candidates in her course were experiencing. In her opinion, “all
students saw in their practicum were students doing seatwork", and as a result, their exposure to innovative teaching strategies was limited. Janice felt that the lessons learned in the classroom limited candidates' openness to new ideas discussed in the university context and their awareness of new curriculum areas such as technology or innovative approaches to science. The lack of "consistency" between approaches in the schools compared to those discussed at the university frustrated Janice. Although time was a constraining factor, she felt that a greater level of communication needed to take place between herself and associate teachers as a first step in improving school-university connections. With increased communication, Janice hoped to "make" associate teachers more aware of the university curriculum so that they could encourage candidates to experiment with new strategies. Further, she noted that she wanted to increase class visits to innovative schools, where integrated programs were the norm rather than the exception so that candidates could see the relevance of the approaches she was trying to model or demonstrate at the university.

On Learning

One of the goals of this chapter has been to challenge the assumption that there is a single definition of what it means to be a teacher educator. As clearly illustrated above, the work of educators in the field of teacher education is complex and strongly informed by personal interpretations of what it means to be an educator and what it means to be educated, and the multiple meanings and sites which inform the process of learning to teach. Despite these diverse interpretations and actions carried out by each educator, the traditional discourse on teacher education continues to perpetuate unitary definitions of
what it means to be a teacher educator. A key element of this definition is captured in the notion that for teacher education to be effective, teacher educators must be the "experts" in the classroom to ensure that their professional knowledge and skills impact on teacher candidates in concrete ways. While this definition is highly popular in the literature, it was my sense that the four teacher educators introduced in this study did not hold similar opinions. Instead, what I heard through interviews was that learning was at the heart of teaching for Paula, Jeff, Karen and Janice.

Learning from experience was a central theme that all four educators used to describe their work. As noted by Karen, this theme was intimately connected to the fact that this was her first year as a teacher educator:

...not having had this experience before, I didn't know some of their expectations. To do it another time I would deal with their expectations as I set out my own expectations.

On a similar note, Paula described how she had made mental notes to change the outline for a class on "The Teacher as Change Agent" based on her observations of how students had approached the different activities she presented. She felt that more time was required for the whole class to share their ideas on educational change, "...you know we have to plan for that next year...we learn - we learn from that". After her first year as a teacher educator, Janice also clearly expressed that she had new visions for her second year. She emphasized how she wanted to articulate a program that began with assisting candidates to understand their own approaches to learning before the focus shifted to how pupils learn in the elementary classroom context.

In addition to learning from experience, the educators also spoke of the valuable
information that they gained through their interactions with candidates. Jeff discussed how feedback from candidates influenced the approach he took in each class from week to week:

I have learned so much from them and I think this is part and parcel of teaching - you learn as much from your students as they learn from you.

Like Jeff, Paula expressed a strong belief in co-learning, and Karen emphasized how communication was source of “so much information” for her development as a teacher educator.

Finally, each educator discussed their strong personal interests in learning and maintaining an open mind to new ideas and experiences. Paula described herself as a “person who likes to have lots of new experiences” because she felt that she could “learn and gain from each new experience”. Similarly, Karen felt that teacher education and a possible future completing her Doctorate would provide her with an opportunity to reinvest in herself and contribute to her personal sense of professional development. From a somewhat more ambivalent standpoint, Jeff described how he had decided “to bite the bullet” and apply to a graduate department to complete his Doctorate. In this move, he hoped to be able to further develop a balance between his practical and theoretical strengths: “I tend to be a very practical person, but I also have a firm footing in the theoretical”.

The metaphors of learning that each educator attached to their work are likely to be related to the fact that teaching in the context of pre-service teacher education was a relatively new experience. Thus, to some degree, each educator was in the process of
defining their roles and understanding of the contexts provided by each setting. In another sense, however, all four instructors drew strongly on notions of negotiation and adaptation to describe their general approach to teaching, regardless of whether they were working in an elementary school classroom, a workshop for in-service teachers, or a Curriculum and Instruction course at the pre-service level. From my perspective, constant references to learning from experience and maintaining an openness to adapting to teacher candidates' expectations captured all four educators' commitment to the ideal of what Paula referred to as "co-learning" contexts.

Conclusions

This chapter began with the assertion that the traditional discourse on teacher educators' work is highly mechanistic and tends to obscure the ways that individual educators understand their work in faculties of education. In contrast to the mechanistic paradigms which direct certain accounts of teacher educators' work, this chapter has worked to illustrate both the highly personal and interactive quality of teaching in the context of three university-based teacher education courses. The narratives of Paula, Jeff, Karen and Janice indicate a keen sense of the ways in which the work of four educators, new to the field of teacher education, might be contextualized and understood through the interaction of many personal and programmatic features.

In section one, the unique story behind each educator's background and their interests in joining their respective faculties indicated the varied personal and professional contributions that Paula, Jeff, Karen, and Janice felt they could bring to their work as seconded teacher educators. Reflections on the switch from work in school
or school board settings to the university context also indicated that three of the four educators saw their new positions as potential learning experiences. In addition to highlighting background experiences, this section was organized to emphasize the variety of ways in which all four educators described their work in personal terms. Captured in the headings that prefaced each of the narratives were key points which stood out when Paula, Jeff, Karen, and Janice described their work. Paula placed a great deal of emphasis on “breaking down the boundaries” between educators and teacher candidates, school board administrators, principals and teachers, and between teacher education in the schools and the university. While Jeff also spoke of these themes during our interview, he was most animated in expressing his commitment to the idea that “learning should be fun”. He used communication and an openness to negotiating the curriculum as a means by which learning could be personally relevant and enjoyable for the ninety-five candidates that he worked with in the program at Northview.

From Karen's perspective, her first year as a teacher educator at Bellhampton was a learning experience where she worked with her own and teacher candidates' expectations to develop an understanding of effective teacher education. Through feedback from candidates Karen gained a sense of the diverse number of expectations that came together in a class of one hundred and twenty students. At times she found it difficult to balance the many needs of students but maintained her belief that feedback was a valuable source of information and noted, “you learn...you learn from that”. Finally, Janice described the tensions that arose in her first year as a teacher educator at Valleyfield. She emphasized that all learning should be personally relevant, and yet she
appeared to be unable to reconcile this belief with her sense that the nature of candidates' expectations was somewhat misguided. Janice was committed to providing a space where candidates could "tell their own stories"; at the same time, however, she encountered a number of difficulties in trying to balance her own images of effective teacher education with those suggested by teacher candidates. Janice worried that candidates had not yet reached a point where they knew "which questions to ask" in order to reach a deeper understanding of innovative teaching strategies. As such she devoted a great deal of time and energy in assisting candidates to become more comfortable in their knowledge of teaching and learning.

Each educator's narrative closed with their unique visions of effective teacher education. This aspect of each educator's story stands in sharp contrast to mechanistic images of teacher education, which suggest that teacher educators are obstructing change in faculties of education. In their roles as educators, Paula, Jeff, Karen, and Janice articulated visions of effective teacher education that included on-going efforts to capitalize on the existing strengths of programs while also investigating strategies for improving for the future effectiveness of their courses and programs. Many of the "issues" discussed in our interviews reflect key areas that have been identified in the literature on teacher education, but each educator placed these "issues", and ideas concerning their resolution, in the context of individual and local efforts. Any sense that their work rested solely on articulating external notions of effective change was absent from all four narratives. Paula, for instance, spoke of enhancing school-university partnerships to enhance the pace of school-based changes. From her perspective, however, such
connections should be located in efforts to link the strengths of school-based initiatives for change with university-based learning around innovation in education. Jeff emphasized personal and professional growth through his commitment to the idea that learning to teach was a lifelong process, through which each teacher developed their own unique approaches to creating positive "kid-centered" learning environments. Janice's goal for teacher education was for candidates to become reflective practitioners who understood their own learning and teaching styles as a springboard for working with the diverse learning styles of students in the classroom. Finally, Karen emphasized the importance of assisting teacher candidates to become reflective practitioners who were able to reflect on their own practices as they continued to develop their knowledge of learning and teaching. It was Karen's wish that teacher candidates would leave the program at Bellhampton with a keen sense of individual and collaborative efforts toward informed and innovative practice.

In the process of interacting with Paula, Jeff, Karen and Janice through interviews, I came to know four very different people who made sense of their relatively new roles as teacher educators in very unique ways. At the same time, however, there were a number of common themes that emerged through our conversations. All four educators discussed how issues of time and class size impacted on their attempts to implement their ideal visions of an effective program. In addition, each described how dilemmas such as the tensions between theory and practice, or issues surrounding connections between associate schools and the university, affected dynamics in the classroom. Common issues emerged in the context of each educator's experiences at their
respective faculties, and yet the issues were interpreted differently. When read together, the four narratives described in this chapter offer a variety of exciting strategies for working within the constraints of particular program contexts. While Janice had been unable to resolve the "inconsistencies" that she saw between her own approaches to teaching and those which teacher candidates were experiencing in associate school classrooms, Paula, Jeff and Karen described how they had worked individually and with other team members to develop strategies for coping with, or effecting change in relation to recurring issues in the context of their local experiences.

Janice, Karen, Jeff and Paula's narratives illustrate the degree to which each educator invested a great deal of personal and professional time and knowledge in their attempts to facilitate effective learning contexts for large numbers of teacher candidates. They worked in settings characterized by complexities of time, space, class size and multiple perspectives on what it means to learn and teach. Each drew on her or his own set of personal understandings to give meaning to both the satisfactions and frustrations experienced in the particular contexts of their teacher education programs. While Janice felt that her work as an educator had not been fully valued, Jeff, Karen and Paula indicated that their varied experiences of teaching in the university setting had been dynamic learning experiences. At the heart of the four narratives presented in this chapter is a sense that teacher educators' work is strongly contextualized through interactions with teacher candidates. The overwhelming view of effective teacher education is found in the metaphors of negotiation and adaptation. Contrary to the traditional mechanistic and hierarchical image of teacher educators having an impact on teacher candidates through pre-defined objectives, this chapter has illustrated the degree
to which effective teacher education can emerge in the meeting of educators' and candidates' unique understandings of learning to teach. As captured in a statement made by Paula, “we all have to admit that we are the learners in some situations and the teachers in other situations”.

CHAPTER FIVE
THE CANDIDATES

We need to be given lots of ideas and encouraged to go out and try them and then come back to class to share with other students how the theories worked in practice - to discuss what went well and what didn't. We need time to reflect on how the ideas worked. (Jean, Valleyfield)

Introduction

In the traditional discourse on effectiveness in teacher education, a significant amount of attention is directed toward improving the degree to which programs will impact on teacher candidates. According to researchers working within this discourse, impact can best be facilitated through organizing programs around a coherent set of goals specifically directed toward the development of “appropriate” teacher beliefs, skills, and knowledge. The “impact” model, as discussed in Chapter One, tends to work on the assumption that effectiveness - or guarantees that all teacher candidates will graduate with a common knowledge base and set of dispositions - is achieved through the one-way transmission of pre-set objectives from the “experts” (teacher educators) to the students (teacher candidates). Within this framework:

The perspectives of students and teachers, their interests, desires, and affective investments are all ignored. Instead teaching and learning are to be stabilized by being equated solely with the measurable productivity and the surveillance techniques necessary to control the work of teachers and students. (Britzman, 1986: 173)

From the perspective of many researchers, it is the responsibility of teacher educators to challenge candidates' passivity, complacency, and dependency (Berrill and Leeking, 1992; Katz and Raths, 1992), and/or their assertiveness around expectations for practical
Katz and Raths, 1992), and/or their assertiveness around expectations for practical information that will allow them to survive in the classroom context (Book, Beyers and Freeman, 1983; Britzman, 1986; Ciscell, 1987; Rodriguez, 1993; Wideen, 1985). Employing aggregate findings that are held to apply to all teacher candidates, the traditional discourse consistently presents negative evaluations of teacher candidates' interactions with program goals, structures, and events. More often than not, these arguments posit that programs which do not aggressively challenge the misguided pragmatism of teacher candidates will be ineffective.

The narratives of the four teacher educators presented in Chapter Four began to hint at the possibility that teacher candidates' perspectives and experiences in teacher education are more complex than the practice-versus-theory paradigm commonly described in the literature. Paula, Karen, Jeff, and Janice all spoke of how the wide range of candidates' expectations were sometimes related to, but by no means limited to, requests for practical information. While the four educators provided personal interpretations of the positive and negative impact of candidates' expectations, they could not fully capture the ways in which teacher candidates themselves might define effective teacher education based on their personal notions of what it means to teach, learn and learn to teach. Definitions offered by scholars and educators cannot account for the ways that candidates' own sense of their roles as learners and future teachers might contribute to a diverse set of expectations and interpretations within a program:

...pre-service teachers participating in class in the same activity designed to communicate a particular notion of professional knowledge will differ from each other in the sense that they make of that activity, and in what knowledge they acquire from that experience. (Tamir, 1991:265)
In other words, "experiences of "the same" will be different" (Gray, 1990: 143), and each teacher candidate will interact with the context of particular programs based on her or his personal understandings of effective teacher education.

The seven narratives presented in this chapter introduce the idea that learning to teach is a complex process which is strongly informed by personal experiences and individual notions of what it means to learn and teach. The candidates who shared their time with me suggested that teacher education was characterized by uncertainties arising from attempts to negotiate theory and practice, school- and university-based learning, innovation and tradition in education, and individual and group perspectives. Candidates also experienced tensions in their attempts to reconcile personal images of teaching with institutional images of teaching (e.g. during practice teaching placements).

The narratives together reflect Britzman's (1986) suggestion that the unitary definitions of learning to teach contained in the traditional discourse on effectiveness in teacher education are false constructs:

When it comes to learning to teach, there is no single-minded conception of success, of competence, of conduct or of survival. There are no common agreements as to the desirable teacher's stance, the constitution of good pedagogy, or the relationship between theory and practice. (213)

Thus, each teacher candidate will bring his or her own unique perspective to bear on the multiple meanings that exist within the complex realm of teacher education.

In this chapter, the perspectives of seven teacher candidates are outlined to highlight the variety of personal meanings that candidates attached to their experiences of learning to teach. Section one is organized into seven narratives which present profiles
of the candidates’ background experiences, initial expectations for learning in their programs, interpretations of the “highs” and “lows” of their classroom experiences, and personal images of their future roles as teachers. Section two describes three issues that emerged in relation to candidates’ expectations for learning in their respective programs. In particular, I highlight candidates’ expectations of teacher educators and describe candidates’ evaluations of effective content and contexts for learning to teach. These descriptions accentuate how the seven candidates held high expectations for their programs and for themselves as they worked toward their ideal images of becoming successful teachers. The section closes with my reflections on an ideal learning model that has been organized to capture candidates’ notions of learning to teach as an iterative process.

Section three - “On Learning” - highlights the value that all seven candidates placed on the importance of taking initiative for their own learning. Challenging the notion that teacher candidates do not “take responsibility for their own learning” (Katz and Raths, 1992: 379), this section describes how candidates took advantage of many opportunities for learning, and outlines their belief in the interaction between teaching and “lifelong learning”. Taken together, the sections of this chapter highlight the interactive quality of seven teacher candidates’ experiences of learning to teach. For each candidate, the process of learning to teach emerged in the dynamic meetings of many people, places, events, and ideas. Underlying these varied experiences were the candidates’ beliefs that there are many ways to become an effective teacher. From this perspective, each candidate fashioned different expectations for, and evaluations of, their
Learning to Teach

Jennifer: Collaboration and Cooperation

Jennifer returned to university after ten years of exploring career possibilities in different areas of the workforce. In the two years before re-enrolling in school she worked as an early childhood educator. Her work with toddlers in a multicultural and multilingual setting sparked a renewed interest in pursuing her university degree in psychology:

Mine is kind of a different story...I was in university ten years ago and then I dropped out but then I actually got into a field that I liked which was ECE. I worked for two years in the area, and became interested in the theory background - like how children learn. That is when I decided to go back to school - that's when I took up psychology.

Once in her psychology program, Jennifer found out about programs offered through Valleyfield's Faculty of Education, and applied. Jennifer hoped that a degree in primary and junior education would prepare her for the year 2000, "when all the kindergarten programs [would] be implemented", and she could pursue her interest in working with preschool aged children in public school rather than daycare settings. During our conversation, Jennifer described how her initial expectations for learning in both psychology and education were to gain a better understanding of developmental theory, language acquisition and theories around early reading and writing stages. In summary, Jennifer noted that she "[wanted] to specialize in language - that is my personal interest".

After three years in the education program at Valleyfield, Jennifer felt that her
attempts to integrate these interests had not been fostered. She did learn other things, however. She had discovered an interest in teaching older children, and encountered a new range of subject areas. She had also learned a great deal through group work and problem solving activities in the university classroom: "that is what I found to be the most productive time because [other teacher candidates] were able to bring up issues and give you information that you may not have thought of [yourself]." Finally, Jennifer believed that her strongest development in terms of skills had been in the area of planning. Nearing the end of her three year program, she had a sense that she was able to "think through" her planning and teaching with confidence.

In describing her own images of effective learning, Jennifer placed more emphasis on the context of learning than she did on the content that was being covered. She was a strong advocate of a learning model that allowed students to take up topics through dialogue and sharing, and at times she was frustrated by the time spent in lecture situations. For her, the most beneficial settings were ones which allowed for personal reflection, cooperative group work and activities that facilitated discussion and analysis of ideas:

[Even] to say okay, this Board has this guideline, let's bring it in and look at, and if you are doing a unit on geometry for instance, let's look at the suggestions in the guideline in terms of how to integrate the unit and then try them out and discuss the positive and negative aspects of the ideas, styles and techniques and how would you integrate it into language... to consider theory into practice.

From Jennifer's viewpoint, collaboration with fellow candidates provided opportunities for different people to bring out a variety of ideas. It also challenged individuals to
develop an understanding of working with other people. Learning about cooperation and collaboration was viewed by Jennifer as beneficial for her personal and professional development.

Jennifer's experiences outside of the university classroom seemed to inform her evaluations and expectations for her coursework. She spoke, for instance, of how issues of accountability that were being communicated to teachers through the Ontario Ministry of Education had led her to question her own preparation for teaching:

That is one of my reasons for deciding not to teach right away. I want to go to more workshops and get more prepared - to get more specialized...There are so many issues for teachers to deal with, so it is hard to prepare.

She also discussed how a parent-teacher meeting had forced her to evaluate the nature of the content being presented at Valleyfield. In particular, Jennifer noted how parents were demanding phonics-based language instruction while her own learning was centered around a whole-language approach:

...it shows that we buy into the things that are constantly being advertised like "Hooked on Phonics"...I look at these things and I wonder why we don't learn it at the university. We have never learned about phonics or basal reading.

Jennifer felt frustrated by the lack of time in her courses for issues such as phonics instruction or the impact of Ministry guidelines on teachers' work. Over the year she had conducted her own research in an attempt to find answers to some of her outstanding questions on subjects such as phonics instruction, although her time outside of school was limited by family and employment responsibilities. While Jennifer did not expect her courses at Valleyfield to provide answers to all of her questions, she expressed concern
that her learning was still incomplete in a number of ways. This was one her reasons for “deciding not to teach right away”.

Jennifer's desire for in-depth learning in cooperative contexts also carried over into our conversation when I asked her to describe her personal images of teaching. In general, she felt that teaching was a complex and demanding job requiring specialization and collaboration between teachers. Through practice teaching experiences she had come to understand that “the job is becoming so much more demanding that one person can’t really do it alone”. Jennifer characterized schools as settings where the demands made on teachers outweighed available resources. Therefore she felt that she herself would have to become more specialized to deal with the multi-dimensional nature of teachers’ work. It was from this perspective that Jennifer seemed to evaluate much of her coursework at Valleyfield. She felt that it was important for her to get a theoretical and practical sense of the foundations of the wide range of responsibilities that she would have to take on in the classroom.

**Carol: Taking Risks**

Like Jennifer, Carol returned to university after many years in the workforce to complete studies in sociology and primary/junior education that she had started fifteen years earlier. Upon re-entering the Faculty of Education at Bellhampton for a second time, Carol had been surprised at how the program had remained essentially the same - including the books and some of the professors who were teaching her courses. While she was somewhat frustrated by this sense of *deja vu*, the familiarity had helped her to gain confidence after being out of school for such a long period. Carol's work experiences also
allowed her to return to school with a greater sense of focus and confidence.

Carol noted the many connections between the knowledge that she had gained through her experiences in the workforce, the ideas that she was learning in education courses, and her studies in sociology. For one assignment in sociology, Carol had investigated her theories of teaching through sociological frameworks. This research allowed her to develop a clearer image of herself as a teacher:

...that is when I became a reflective practitioner - that changed my way of thinking. I think that is why I like to take risks and I like to help make change...because of that experience.

The process of developing a personal-professional image of teaching was also, in Carol's experience, an aspect of her coursework at Bellhampton:

I can see a development of expectations from observing, looking at role models, discussing theories and sorting out your own philosophy of education.

In her three years of concurrent studies in sociology and education, Carol had become a person who was willing to take risks. She also described how her experiences in the program had enhanced her knowledge of teaching by balancing her previous volunteer teaching experiences in rural schools with experiences in urban school settings. Finally, Carol recounted how she had developed an understanding that “teachers do teach differently, that each classroom is unique, and that each child is unique”.

Carol’s evaluation of her coursework was overwhelmingly positive. She sensed, however, that courses were predominantly directed toward younger people who had entered the faculty with no previous work experiences, and felt the program was geared, at times, towards teaching basic job skills such as punctuality. From her perspective,
some of the "younger" students did not take their coursework very seriously. Younger students' attitudes of working to just "get by" stood in sharp contrast to her own approach, which centered on "learning a lot" through reading, reflecting and taking risks in areas that she was less familiar with - such as the role of technology in primary/junior education.

Carol had a clear set of expectations for learning at Bellhampton. Her most positive experiences took place in courses where professors communicated clear expectations, introduced ideas through a short lecture and then followed up by giving candidates an opportunity to become involved. In her experience, active learning was a key element of effective courses - "if there is a lot of hands-on you will remember what you were doing". In addition, Carol felt that effective programs grew out of attention to issues such as anti-racist education and dealing with issues such as child abuse. As a former social worker, Carol had a great deal of experience in dealing with these issues and was somewhat disappointed that they had not been taken up in the university classroom. In her opinion, these areas were crucial issues in teachers' work.

Carol's image of herself as teacher was very positive. She discussed her eagerness to begin teaching immediately after graduation, and expressed her readiness to teach at any grade level. While she communicated a strong sense of confidence, she also acknowledged that "the ideas will change", and therefore she would have to keep on learning throughout her career. In contrast to the image that she held of herself as a future teacher, Carol conveyed a deep sense of disappointment with the teachers and school cultures that she had encountered in her practice teaching placements. She
outlined an image of teachers as "lost, frustrated, overly authoritative, biased, and resistant to change". She was also frustrated that teachers received very little professional support from school principals or school board personnel:

That's when I saw how teachers are isolated and they have problems, but they are not given the support...I thought, here is a teacher who really tried [to implement a new program] and she was reaching out for help and she just didn't get it. Maybe the principal didn't understand the depth of the teacher's problem or the principal didn't believe in it herself...that was the environment.

Despite these concerns, Carol maintained that her skills as a reflective practitioner, independent risk taker, and caring educator would prevent her from becoming "lost" and "resistant to change". As a teacher, she was confident that a balance of common sense, knowledge, and ongoing inquiry would enable her to be a successful teacher.

**Linda: Fate Really Wanted Me to be a Teacher**

Linda came to teacher education following a year's deferral, granted by the Faculty of Education at Northview, to enable her to fulfill an employment contract in publishing. Linda had been working only a month when she received her acceptance letter from Northview. Given that she "couldn't just quit" to pursue other interests, she applied for and was granted a one year deferral. She described the significance of this event with a bit of laughter:

...they agreed and I thought "God!"... at that point I thought fate really wanted me to be a teacher! I thought a lot about it during that time and the more I thought about it the more I decided that I would really like teaching, but I had no idea of what to expect from the program.

In describing her interests in becoming a teacher, Linda spoke of how "one way or
another" she was always taking on a teaching role in her interactions with both children and adults. From these experiences she had been able to develop a strong sense of what she had to offer to her role as a teacher. She believed her knowledge of history, her experiences as an archeologist, her work experiences as a teaching assistant, and her personal commitment to teaching would contribute positively to her work in schools. While she began her program with a strong sense of what she could contribute to teaching, her lack of formal teaching experiences and exposure to Ontario schools made her feel less confident. She hoped her program at Northview would provide a wide range of information on the particularities of education in Ontario. She also hoped to gain a better understanding of what it meant to teach and learn in elementary classrooms.

Given Linda's initial desire to learn about a wide range of topics, I was not surprised when she commented with enthusiasm that the program had "really changed [her] outlook on teaching". Through the program she had learned a number of alternative strategies to teacher-directed learning, such as cooperative learning. In addition, Linda had thought a lot about students' needs and the importance of making learning relevant or meaningful to students through attention to individual differences and theories of multiple intelligences. Linda's positive experiences centered around learning practical ideas in subject areas such as art and music, and strategies for program planning. In contrast, she felt that discussions of the theoretical foundations of teaching tended to be too abstract:

You can't begin with imposing a big concept on a limited framework. Now other people might not find that because they have had more experiences...it's almost like it should be
two years moving from the basics to the specific...It would be easier to put the theory into practice if we had some practice and could look back and reflect on that - it would reverse the process.

In illustrating the value of concrete learning, Linda described a presentation on cooperative group work which was "really helpful" because it had focused on "practical hands-on stuff that we could use in the classroom". From her standpoint this type of learning did not happen often enough at the university.

Developing a grasp of the common sense and practical aspects of teaching was important to Linda. She viewed this process as a "first step" in her own attempts to develop a balance between her knowledge of theory and practice. She felt that practical strategies should be discussed in class as a context for the investigation of theory. It was through this framework that Linda evaluated her learning about cooperative education, developmental theories of learning, and subject-specific topics in areas such as science and social studies. She felt somewhat frustrated by her perception that educators in the university classroom were presenting limited images of learning and teaching:

...it is nice to know that there are different ways to do things in the classroom. Too often the profs here just talk of certain ways of teaching and they do not make connections to our experiences in the classroom.

Linda was also disappointed that she had not seen many of the ideas discussed in class being implemented in the classroom during her practice teaching experiences. For example, she had learned about cooperative education through her coursework but had yet to see it in practice, and therefore questioned her ability to use cooperative strategies in her own work:
Well I have certainly seen how it been a success in terms of my own learning. You know it makes you feel more comfortable and confident than working alone. And if I feel that way and I communicate it to students then students will...well, I guess...it will be difficult because I haven't seen anyone implement it but I can see myself doing little things in groups and then if that works I will do bigger things in groups.

For Linda, “seeing was believing”. She was committed to working with strategies such as cooperative education - “I think there is a lot of potential for it... I really like the theory.” but without concrete examples of theory to practice, she was unable envision how such strategies might become part of her teaching repertoire.

Attention to practices and the day-to-day tasks of teaching also directed Linda’s response when I asked her to describe her image of teaching. She had expected to encounter a number of “things”, such as strategies for developing long range plans. The fact that she had not seen “real” examples of long range plans meant that she still felt somewhat unprepared to plan for a full year of teaching. Furthermore, she worried about issues of “control” or behaviour management. In one of her early practice teaching experiences. Linda had observed a classroom that was in “complete pandemonium”.

Based on this episode, Linda developed a sense that teachers needed to develop control in the classroom:

It was a good class and I was sitting there trying to figure out what he was or was not doing so that he had no control, and wondering how could I get that control. If you don't have it on the first day then you can kiss it good-bye - you will never get it.

While Linda’s image of teaching was centered on practical matters, she saw herself as someone who would care about the students and who would work to impart the
importance of education to them. She believed in lifelong learning and felt that she would continue to grow as a teacher through experiences in the classroom. She also predicted that she would take additional qualification courses to gain more confidence in areas such as behaviour management and cooperative education. Although she did not feel fully prepared to deal with the practical demands of teaching, Linda believed that her positive outlook on teaching would remain strong - “I really like the teaching and I really enjoy the kids”.

Jean: “I Am a Teacher Now”

My interview time with Jean was quite short given that she had to leave for work each day following classes at Valleyfield. Despite the short length of our conversation, however, I gained a strong impression that Jean had a very clear set of expectations for the program and definite goals for herself in relation to her development as a teacher. Jean had specifically chosen to enroll in the concurrent program at Valleyfield because it provided opportunities for extended practice teaching at a variety of schools, and a wider range of experiences and knowledge than she would encounter in a one year program. In her three years at Valleyfield, she had combined her work in the Faculty of Education with studies in French and Psychology. Jean had worked with children since she was sixteen and had a strong commitment to becoming a teacher in the primary and junior divisions.

When I asked Jean to describe the high points of her experiences at Valleyfield she was quick to note that she had developed a strong sense of “confidence”. As she neared the end of her program, she felt ready to begin her career with a sense that she
would be successful:

I think when I finish I will be able to say that I am not learning to be a teacher but, "I am a teacher now".

Jean's level of confidence had developed over time. In her first two years with the program she had focused largely on practical questions. During her final year, however, she had taken the initiative to research and experiment with new ideas on her own. Jean's learning occurred through trial and error, personal reflection, and dialogue with other teacher candidates or in-service teachers. It was Jean's opinion that because all schools are different, she would have to rely on inquiry and dialogue with colleagues to develop an understanding of each setting.

Jean drew on the theme of "sharing" to describe her positive experiences at Valleyfield. She was resistant to lecture-style teaching, feeling that it led to professor-dominated learning and a narrow range of theories and practices. As an example, she described a professor who had focused exclusively on theories of whole language instruction, while neglecting to acknowledge other areas such as phonics and spelling instruction; Jean felt that there were many options for teaching language arts and therefore professors should discuss a range of options. Jean suggested that educators should provide opportunities to make learning personally relevant by allowing candidates to discuss their own ideas and practices and to develop a personal philosophy of education.

We need to be given lots of ideas and encouraged to go out and try them and then come back to class to share with other students how the theories worked in practice - to discuss what went well and what didn't. We need time to reflect on how the ideas worked.
For Jean, the importance of discussing the significance of ideas in practice was academically and personally important. I had a sense that this framework was the key strategy that she used to evaluate her experiences in the university context. As Jean noted early in our conversation: "...if you received an idea it was great, and if you were able to help someone else out you also felt good".

Jean's commitment to learning through inquiry and dialogue was strongly connected to her images of teaching. She felt that teachers' jobs were complicated by the imposition of school board mandates. It was her opinion that this strategy of top-down management over teachers' work was not only ineffective but also created a great deal of unnecessary stress in teachers' lives. Jean sensed that teaching could be an enjoyable profession, but that it would also be characterized by limited time and resources, and an unlimited set of expectations from students, parents, and school board administrators. Jean saw herself as a teacher who would have to remain open to new ideas, continue to research alternative theories and classroom strategies, and work with fellow colleagues to relieve external pressures. While Jean was open to new ideas, she also felt that as a teacher, she had the right to evaluate these ideas based on the uniqueness of her own situation. From her perspective, the diversity of each setting and each teacher's experience engendered a situation where single-minded notions of effective teaching were unnecessary and ineffective.

**Brian: Learning On my Own and with Others**

Prior to entering the Teacher Education program at Northview, Brian spent four years in the workforce, and then returned to university to complete his Master's degree
in Mathematics. The choice to pursue a career in teaching emerged over this period of six years and was the result of a great deal of soul searching:

The Master’s program went really well and it was hard to decide whether to come back this year because they were telling me I could get into the Ph.D. program...but that was hard because there are only four or five openings a year for mathematics professors. So that uncertainty was one part of the decision...I knew in teaching there would be more opportunities. I also had a strong social need to work with people and I could get that with teaching - I think I like that.

While Brian did not have much experience working with children, he drew on his work as an instructor with a tutoring centre as a starting point for learning to teach. He thought he would find both the social and technical aspects of teaching personally satisfying. Brian believed that his caring attitude, commitment to dealing with social issues such as racism, interest in community and school relationships, and commitment to creating positive learning environments for students would be his strengths for teaching in the junior and intermediate levels.

Brian began his course work in education on a whirlwind, having just completed his Master’s thesis three days before the first day of classes at Northview. Because of the quick transition, he did not have a list of expectations when he first began, and took a “wait and see” attitude. Brian sensed that his general “love for learning” would help him be open to any of the experiences that he encountered at the faculty. When I spoke with Brian he was entering the second-to-last week of courses, and as he reflected on his year at Northview, he emphasized the benefits of learning to work collaboratively with fellow candidates. In contrast to his solitary work experiences during his Master’s degree, Northview’s group focus enabled him to learn about the need for goals, structure and
open communication as strategies to facilitate effective collaboration - knowledge that he felt would be helpful for teaching where he expected to be working with people who were likely think to differently than he did.

Brian also described his feeling that professors in the program:

...want us to have a really good understanding of ourselves as learners and want us to engage in ongoing professional development.

Brian anticipated that his orientation toward lifelong learning would enable him to develop an active, reflective, and inquiry-oriented role as a teacher. With these strategies, he believed that he would be able to "zero in on what [he was] really good at as well as identifying some of the things [he] really had to work at". From Brian's standpoint, teachers could not be expected to possess all the strengths associated with ideal images of teachers. Through his learning, he had come to the conclusion that collaboration and personal reflection with a view toward improved practice would be the most crucial contributions to his effectiveness in teaching.

While Brian identified learning about collaboration as one of the high points of his experiences at the Faculty, he emphasized his preference for independent rather than group learning. He spoke often of how he took ideas and strategies learned in the classroom and reflected on them through journal writing, independent research, and one-to-one discussions with friends and teacher educators. Brian believed that the best way to learn something was "to teach it", and to approach learning through an awareness of personal interests and strengths. Nearing the end of his program, Brian felt somewhat overwhelmed by the number of theories and strategies that he had encountered. He was
frustrated by the extent to which time constraints meant that he had to suspend judgment on many of these ideas:

...we don't have a lot of time to evaluate these theories, so for myself I've had to postpone any kind of judgment or opinions on tons of these theories. I mean you hear them and you say okay, that's great, but you have to think about them. I've got to see what other research says, I've got to try it out myself.

Brian placed strong emphasis on issues of respect. He expressed his frustration with what he called the "student mentality" which left him feeling that his learning was based on a professor's "whim". It was important for Brian to feel that he was learning for himself and not for other students or professors.

Brian's individualism as a learner informed his image of himself as a teacher. When I asked how he might feel about teaching after graduation, he replied that he felt confident and would be able to "set up [his] own agenda...I won't need a principal". He viewed teaching as a career that involved numerous "hassles" but also a wide range of satisfactions. He described teachers as change agents, and emphasized that teaching carried a great deal of social responsibility - for example, to make an effort to establish connections with the community and to work to confront issues such as racism and sexism in the classroom. While he had not seen evidence of anti-bias education at the university or in his practice teaching placements, he felt that these beliefs would drive his practices in the classroom. He also believed that his sensitivity to different learning styles would be one of his strengths. He predicted that his work in the classroom would involve a great deal of "thinking on my feet". Through this image Brian conveyed his opinion that many aspects of teachers' work could not be taught through a teacher
education program. He believed that an effective teacher education program was one where candidates could learn enough about themselves to minimize the effects of their weaknesses and maximize the potential of their strengths. In other words, personal development and awareness were part and parcel of professional development.

**Sharon: Education as a Highly Personal Profession**

Sharon came to Toronto after two years of post-secondary education in Quebec. Her main goal after completing highschool was to pursue her doctorate in Psychology. However, her parents, both teachers, advised her to make sure she had an alternate route to follow should her goal to work as a psychologist be unattainable; thus, Sharon applied to study Psychology and Education concurrently at Valleyfield. She did so, however, with a number of reservations - she had very little experience with teaching, felt that she was not "born" to be a teacher, and worried that her work with the Faculty of Education would cause her to lose her focus in Psychology. Despite these apprehensions, Sharon followed through with her applications, and was surprised to receive a letter of acceptance. Because she did not have a clear image of herself as a teacher, she felt that her experiences at Valleyfield would only be the first steps toward understanding what her role as a teacher might entail:

> When I finally found out that I was accepted I was excited but there wasn't this huge driving force for me. So that is why it has taken me up until now to know what I want to do.

In entering the program, Sharon had very few explicit expectations for learning. For the first few months she drew on ideas from her parents and her own experiences of schooling to develop her initial notions of both learning and teaching. With few
preconceptions she was able to begin with an open mind, but she also felt like an outsider compared to many students in the course whom she saw as highly motivated and goal-oriented.

Without an initial set of articulated expectations, Sharon experienced her first two years of course work and practice teaching as “just going through the motions”. As she neared the end of her third year, however, she gained a sense that she had “learned a lot which [she] didn’t realize going through” the first two years. Reflecting on her experiences over the three years, Sharon described how things were beginning to fall into place:

I am just now getting a focus on what I want to do and establishing my philosophies on things.

Learning at Valleyfield was a first step in what Sharon viewed as a long process of personal and professional development. Teacher education had provided a “taste of a lot of different things”: with this grounding, it was now up to her to develop her own philosophy of education.

Emphasis on the development of her own philosophy of teaching influenced Sharon’s evaluation of learning in the classroom. Like Brian, Sharon indicated that independent research, reflection and practice were the most effective strategies for her growth as a teacher. Over the course of three years, a focus on anti-bias education allowed Sharon to identify “definite ideas about what [she] wanted to do” as a teacher.

For Sharon, education was a very personal activity, and therefore learning to teach was best facilitated when professors allowed candidates to bring their own
interests into the learning environment, to explore and question their own notions of learning and teaching. Sharon described an ideal learning model:

I think it would be beneficial if we had a lot more independent study opportunities - give us a basic topic that needs to be covered but let us bring our own interests into it.

She also suggested that course work would be more effective if candidates had more time to interact on a one-to-one basis with teacher educators:

...because the nature of the program is so personal, you need to communicate well with a person. It isn't like you are just doing assignments.

From Sharon's perspective it was important that candidates had some choice in defining the details of the content and contexts of their learning. She also suggested that candidates should be able to choose the educators they worked with in pursuing a self-defined program. It was her feeling that “you can't learn it all without doing it...without having to be totally independent about it”. Like Brian, Sharon advocated a model that worked to challenge the “student mentality”. She was committed to the idea that candidates should not be made to feel “powerless” while learning about an activity that was so personal.

When I asked Sharon to reflect on her image of teachers, she was quick to assert a belief that “what you bring as a person to teaching is the most important thing”. Sharon understood herself as “more of an academic” and was not willing to undertake some of the tasks that she associated with a traditional image of teachers:

I always said to myself that there is no way I am going to go home and cut out pumpkins or ghosts...

Because she did not see herself fitting into a “standard” image of teachers, she believed
she would need more time than other candidates to reconcile her personal and professional goals. At the end of her three year program, Sharon felt that she was "nowhere near being a teacher", and that she “had a lot more growing to do” before she could claim ownership of an image of herself as a teacher. Sharon still had a strong desire to pursue her goals in the field of psychology and was investigating the possibility of graduate work in the area of educational psychology. While she was somewhat frustrated by aspects of the program where specific models of teaching were, in her opinion, imposed on candidates - she felt she had learned a great deal, and now it would be her personal responsibility to decide where she wanted to go with her learning after she graduated.

Mary: “I Knew I Would Get an Education on How to Teach”

Mary entered her Teacher Education program with a background in math, statistics and business administration. Mary grew up in South-East Asia, and in the course of receiving her undergraduate and Master's degrees had studied at two American universities. When we spoke, she had just received information that she would be moving to the South Pacific, where her partner had received a post-Doctoral research fellowship.

Mary had lost her career interest of working in a corporate setting and had developed an interest in teaching. Like Brian, she had gone through a lot of “soul searching” and realized that she had always enjoyed working with children and adults. She had not expected to get accepted when she applied to the program at Northview because she had little formal teaching experience. Nonetheless, Mary took a chance and applied.
From the outset, Mary expected to "get an education on how to teach". As a foreign student:

I was hoping to at least understand how the system here works and to be given sufficient training to teach in a North American school... My expectations were that whatever I did here would be transferable anywhere.

Reflecting on her experiences over the year, however, Mary described her learning in much less pragmatic terms. Her course work and practice teaching had "opened up a lot of thoughts and thinking" and had given her "more exposure in public schools" than she had expected. With her orientation toward learning through reflection, she had been able to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of a variety of theories and strategies. She had also grown personally in terms of understanding her capabilities and initial limitations as a teacher. Mary had learned to question, reflect, to become more "self critical", and had gained the confidence to "think in terms of taking risks and doing new things". From her perspective, course directors "really wanted people to think about what works and what doesn't work" from a theoretical, practical and personal perspective.

Given her experiences of education outside of Canada, Mary believed that a stronger emphasis on comparative international models of education might have enhanced her understanding of education in Ontario:

...it would be nice if they could show more models of how education is done in different countries. So when they talk about standardized testing and competing globally they also need to show teachers here how teachers in other countries are trained and how kids there are taught, just to get that perspective.

In addition to a balance between local and international models of education, Mary
emphasized the value of a balance between individual and group learning experiences in the classroom. At the root of Mary's notions of effective learning was the all-encompassing idea that learning had to be personally relevant. Mary's most positive experiences took place in courses that were "open-ended" enough to allow candidates to decide for themselves "this I can take and this I cannot take". She also described the benefits of working in groups, but was frustrated by her sense that "people are having different experiences but we don't hear enough about them".

I asked Mary to describe the image of learning and teaching that she had developed through her experiences in Ontario. Compared to her experiences in South-East Asia, Mary sensed that teaching in Ontario was strongly influenced by politics. Issues such as standardized testing and cutbacks in resource support to areas such as special education meant that teachers in Toronto were "stressed out a lot both physically and emotionally". In addition:

[y]ou have the worry about kids not having food...about physical abuse and neglect. I find that this is over consuming. Whereas back home kids are stressed out about standardized tests and how parents are pushing them. But people think that kids should not have to worry about anything but school - they don't worry about their next meal and they are given all the comforts.

As she neared the end of her program, Mary frequently found herself comparing Toronto schools to the systems she had experienced as a student, and trying to reconcile the highly regimented system that she had experienced through her own education with the active learning models that she was learning about at Northview. After weighing the pros and cons of what she referred to as Eastern and Western models of education, she
believed that there was room to integrate both models. From her perspective, it would be most effective for elementary education to focus on drills and testing (Eastern) with later learning in secondary schools shifting toward problem solving and active learning models (Western). Mary's awareness of different models of education made her keenly aware of the role of culture in definitions of teaching and learning. She had started her program at Northview with the expectation that her learning would be transferable to any context, but now felt that she would need time to adjust to the culture before accepting a teaching position after her move to the South Pacific. Like Jean, Mary's image of teaching was strongly informed by a sense that each school and classroom was unique within a broader cultural context, and that she would have to draw on her personal and professional knowledge to be a successful teacher.

Summary

Each of the foregoing narratives illustrate how teacher candidates' personal biographies interact with their experiences of teacher education to create particular understandings of effective learning, teaching, and learning to teach. In the course of their studies, each candidate had compared their own notions of teaching with the images that they encountered through coursework and practice teaching. Candidates' senses of their roles as learners had allowed them to articulate their personal notions of effective content and contexts as they related to their development as successful teachers.

In contrast to the narrow image of pragmatism projected in much of the literature on teacher education, candidates' stories of learning to teach suggest that the search for practical teaching strategies was only one of the many discoveries that each made during
their experiences of a one or three year program. When read together, the narratives illustrate how teacher candidates come from very different backgrounds that include a variety of work, educational and emotional - "soul searching" - experiences. Likewise, each candidate entered his or her program with different expectations. Some, like Mary, who knew she would "get an education on how to teach", had very mechanistic notions of what they would learn. Others, such as Linda, did not quite know what to expect when they began their first day of classes.

Regardless of initial expectations, all seven candidates were able to clearly identify their most significant learning experiences in their programs. Jean and Carol described how they had gained a strong sense of confidence; Jennifer noted how her interest in early primary schooling had expanded to include a new understanding and interest in the upper primary and junior panels; and Linda described how the program had changed her perspective on teaching from a teacher-directed model to one which emphasized cooperative education. Mary and Brian both felt they had gained a clearer understanding of their strengths and weaknesses as teachers, while Sharon felt that she had learned a great deal in a general sense, but was still felt "nowhere near being a teacher". Nearing the final weeks of their programs, each candidate was also able to articulate their ideas about effective learning contexts. These notions ranged from an emphasis on individual study to a sense that learning was most beneficial when it took place in a group context. For all candidates, the need to see the personal relevance of their learning was of utmost importance. A second theme which also ran throughout my conversations with all candidates directed attention toward the sense that candidates
needed time to reflect on their learning. While some (such as Brian and Sharon) wanted time to reflect on their own, others (such as Jennifer and Jean), emphasized the value of having time to dialogue with other candidates in an attempt to make sense of, and evaluate new ideas and activities that were taken up in the classroom.

Each candidate had developed ideal notions of themselves as teachers which they compared against their experiences of teaching during practice teaching placements. While they described teachers' work as a complex and stressful occupation, where teachers struggled with the expectations of students, fellow colleagues, principals, school board administrators, and government policies, each candidate maintained an image of themselves as being able to work with, or overcome, these obstacles. Personal strengths -- a caring attitude or a sense of enjoyment in working with children -- would assist them in maintaining their commitment to a career as teachers. All candidates had developed a view of themselves as lifelong learners and asserted that teacher education, while not enabling them to feel completely prepared, had provided them with enough knowledge to continue their development as effective teachers. For Jean and Carol, a teaching career was something that they wanted to pursue right away although others (such as Jennifer, Mary, and Brian), were uncertain as to when they would be ready to enter the classroom. Finally, for Sharon, the end of the teacher education program at Valleyfield might have also signaled the end to her journey as a teacher.

**A Learning Debate**

While not taken up in detail thus far, the above narratives provide clues to the tensions that candidates experienced in negotiating an understanding of their own ideas
while participating in a range of learning activities and interacting with the variety of perspectives introduced by teacher educators and fellow candidates. Like my interviews with teacher educators, conversations with teacher candidates indicated a number of strains that emerged as common elements in each candidate's experience of teacher education. As discussed in this section, three issues recurred in my reading of interview transcripts. First, candidates felt the quality of their learning was influenced by teacher educators' perspectives and their teaching strategies in the classroom. From this standpoint, candidates expected instructors to act as role models in the classroom, and felt that they should also provide clear guidelines for learning. The candidates also described their expectations concerning course content. Captured under the second heading "specificity and variety", this theme reflected candidates' desire for educators to provide specific information on a variety of topics. Thirdly, each candidate discussed the importance of classroom activities, which allowed them to evaluate new ideas from a personal perspective, through dialogue and personal reflection. Taken together, candidates' reflections on these three issues suggest an ideal learning model for teacher education which is presented in closing to this section.

**It All Depends on the Professor**

I think most education programs are the same. It always depends on the [professor] - it makes such a big difference it is crazy. (Sharon)

Sharon's emphasis on the role that teacher educators play in effecting the success and/or failure of a course was similar to sentiments expressed by all seven candidates during our interviews. While Sharon's comment was more dramatic than most, it was also
indicative of candidates’ sense that many of the positive and negative aspects of a course could be captured in reflecting on the role that teacher educators played in defining the content and contexts of learning. As outlined in Chapter Four, Janice, Paula, Jeff, and Janet viewed candidates’ expectations as important aspects of their work in planning and implementing events in the classroom. In my interviews with teacher candidates, I discovered the other side of the coin: each candidate voiced her or his opinion that educators’ perspectives and strategies for teaching also had a strong impact on their experiences of learning to teach.

Practicing what they preach

In their efforts to understand new ideas introduced through coursework and practice teaching, many of the teacher candidates had high expectations of teacher educators to model strategies as part of their role in university classrooms. As noted by Mary, for instance, “they are teaching us to be teachers so they should show us a good model of how to teach!” A number of Mary’s instructors had spent a considerable amount of time discussing the advantages of cooperative education and child-centered learning. However, they “lost it” - contradicted themselves - when they then proceeded to lecture on topics that they had chosen without any input from candidates. In a similar but positive vein, Carol offered an image of an ideal instructor who had communicated her expectations clearly and acted “just like a teacher would in the classroom”. Carol’s model instructor “practiced what she preached” and modeled what Carol felt were effective classroom strategies. Linda on the other hand, described her frustration with her instructor’s approaches to facilitating groupwork. In her opinion, candidates had just
been thrown into groups and expected to know how to work effectively with cooperative learning strategies. As a candidate who had never experienced cooperative groupwork, Linda noted with frustration that “groups just don’t work like that...do you expect students in a school environment to just pick up and immediately work well in groups?” As Linda increased her knowledge of cooperative strategies, she came to understand that students needed to be taught the skills of effective groups and that group dynamics emerged over time. With an enhanced sense of ideal strategies for groupwork, Linda was able to evaluate her own experiences as insufficient. On a similar note, Sharon described how she felt that some educators had taught her “more about how not to teach rather than how to teach”. When I suggested that she might feel this way because she was beginning to develop her own approaches to teaching, Sharon agreed. She also added, however, that in her experiences with some instructors, “we were waiting for them to say... ‘now what I have done this semester you should not do with your students’”. Finally, a statement that captured the sentiment that educators should “practice what they preach” was expressed by Jean - “[they] tell us to do that when working with children, so they should also do the same!”

**Clear expectations for learning**

Some candidates also communicated their feeling that it was important for instructors to outline expectations for candidates’ learning and to remain consistent with their expectations. Sharon, for example, felt that a “good” instructor was one who communicated his or her expectations clearly and supported their ideals for candidates’ learning through their own practices. Likewise, Jennifer described the importance of
understanding the perspectives that educators brought to their work, so that she could be aware of what was expected of her in her role as a student:

They need to be more specific - they have to develop a philosophy themselves about what they want to teach in terms of what they want teacher candidates to walk away with...Yes they believe in the whole child, child centered and holistic approaches - I got that sense but they never said that to us.

A desire to understand educators' expectations was intimately related to each candidate's attempt to negotiate their position as learners within the student-teacher relationship. As illustrated in Chapter Four, Paula and Jeff emphasized their commitment to a negotiated curriculum as a strategy for balancing their own objectives with the needs of students. Linda had experienced this strategy in her work with Jeff at Northview. From Linda's perspective, this strategy had been ineffective because it left her feeling unclear about the direction of the course and therefore about the direction of her own learning:

I guess I am used to more structure. I realize that you have to adjust to fit the needs of your students - on the other hand, presumably they knew in advance what they should have been giving us...[T]hey never really seem to know what they are supposed to be doing.

Mary also noted that many of her instructors at Northview were committed to being flexible and adaptable. While Mary supported this commitment, she too felt that it was frustrating for students because it left them feeling that there was no direction in the course:

...they have the experience and they know which topics are important...[Professors] get so caught up in writing and trying to get tenure that they forget they are teaching us to be teachers so they should show us a good model of how to teach... and that is where they lost it, that is when I became a bit disenchanted.
In working to establish a sense of where they “fit in” as learners, these candidates appeared to expect their instructors to provide a clear structure for the content of and contexts for learning. Each candidate was quick to insist in their own way that they did not expect educators to take responsibility for candidates' sense of achievement. At the same time, however, each conveyed a strong belief that, to some degree, “...it always depends on the prof” (Sharon).

**Specificity And Variety - Expectations in Learning to Teach**

As a researcher I initially struggled with the tensions that I felt were inherent in many candidates’ attempts to make sense of their expectations for learning through coursework. While each candidate desired educators to provide structure and specificity to their learning, they wanted to learn about a wide variety of topics in a setting where dialogue and student-directed activities prevailed as the key contexts for learning activities. I first interpreted these expectations as contradictory. On one hand, some candidates wanted educators to direct their learning and on another, they wanted educators to step back so that candidates to take ownership of their own learning. Over time, however, I began to understand that expectations for specificity and variety were related to many candidate’s sense that in order to deal with the complexities of teaching, they would need to understand a wide range of topics and strategies. Further, in their attempts to negotiate personal understandings of what it means to teach, a number of candidates came to their courses with the hopes that they would learn the details or specifics of many or a variety of models for teaching so that they themselves could fashion their own sense of what it means to be an effective teacher. In this section the tensions
between “specificity” and “variety”, as they were communicated by the five of the seven teacher candidates, is taken up in detail to illustrate one aspect of candidates’ attempts to define effective teacher education.

**Specificity**

In one sense, a desire for “specificity” was related to the pragmatic concerns of some teacher candidates. In this context, “specificity” was defined through candidates’ desires for concrete examples of theories presented in class. Jennifer, for instance, described how she wanted to know how to implement Ontario’s new Common Curriculum guidelines:

> I think they have to get more specific...[I]t is a common question of people to say “I have this to teach now tell me how to teach it”. I think even with teachers this is a common question...It would be nice if they gave student teachers access to curriculum guidelines...we were given the Common Curriculum last year but we hardly looked at it. It is nice to go out and see programs - to have speakers come in and give you a general idea but you go out [into schools] and the first thing you need are the specifics.

In another sense, Jean indicated that learning should move from general learning around topic areas such as math or science, toward specific learning around a more eclectic range of topics or questions that candidates wanted to know more about as they neared the end of their programs. At the end of her final year at Valleyfield, Jean reflected on the possibility that “third year should be more specific to tie up loose ends or unanswered questions”. For Mary, “specific” learning was connected to her desire for focused learning:

> We should have done more on unit planning, more on integrated units, group work and lesson plans. These areas were rushed and we needed more time for hands-on activity... they should have been more focused - they introduced a lot but then never went anywhere with it.
In my discussions with both Brian and Sharon I understood further how notions of specific learning were related to understanding the direct connections between theory and practice. As noted by Sharon, “the theoretical is nice but there is just so much of it that we don’t focus on the practical”. In turn, Brian felt that many of his fellow candidates had difficulties in making specific connections from abstract (theoretical) to concrete (practical) ideas. He did not experience this tension in his own learning but he did assume that other candidates expected educators to make these connections:

So...here is theory and here is the research on the effects of these strategies so there is a concrete example to show the connection between theory and practice. I’m sure we could find lots of examples from what we have done this year...But as I said before a lot of people are uncomfortable with ideas in general. They are not comfortable with abstract ideas. I am because I have dealt with abstract ideas, and in a very sophisticated way, so I have no problem dealing with theory period. But a lot of people do and we come from diverse backgrounds...

Captured in Brian’s final sentence is the reality that teacher candidates enter teacher education with diverse backgrounds. Therefore it is possible that they will employ different notions of what “specificity” might mean according to the context of their own learning. In one way or another, specificity appears to imply clarity or a sense of focus. Like the expectations that some candidates held for educators, many candidates also indicated that an understanding of the specific details of content and events in the classroom was important to their attempts to understand how their learning related to their own unique experiences of learning to teach.
Variety

Notions of specificity took on numerous meanings in relation to the content and learning contexts which candidates experienced. In contrast, many candidate’s expectations for variety were more consistent across the collected interviews. Brian related an example of the variety of elements that contributed to his understanding of cooperative learning and working environments:

As a teacher there is cooperation with your staff as being crucial to a school’s success or a school’s effectiveness. And then of course in order to teach cooperative learning to the kids you have to have a good understanding of it. So, there is that aspect and then there are the students that we are going to be working with - we will have to cooperate with them all the time...[T]here is working with parents and also, teachers should look to be more collaborative with professionals in the community. So there is that dimension as well.

In his experiences at Northview, Brian encountered the variety of ways in which cooperation and collaboration could work to inform his abilities as a teacher. From other candidates’ perspectives, however, their experiences were characterized by a lack of variety because instructors tended to emphasize one set of strategies or ideas to the exclusion of others.

Sharon felt that some instructors presented narrow images of teaching by keeping to a narrow range of topics and implying that they were guarantees to becoming a successful teacher:

I have a sense that we are kind of taught that “if you do this it will work”...[T]hey don’t say that “this is what you must do” but, they also don’t say “you could do this, and you could be that and if you this too, it is okay”. I have had the sense of
being a fringe person the whole time, the sense that I was doing it all wrong throughout...like "maybe one day I will get it". But no, now I know I have always [understood] it, but I was just doing it differently and that is all right.”

Similarly, Jean noted “each school and each class is different and therefore you need to know about all of these different strategies”, in order to be able to adapt to each new situation. With this idea in mind, Jean explained her resistance to educators who expected candidates to conform to particular or single-minded images of effective teaching - “it was difficult when we knew it was [their] way or the highway”.

The desire to explore a variety of topics was strongly connected to some candidate’s experiences of practice teaching. In other words, the variety of ideas and strategies that they observed in associate schools provided a framework to guide many candidate’s expectations for learning in the university classroom. In one of her practice teaching placements Jennifer, for instance, had encountered information on new standards for evaluation and assessment that had been introduced in conjunction with Ontario’s new curriculum guidelines. From her perspective, the strategies outlined in Ministry documents were significantly different than those that she was learning through university coursework. Jennifer maintained that candidates needed “to be given different models and different theories”:

[i]f that is going to be something that is going to be expected of teachers once they go out, then we should look at the different techniques to use...there is no way that you can teach everything...but I do have a problem with how a lot of it is being taught from the same perspective.
Evaluating Ideas from a Personal Perspective

As depicted in the above section, some candidates appear to carry some highly mechanistic expectations into their coursework at the university. Many want educators to act as role models and expect them to cover the details of a wide range of topics. But, the desire for specific knowledge of a variety of ideas was only a first step in most candidates' approach to learning. As a second step, each candidate described how she/he undertook to evaluate ideas so that they could understand how coursework related to their personal notions of effective teaching. In other words, while candidates wanted specific information, they did not want to be told how to teach. All wanted to encounter a wide range of ideas but also wanted to reserve their right to choose which ideas would be most relevant in their attempts to define personal approaches to teaching. The key strategy used by the seven candidates to understand the personal relevance of a topic was - as discussed by candidates themselves - established through opportunities for dialogue and personal reflection. In describing an ideal learning model, candidates highlighted the importance of sharing and engaging in dialogue, so that the ideas presented by educators could be clarified, evaluated, and contextualized by personal perspectives and experiences.

Each candidate emphasized their belief in the value of learning from other candidates. Jennifer, for instance, recalled how she had spent a great deal of time planning for her practice teaching placements and had experienced varying levels of success in implementing her ideas in the classroom. From her standpoint, these were significant experiences and she felt that class time should have been structured to allow
candidates to share and discuss their experiences of “what works and what doesn’t work”.

Similarly, Mary noted that groupwork had played a large role in candidates’ experiences of their coursework at Northview. She explained, however, that many groups had experienced difficulties during the first months as they attempted to understand the dynamics and structure of groupwork. From Mary’s perspective the problems experienced in group activities might have been “more manageable” if candidates had been given time to help each other:

[the professors] should have taken more leadership - like let’s do some sharing. Pick a representative and have them discuss what was happening in the groups so that each could take ownership of their own situation. So if one group is doing something really great but another group’s dynamics are not good we could all listen and maybe say “well maybe you are doing this wrong” or “maybe you could try doing this”. But if there is no sharing going on amongst the groups during this structured time then you have lost that input.

Jean had formed a number of close ties with candidates that she worked with during practice teaching placements and noted that they spent time talking and sharing their ideas. She remained committed to the idea that “the program should structure sharing time for students who teach similar grades”. Sharon also believed that time for both sharing and independent reflection were essential to facilitate candidates’ exploration of new ideas introduced through coursework or practice teaching.

Brian emphasized dialogue as a means of counteracting the effects of learning through teacher-directed lectures.

We have some classes where it is a room of thirty and the instructor just talks and we don’t engage in any dialogue. And if someone asks a question they answer it in a way which doesn’t invite any further dialogue at all. It is very boring.

Linda also described a similar experience in an educational psychology course:
There were a lot of assumptions being made and they were not being questioned - there was no discussion. He would talk and talk and then have us do activities that were used by different [teachers]...sometimes it was like, “why are we doing this?”.

In contrast to Brian and Linda’s experiences, Jennifer recalled her enjoyment of a second year course where candidates discussed and shared their ideas on a number of topics. These events were “high” points in Jennifer’s experiences:

We would all sit together and there would be a workshop say on children’s literature, and everyone would bring in or the professor would bring in a bunch of books, and we would all look at them in a group and decide how we would integrate it in the different grades. Or we would get together before our practice teaching blocks - groups would get together and share ideas...There are not enough opportunities for that.

A Learning Model

The above excerpts of my interviews with teacher candidates emphasize candidates’ negative experiences of their courses. This, however, does not indicate that the candidates were critical of all educators, or of all their courses. In many cases candidates evaluated their learning experiences very positively. Moreover, it was my sense that this negativity might be related to the interview process: candidates could communicate their ideas more forcefully from a critical standpoint. Negative and/or frustrating learning experiences became a window through which I could view candidates’ notions of positive and/or enabling contexts for learning. In reading all seven interviews together I was able to create a basic image of an ideal cycle of learning as it emerged from candidates’ explanations of their experiences in learning to teach. As an ideal, teacher candidates desired contexts where educators provided specific information on a variety of topics with an emphasis on balancing theory with concrete or practical ideas. Following this level of introductory learning, each candidate wanted time to
develop their own understanding of topics through discussions with other candidates. As a third step, candidates felt that they needed to “try out” new ideas and/or needed time for personal reflection to see how ideas taken up in class could apply to their own ideals for effective teaching. Through this process of evaluating or testing the relevance of new learning, candidates hoped to gain an understanding of how their experiences of learning to teach could be translated into concrete frameworks, to guide their understanding of and practices for their future careers as teachers.

In reading all seven interviews, I also gained a sense that candidates’ expectations of their programs were highly similar to the expectations that each had established for themselves as learners. Like the ideas presented in class, candidates viewed their own notions of effective learning and teaching as partial, open to evaluation, and likely to change over time through a cycle of learning. To test the validity of their own ideas, candidates relied on a process like the one outlined above. They evaluated and reflected on their ideas, were eager to share them with fellow candidates, and to “test” their thinking through practice. In this sense, candidates were probing their own ideas in order to see if they would be valid frameworks to guide their theoretical and practical approaches to effective teaching for the future.
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On Learning

Opportunities for Learning

It was my finding that the candidate-teacher educator relationship was at the heart of teacher candidates' notions of effective teacher education. This relationship, however, was only one of many that each candidate drew on in fashioning images of learning and teaching. Candidates also valued opportunities to learn from each other, from associate teachers, and from "the kids" that they encountered during practice teaching placements. In addition, candidates drew on various strategies to enhance their knowledge of teaching and learning, through research (self-directed reading), inquiry (school based investigations of topics such as classroom management), and self-reflection (journal writing, daily logs). In other words, teacher candidates profited from the wide range of resources and people that they encountered during university- and school-based learning.

Each candidate took the initiative to profit from learning from people around them; each had devised numerous strategies to enhance their learning and to understand the personal relevance of ideas that they encountered through coursework and practice teaching. This initiative stands in sharp contrast to the images conveyed through the traditional discourse which posit that teacher candidates are highly dependent on teacher educators and do not "take responsibility for their own learning" (Katz and Raths, 1992: 379). While Sharon described how the dynamics of any given course were dependent on the professor, for instance, she also insisted that candidates also had to contribute to their own learning:
...to blame the program is wrong - if it isn’t meeting your needs it is your responsibility to deal with it on your own. That is the reality of it. There is no way that they can meet everyone’s needs in the program - that is impossible.

Similarly, while Jean expressed her disappointment about the limited amount of time spent discussing strategies for student evaluation and assessment, she recognized that all topics could not be covered in depth and conducted her own further research on the topic, collecting resources and speaking with various staff members during her practice teaching placement. As Jean noted, “I had to take the initiative myself” to find answers to her outstanding questions.

One aspect of taking personal responsibility for learning surfaced as candidates discussed how some of their key learning experiences emerged from interactions with pupils during practice teaching placements. Both Carol and Brian felt that their own learning was intimately tied to an understanding of how children in particular classrooms learn. Carol asked pupils to evaluate their own learning through response sheets and combined this information with her own self-evaluations so that she could improve both the learning and teaching opportunities in future lessons. Likewise, Brian discussed a process of working to understand the “connection between our own development as learners and kids’ development as learners”. In addition to his belief that every learner (himself included) had a unique learning style, Brian also felt that each person had many strengths and weaknesses. From his perspective, therefore, learning to become a teacher was a process of working to understand how to “exploit” his personal strengths while also attempting to “improve” on his weak points. Like Carol’s approach, Brian believed that self-evaluation and reflection would assist him in this aspect of his
development as a teacher.

Lifelong Learning

A second element connected to candidates' sense of learning through their own initiative emerged in the context of discussions about lifelong learning. Candidates did not foresee graduation as the end of their development as teachers. While Carol felt confident about "taking up her first teaching position", she also believed that teaching was an occupation characterized by on-going change and predicted that she would "have to keep learning" throughout her career. Linda had learned a lot through coursework and practice teaching but also had a sense that her learning had just begun. She described herself as someone who "believes in continuing education" and felt that she would return to the university on many occasions throughout her career for additional qualification courses. Finally, Mary discussed how her experiences at Northview had allowed her to learn strategies that she could use in the future as both a teacher and a learner:

I think their overall goal is to just scratch the surface...[T]here is so much more learning that we have to do on our own...The training allows us to at least question and reflect and figure out what we can do. To know what we can do and what we can improve. To get us to be more introspective about how we fit and to observe others and decide what we like and don't like and to be more self critical...they really want people to think about what works.

Despite the number of tensions that candidates identified in regards to the content and contexts of learning in their respective programs, each also believed that experiences in the university classroom were only part of the wide range of learning opportunities that they had or would encounter in their development as teachers. In contrast to Katz and
Rath's (1992) opinion that candidates' needs are based on dependency, my encounters with these seven teacher candidates left me with a sense that a great deal of learning takes place outside of the candidate-teacher educator relationship. I felt that I was dealing with seven independent, resourceful, and reflective people who strongly believed in the ongoing interaction between learning and teaching.

**Conclusion**

Authors such as Britzman (1986) and Haigh and Katters (1984) maintain that it is difficult to establish unitary definitions of effective teaching. Similarly, Knowles, Cole and Presswood (1994) argue:

> Because of its complexity, teaching is informed by multiple forms of knowledge and is representative of a variety of ways of knowing...In the context of teaching and learning there are no completely generalizable rules, laws or theories. Human behaviour is far too idiosyncratic, complex and unpredictable. (3,5)

Despite these arguments, researchers working within the traditional paradigm of effectiveness consistently maintain that educators need to uncover a common understanding of "appropriate" teacher beliefs, skills, and knowledge. Once uncovered, educators are expected to fashion a coherent program which will challenge the pragmatic perspectives and dependency needs of candidates, and mold them into effective teachers. Within this neatly organized framework, teacher candidates are relegated to a peripheral position in the process of effective learning. Their role is passive - to learn from the "experts".

Data collected through interviews with four teacher educators and seven teacher candidates suggest that the "impact" model described above was the exception rather
than the rule in the courses at Northview, Valleyfield, and Bellampton. The various sections of this chapter have illustrated that learning to teach is significantly more complex than the simple impact of teacher educators’ work on teacher candidates. In all seven interviews, candidates voiced their resistance to an image of themselves and their fellow candidates as passive learners unable to define the possibilities for their own learning. Each candidate offered an account of how they were actively and intimately involved in bringing together their own ideas about effective learning and teaching with those that they encountered, through a variety of experiences in their respective programs. For each candidate, learning to teach was fashioned through their interaction with a dynamic collection of people, places, events, and ideas. The end result of these interactions was the enhancement of each candidate’s personal understanding of what it means to learn and teach in the context of learning to teach.

In section one, seven narratives were organized around four themes to highlight how each candidate’s background experiences, initial expectations of their programs, positive and negative experiences, and images of teaching contributed to their evaluations of and expectations for their learning in Curriculum and Instruction courses. Candidates drew on a wide range of background experiences and their varied experiences of learning to teach to describe their expectations for their Bachelor of Education programs: to develop a sense of what they could contribute to and learn from a teaching career, to identify an initial set of expectations for their teacher education program, and to establish a personal sense of how they would interact as learners and teacher candidates in university- and school-based settings. Some candidates, such as Mary,
drew on personal experiences of schooling at the elementary, secondary, post-secondary and graduate levels to understand their experiences of learning to teach. For others, such as Carol and Jennifer, work experiences in social work and early childhood education were sources of information in making the transition to a new career. Finally, for Sharon and Linda, a lack of teaching experience contributed to a feeling that they could not understand the significance of their learning as deeply as they wished. Prior experiences helped each candidate to define individual areas of interest and was a point from which they could understand the personal relevance of their learning experiences.

A fourth theme that was taken up in the narratives focused on the "highs" and "lows" of each candidate's experiences at Northview, Valleyfield or Bellhampton. Some candidates discovered new interests and skills, some valued their increased sense of confidence, and others, such as Sharon, discovered that they might prefer to pursue goals for work in another field. All seven candidates spoke of how they had learned to be self-reflective, and had developed a sense of lifelong learning. In reflecting on the "low" points of their experiences, candidates were also able to identify a number of tensions that emerged as their own expectations met with those of fellow candidates and teacher educators in their programs. In particular, each candidate described their own learning styles and personal images of the ideal content and contexts for learning to teach. While candidates such as Jean and Sharon wanted to learn about a wide range of issues, classroom strategies, and education theories, Linda emphasized that she would have preferred specific information on the practical or day-to-day tasks of teaching. Finally, other candidates expressed a more topic-specific set of expectations, such as the study of
comparative international education, anti-bias education, and/or developmental theories of language acquisition. In addition to content, the data revealed the different ways in which candidates defined ideal learning contexts. While the majority of candidates spoke of their preference for interactive and hands-on learning, there were also numerous references to the importance of independent learning and self-reflection.

In section two, I presented a review of teacher candidates' expectations of teacher educators and their reflections on the ideal content and contexts for learning in Curriculum and Instruction courses. There was a common expectation that teacher educators should "practice what they preach" and provide candidates with clear guidelines for learning. Candidates also expressed their preference for learning environments where educators presented specific information on a variety of topics and then allowed candidates to evaluate new ideas through sharing and dialogue in small groups. Through the combination of specific information and open-ended discussion, candidates felt that they could work to understand the personal relevance of ideas and strategies in terms of their own notions of effective learning and teaching. They also described how they took advantage of the extensive range of content, contexts, and personalities that they had encountered in their one or three years of teacher education. With each interaction, their personal understandings of who they were as lifelong learners and teachers was enhanced. Each candidate had many outstanding questions about teaching, as well as ongoing questions about their roles as learners. Overall, however, each candidate's narrative suggested that learning to teach was an ongoing process - through their experiences in the Faculties of Education at Northview, Valleyfield, and Bellhampton, each had barely scratched the surface of their own
learning. From there on, each was prepared to take hold of this learning as a starting point for establishing personal notions of effective teaching and learning in their future role as teachers.
CHAPTER SIX
CONCLUSION

What if teacher education began from the assumption that a great deal of its work is to produce debate, multiple perspectives on events, practices, and effects, creative dialogue on practices, and a more negotiational and hence active stance within learning and teaching? (Bellhampton Faculty of Education - Academic Framework Discussion Paper, 1995:12)

Introduction

A recurring theme in the chapters of this thesis indicates that there are “multiple ways of knowing” or understanding the meaning of effectiveness in teacher education. From the outset, I believed that understanding teacher educators’ and candidates’ experiences of the day-to-day dynamics of learning to teach might inform a broader discussion of how best to define and facilitate effective teacher education. In response to many researchers’ reliance on a generally functionalist paradigm of effectiveness, this study has worked with an interpretive framework to understand four seconded educators’ and seven candidates’ senses of effective learning and teaching in the contexts of three university-based teacher education programs. As outlined in Chapter One, the central question which guided this “search for meanings” was:

How do teacher educators and teacher candidates involved in the day-to-day realities of learning to teach define and evaluate effectiveness in teacher education?

In this concluding chapter I return to the above question and offer a number of reflections on the results of my attempts to compare the traditional “search for mechanisms” with a “search for meanings”. Like the quotation that opens this chapter, the following discussion investigates how a focus on diversity or multiplicity might influence future
the following discussion investigates how a focus on diversity or multiplicity might influence future attempts to theorize about the process of learning to teach. With the limitations of this study in mind, I also consider how images of the highly personal, interactive, and dynamic nature of teacher education might influence the practices of educators and candidates as they attempt to negotiate between diverse notions of effectiveness at local faculties of education.

In the first section of this chapter, I briefly review the key findings of this study in order to establish a framework for the discussions that will follow. In section two, I draw on these findings to analyze how they contribute to an understanding of the process of learning to teach. Organized around the recurring themes of diversity, complexity and negotiation, this section highlights the commonalities and differences of four educators' and seven candidates' understandings of learning and teaching at Northview, Valleyfield, and Bellhampton. Section three moves forward to discuss the implications of this study. In conclusion, I return to statements made in Chapter One, to contemplate how a combination of the "search for mechanisms" and "meanings" might contribute to a broader range of possibilities for theorizing about effectiveness in teacher education.

**A “Search for Meanings”: Key Findings**

**Contexts for Teaching and Learning**

Observations and informal interviews conducted in three Curriculum and Instruction courses indicated a wide range of roles, activities, topics, and contextual features that contributed to teaching and learning in each course. These data also supported a discussion of how the day-to-day events in each setting were shaped by
factors such as time, space, class size, the length of programs, and program organization. Course foci, such as the integration of theory, knowledge, skills, and attitudes of "successful teaching", were shown to be broadly similar across programs. Key outcomes such as the development of an understanding of reflective and collaborative practices, were also identified in a general sense, as common to each course. In reflecting on my observations of the practical outcomes of stated foci and objectives, I described how each objective was implemented in unique ways in the different contexts surrounding each course.

Teaching

Teaching and learning encounters emerged as teacher educators met with thirty five, ninety-five or one hundred and twenty teacher candidates. In these settings, I observed and recorded the variety of ways that educators carried out their work, both inside and outside of the classroom. All four educators discussed a variety of topics, facilitated whole and small-group activities, acted as role models in demonstrating teaching strategies, solicited feedback, clarified information for candidates, and participated in a range of faculty related responsibilities such as staff meetings. Educators managed, clarified, negotiated, encouraged, informed, interacted, assisted, modeled, and offered what I considered to be an exciting number of opportunities for candidates to learn in a range of contexts. Direct or structured learning with educators at the front of the classroom "instructing" teacher candidates was the exception rather than the rule in all three courses.
Learning

As an observer and occasional participant, I positioned myself among the teacher candidates in each classroom. From this vantage point I noticed how candidates integrated social and academic interests in the classroom. In this easy-going environment, candidates took on many active roles, both participating and contributing to the dynamics of learning. Candidates were actively involved in asking questions, discussing and offering ideas, and negotiating their roles in large and small group activities. Candidates’ contributions to classroom events were formidable - they offered general “tips” for teaching such as developing classroom management strategies and presented theoretical and practical considerations on topics ranging from conflict resolution in the playground to computer literacy in the classroom. A “considerable amount of groupwork” distinguished learning events in each class. In small and large group activities candidates had opportunities to share, apply, create, respond, evaluate, and plan around a range of topics.

Personal Perspectives on the Process of Learning to Teach

My records of the interactions between students, teachers, content and context (Feiman-Nemser, 1990) provided a rich source of background knowledge from which I was able to approach formal interviews with four educators and seven candidates. Data collected through interviews were presented in Chapters Four and Five. These open-ended interviews illuminated how features of a setting are understood and evaluated in different ways as individuals articulated their own notions of what it means to teach and learn and to negotiate their own definitions of effective teacher education.
Leaving the "expert" image behind

Three of the educators interviewed for this study were full-time seconded faculty members, and a fourth was working at Valleyfield on a part-time contract. Paula, Karen, Jeff, and Janice had recently left their different positions in the field to join their respective programs for one to three year terms. A key feature drawing together the four narratives was the strong influence of field-based perspectives on each educator's description of their experiences of and visions for learning and teaching in their courses. Beyond this commonality, the narratives illustrated how the work of seconded faculty members is difficult to categorize within a single framework.

The sections of Chapter Four indicated how each educator brought a different meaning of effective teaching and learning to her or his role as an educator. They also portrayed each educator's experience of issues such as time, space, class size, tensions between theory and practice, and the impact of teacher candidates' varied expectations - more than any other factor, the educators' work was contextualized by their interactions with candidates. The narratives also captured the educators' unique visions for enhancing the effectiveness of their program in general and their course in particular.

In summary, Chapter Four illustrated the limitations of traditional paradigms of effectiveness that rely on generalized notions of educators' roles. In contrast to the traditional discourse which perpetuates an image of teacher educators as the "experts" (e.g. Friesen-Poirier, 1992), Jeff, Janice, Paula, and Karen employed a range of strategies that appeared, from my perspective, to actively challenge this image. The emphasis on individual educators' perspectives revealed how personal understandings of effective
teacher education influence everyday practices within the field.

Defining a future as teachers and learners

Interviews with seven teacher candidates indicated that each held high expectations for both their programs and themselves as they worked toward becoming effective teachers. In contrast to the traditional discourse which emphasizes the prevalence of candidates' pragmatic concerns, the collected narratives in Chapter Five exemplified how candidates' understanding of learning to teach is much more complex than the simple dichotomy between practical and theoretical interests. Like the educators, all seven candidates described the importance of the educator-candidate relationship in learning to teach. In addition, candidates spoke of the initiative they took to enhance their learning through interactions with the people, events and ideas that they encountered during their teacher education programs.

In comparison to researchers' tendency to describe teacher candidates as passive and dependent (e.g. Katz and Raths, 1992), all seven candidates described the strategies that they employed to become active, independent and reflective learners. Central to this image was a desire for a wide range of content and activities and the modeling of respect for active and independent learning. A recurring theme in candidates' descriptions of an ideal model for learning to teach was the importance of time for personal reflection and sharing or debating ideas with fellow candidates. In their experiences of learning to teach, candidates discovered new skills and interests and spoke of the extensive range of content, contexts, and personalities that they had encountered through their teacher education programs. Nearing the end of their programs, the candidates believed that
they had just begun their learning as effective teachers - each candidate described a different future for themselves as teachers and lifelong learners.

**Images: Diversity, Complexity and Negotiation**

In the traditional discourse on organizational effectiveness, diversity is viewed as a deficiency to be overcome. Insofar as researchers emphasize coherent teacher education programs as the ultimate goal (Wideen and Fullan, 1983b), they tend to overlook how the distinctive features of each setting enable or constrain individuals' efforts to realize local movement toward effectiveness. As illustrated in Chapter One, traditional images of effectiveness are founded on managerial metaphors that provide step-by-step plans for the reform of programs (Hargreaves, 1994). External mechanisms designed to apply to all faculties of education are promoted as the "the one best way" to define and manage the future effectiveness (and impact) of teacher education. The rhetoric of agreed upon expectations for the training of teachers ignores the influence of individuals' expectations for learning and teaching in their particular program settings. Findings presented in this study support the notion that even the best of researchers' attempts to direct effectiveness in teacher education will fail if they neglect to consider the important ways that individual meanings contribute to the dynamic process of learning to teach.

While less evident in the literature, there are a number of researchers who maintain that linear notions of reform toward "single-minded" images of effectiveness do not reflect the dynamic qualities of teacher education programs. This area of the literature on teacher education indicates that course goals or expectations will be modified in different ways as educators and candidates meet in the classroom (Feiman-
Nemser, 1990; Haigh and Katterns, 1984; Tamir, 1991). From this interactionist perspective, programs are characterized by a diversity of orientations and practices which contribute to individual educators’ and candidates’ interpretations of effective teaching and learning (Zeichner, Liston, Mahlios and Gomez, 1988). This remainder of this section draws on key findings presented in Chapters Three to Five to provide further support for a “many-sided” view of effective teacher education. In highlighting the themes of diversity, complexity and negotiation, I offer an image of teacher education as an emergent process that is contextualized by a range of individual and group strategies for locating the meanings of effectiveness in the dynamic process of learning to teach.

**Diversity**

As I noted in Chapter Three, learning in each of the Curriculum and Instruction courses was characterized by an exciting level of diversity. The three courses that I observed were characterized by differences in levels of certification (primary/junior and junior/intermediate), in the length of programs (one or three years), and program organization (consecutive and concurrent). In these contexts, teacher candidates worked with faculty members who occupied a range of positions that included part-time contract and seconded faculty, as well as tenure-track and tenured professors. In addition, they encountered a range of associate teachers and school settings. Educators met with large numbers of candidates who came from a wide range of personal, academic and professional backgrounds.

In addition to contextual features, the perspectives of candidates and educators contributed to a wide variety of expectations, experiences, and evaluations of teaching
and learning within each setting. As a group, the four seconded educators illustrated the degree to which their work was informed by attempts to balance their own images of effective learning and teaching with the diversity of expectations communicated by teacher candidates in the classroom. The educators emphasized similar goals and yet drew on different images to define strategies for their realization: Paula spoke of co-learning; Jeff described his work toward the ideal of a negotiated curriculum; Karen defined her role in balancing expectations; and Janice reflected on her struggles to articulate a model of learning where she could provide candidates with the space to "tell their own stories" about teaching and learning.

Teacher candidates also offered a diverse range of images regarding their definitions of effectiveness. Each candidate noted the importance of their unique learning styles. For candidates like Brian, this meant having time to work independently. In contrast, Jean noted her preference for learning through sharing and dialogue with other candidates. There was also common agreement on the benefits of learning the specifics of a variety of topics and yet Linda wanted to learn about practical ideas for the classroom. Mary wanted to understand the specifics of teaching in Ontario, and Sharon had developed a strong interest in learning about anti-bias education. A central point of learning for each of the candidates was their sense that there are a number of ways to become a teacher. Based on this perception, candidates described an ideal learning model as one in which they could bring together their multiple perspectives on effective teaching and learning with the diverse set of images that they came in contact with through university- and school-based learning. From my perspective as a researcher, I
came to see that candidates' efforts to organize diversity were key aspects of their experiences. Both educators and candidates offered their own understandings of the mechanisms that might be helpful for facilitating and possibly enhancing this process.

**Complexity**

Educators and candidates actively worked to incorporate a diversity of meanings around effective teaching, learning and learning to teach in the classroom. In many cases this work took place in settings that were, from my perspective, characterized by complexity. Data presented through this study indicate that learning to teach in all three courses was influenced by a number of constraints as well as a variety of enabling factors. In addition to enhancing diversity, educators and candidates worked to diminish the impact of tensions and constraints. In doing this, each participant drew on her or his personal understandings to give meaning to both the frustrations and satisfactions that they experienced in their particular contexts of learning and teaching.

Time was a key element which contributed to each educator's and candidate's experience of teacher education. For both groups time was a factor which limited the degree to which they could realize their own goals while also dealing with the expectations of others. Time, compounded by class size, limited educators' efforts to cover a wide range of topics and to work with the wide range of expectations and needs of teacher candidates. For the candidates, time was intimately tied to their sense of competence to begin their careers as teachers. Many candidates felt that they needed more time to reflect on new ideas or to become more confident with their own educational philosophies. Time also factored into many candidates' beliefs about learning to teach as
a lifelong pursuit: candidates were able to see beyond the time constraints of their teacher education programs to view their learning as a process that would emerge over time.

In addition to the constraints of time, candidates and educators alike worked in contexts that were "complicated" by a number of tensions. While there were some common threads that ran throughout each group's narratives, it is also possible to argue that different individuals held different opinions concerning the strengths and weaknesses of their courses. Tensions arose in regard to individual definitions of meaningful roles, content, and learning/teaching contexts. A number of candidates, for instance, wanted educators to act as role models in the classroom by demonstrating the ideas that were presented through lectures on topics such as cooperative learning. In contrast, instructors like Paula and Janice believed that their role was not so much to demonstrate particular ideas but to provide candidates with the tools to discover a wide range of ideas to enhance their skills as innovative practitioners.

Tensions also arose in both groups' attempts to define their expectations surrounding the role of theory and/or practice in university-based learning. This tension distinguished by comparisons between abstract and concrete knowledge, field and university-based knowledge, the "big" picture and practical skills, or the difference between ideals and common sense - emerged as a recurring theme in all eleven interviews. Both candidates and educators also experienced a certain level of frustration in attempting to enhance connections between university and school-based learning. Candidates noted how their experiences of the "realities" in classrooms did not always
correspond with the ideas that they encountered through coursework. The four educators described how their work was informed by attempts to establish stronger connections between schools and universities, and suggested different opinions concerning the most effective ways for breaking down the boundaries that existed between the two sites of candidates’ learning.

In many ways, the above tensions emerged as candidates and educators met in classroom contexts. Candidates viewed teaching and learning to teach as a complex process. The educators also viewed their work as complex given the range of expectations that they had to work with. A key element contributing to the complexity of each setting was the number of ways in which each educator and candidate defined the “issues” and suggested strategies for their resolution, each in relation to a broader vision for realizing an ideal image of effective teaching and learning. Enhancing the value of diversity and diminishing the effects of complexity involved a great deal of negotiation on the part of each individual as they interacted with a range of people, places, events and ideas in enacting their own images of teaching and learning at Northview, Valleyfield, and Bellhampton.

**Negotiation**

The dynamics of learning to teach are much more complex than the simple transmission of pre-set objectives by “expert” educators to passive and dependent teacher candidates. Diversity and complexity inform the process in myriad ways. Educators and candidates negotiated roles and ideas in the classroom with varying levels of success and a commitment to breaking down the traditional boundaries between their respective roles
was evident in all the narratives. All four educators described their efforts toward the maintenance of on-going communication with candidates to facilitate negotiation, balance, or co-learning; in contrast, candidates drew on their own resourcefulness to evaluate new ideas and to negotiate between their own interests for learning with opportunities presented in class.

In all, candidates negotiated their personal understandings of theory and practice, school and university-based learning, individual and group perspectives, and their own images of effective learning and teaching with the images encountered through experiences in their programs. They also worked to balance knowledge of their own strengths as learners (e.g. independent learning) with the variety of roles that they took on in the university classroom (e.g. group activities). Thirdly, candidates struggled to negotiate their desire for specific information on a wide variety of topics with the reality that everything could not be covered in one year of full-time studies or three years of part-time studies. As such, they drew on their background experiences and took advantage of learning from each other, from the “kids”, and from the range of other individuals that they met through practice teaching. Dialogue and reflection were key elements in all seven of the candidates’ attempts to develop a personal philosophy of effective learning and teaching.

For the four educators who were relatively new to their roles, teaching involved an openness to “learning from experience” as their ideals for facilitating effective learning came into contact with candidates expectations. Given their backgrounds in field-based settings, each educator also worked to negotiate their experiences in the field with their
roles in the university. Each educator believed that they had a lot to contribute to their roles as teacher educators. Paula, Jeff and Karen also viewed their new positions as potentially rich learning experiences. Each educator attributed new experiences in the university classroom to their success in negotiating the content and contexts of learning in their courses. Each was faced with having to negotiate their own visions within the constraints of time and space. Finally, educators worked outside of the classroom to negotiate with program teams and school-based associate teachers and personnel. For the four educators, communication and a certain level of openness to change were helpful strategies to develop future images for enabling positive learning environments.

Given the social or interactive nature of learning to teach, negotiation was a central aspect of teaching and learning in all three settings. Each individual had to give and take a little in etching out their images and experiences of teacher education, but with the push and pull of diversity, complexity and negotiation, each candidate and educator was able to articulate their unique definition of effectiveness. In this sense, images of effectiveness were both highly personal and located in the diverse and sometimes complex interactions in each setting. Effectiveness remained in the eye of the beholder as each teacher educator and teacher candidate looked back on their experiences of learning to teach and viewed the possibilities of their future roles as teachers and learners.

**Future Directions in Theorizing about Effectiveness**

It has been suggested that images of effectiveness emerge through individual and setting-specific attempts to negotiate the diversity and complexities that characterize the
particular realities of learning to teach. In this section the implications of these findings are investigated on two levels. First, I discuss how this study might influence future attempts to theorize about teacher education in general, and issues of program effectiveness in particular. I close this discussion by revisiting the limitations of this study and offer suggestions for further research that will work to diminish the impact of these limitations. On a second level, I discuss the relevance of this study to those who are currently involved in teaching and learning at local faculties of education. Keeping in mind the impact of time and class size, I suggest how setting-specific and individual meanings might contribute to a broader understanding of the mechanisms for defining and facilitating effective teacher education.

Traditional approaches to the study of effectiveness in teacher education have directed researchers' attention to externally defined "parameters of effectiveness" (Howey and Zimpher, 1989). The general utility of these studies is limited by their exclusive focus on system-wide strategies and assume that single prescriptions for change can be applied uniformly to all faculties of education. The absence of considerations of system level mechanisms' relevance to particular "realities" or meanings intensifies the gap between the linear qualities of traditional images and the diversity of visions in specific settings. Any attempts to narrow this gap will require efforts toward integrating the traditional search for mechanisms with the more recent emphasis on the search for meanings that contribute to setting-specific and individual understandings of effective teaching and learning in faculties of education.

A necessary step in probing the value of a many-sided view of effectiveness
requires that researchers place greater emphasis on documenting how differences within
and between programs and individual differences contribute to the dynamics of learning
to teach. This thesis suggests that images of effectiveness are intimately connected to the
immediacy of individuals' experiences of teaching and learning in the classroom. Any
efforts to enhance the long-term value of research, therefore, will require that images of
effectiveness are informed by the values and visions that different participants bring to
their roles as teacher educators and candidates in different settings. A deeper level of
appreciation for the complexities of teaching and learning in faculties of education should
also inform scholarly considerations of effective programs. Researchers might engage
different groups of educators and candidates in discussions about the variety of factors
that enable or constrain their attempts to realize personal images of effective teaching
and learning. Understanding the range of commonalities and differences among
individuals' needs, expectations, and visions will provide a preliminary framework for
debate and indicate a number of possible avenues for effecting meaningful change in
different settings. Rather than recommending an exhaustive list of expectations for
educators and candidates to conform to, future attempts at theorizing around
effectiveness can begin by suggesting strategies for defining, implementing and
evaluating system level, setting-specific and individual efforts toward improvement. The
theoretical frameworks and research strategies made popular through interpretive
studies in the fields of phenomenology (e.g. Denzin, 1983), interactionism (e.g. Woods,
1983), and critical ethnography (e.g. Britzman, 1991) are particularly suited for realizing
these efforts through a "search for meanings".
The above framework indicates an ideal direction for future attempts to theorize around issues of effectiveness in teacher education. It also re-directs attention to the strengths and limitations of this study and suggests areas of research that might be pursued to extend the scope of present findings. My focus on understanding teacher education from the personal perspectives of a small group of educators and candidates provided valuable insights into the diversity of meanings that individuals attached to their experiences at three faculties of education. Combined with the restricted length of this study, this focus has limited my ability to present an in-depth discussion of local differences. Furthermore, this study has discussed the dynamic nature of learning and teaching in three Curriculum and Instruction courses. The specific concentration on a particular course can only begin to account for the different "realities" or dynamics that may be characteristic of other courses within each of the programs at Northview, Valleyfield, and Bellhampton (and elsewhere).

A number of strengths and limitations are also evident given that the four teacher educators introduced in Chapter Five are all seconded faculty members. These data enable an understanding of the unique needs and visions of faculty who are relatively new to teacher education and who draw strongly on their field-based experiences to inform their roles as educators in the university setting. At the same time, a focus on the differences within a particular faculty designation closes off consideration of the differences between seconded, tenure-track and tenured faculty. It also leaves unanswered questions of how field-based perspectives compared to university-based orientations might influence the range of values and visions that different groups bring
to their work as educators. Finally, this study has challenged the assumptions and values underlying the study of teacher education within traditional paradigms of effectiveness. From my perspective, this is a preliminary step that will be enhanced by further research designed to investigate educators' and candidates' evaluations of their teacher education programs. An understanding of how external images of effectiveness interact with internal and individual meanings will contribute further to closing the gap between mechanisms and meanings.

**Searching for Meanings and Mechanisms**

What strategies might be helpful for educators and candidates in their attempts to define, facilitate and evaluate effective teaching, learning and learning to teach? How can individual efforts to negotiate between diversity and complexity be enhanced so that diversity is encouraged (Cohen, 1985) and the impact of constraints diminished? The complexity of learning to teach indicates the need for diverse strategies. It also demands recognition of the possibility that meaningful strategies for individuals in one setting may not be relevant to the needs or interests of candidates and/or educators in another.

In our interview Paula emphasized that “we all need meaningful roles in change”. It may be added that educators and candidates also need to have “meaningful roles” as they participate in the day-to-day dynamics afforded by current practices. Bringing different definitions of the meanings behind effectiveness together in classroom contexts may be a powerful strategy for enhancing both educators' and candidates' understanding of these roles. It may also provide a wealth of insights around issues such as the tensions between theory and practice and connections between school and university learning.
Providing educators and candidates with the space to articulate their expectations and visions will provide a window for viewing how individuals understand the successes and limitations of their own learning and teaching and how they might better be supported. This standpoint recognizes that the “unique experience and perspective of each participant merits attention and cautions that potential gains in education will go unrealized unless we are prepared to entertain, as learners within community, multiple perspectives” (McPhie, 1995:196). Rather than devising strategies for the management of programs toward limited images of effectiveness, researchers can support this interpretive process. They can assist both educators and candidates to locate the space and setting specific strategies for dialogue and research. With a focus on understanding setting-specific mechanisms and meanings of effectiveness, researchers can enhance an iterative process of change designed, in turn, to enhance the strengths of teacher education programs.

Effectiveness is an emergent reality that results when multiple perspectives on the mechanisms and meanings of effective learning and teaching come together into visions and strategies for enacting setting specific images of effective teacher education. It would be pointless to suggest that researchers should not “encourage innovations and visions beyond those in particular settings” and yet, in their attempts to predict “healthy” futures for effective programs researchers must be cautious in assuming that they can “dictate local values, patterns and practices” (Deal, 1990: 216). In their descriptions of effectiveness, many of the educators and candidates introduced through this study articulated the value of sharing ideas about “what works and what doesn’t work”. In all of their attempts to establish the “one best way” to define and facilitate effective teacher
education, researchers working exclusively within traditional paradigms may be overlooking the fact that the mechanisms for enabling this process in a meaningful way are readily available in the everyday successes and struggles of those who teach and learn in faculties of education. Researchers can work to capture the valuable information and insights that are shared by educators and candidates as part of their day-to-day experiences of teacher education in particular settings. Through this interpretive project they will likely uncover a range of meanings and mechanisms that will be helpful for enabling a broader repertoire of images, identities, and practices to be taken up in the dynamic process of learning to teach.
Dear (Name of Professor):

I am writing to request your approval for me to participate as an observer in four sessions of your course this term at the (Name of Faculty of Education). As part of my master's thesis I would like to conduct a qualitative research project to explore how teacher educators and student teachers personally define and evaluate the goals of teacher education. In particular, I would like to develop an understanding of the broad set of goals which inform the teacher education programs at The University of Toronto, the ways in which these goals are interpreted and implemented by instructors as they develop course objectives, and any factors which exist to support or limit instructors' work as teacher educators. I am also interested in exploring the ways in which student teachers define the goals of teacher education from a personal perspective in light of their experiences and expectations concerning their future role as teachers. While my main method of data collection will be interviews I would also like to do some observations to gain an understanding of the physical settings, roles and activities that are part of the program at (Name of Faculty).

As my focus during these observation periods will be on the content of class sessions and the setting I will not be evaluating your work or the work of students. Following each class session I will record my observations in the form of fieldnotes. Care will be taken to ensure that individuals cannot be identified in my notes; all names of people and places will be replaced by pseudonyms or codes. All of my fieldnotes will be stored at my personal residence in locked files.

Thank you for taking the time to review my request. I would be happy to meet with you or speak with you over the phone should you have any questions or concerns about my project. Please feel free to contact me at (----). Please indicate your consent by signing below.

Sincerely,

Jodene Dunleavy
Dear (Name of Interviewee):

In order to be part of a graduate research project at O.I.S.E. each participant must receive and fill out an informed letter of consent. This outlines the project and your rights within it so that you are able to make a knowledgeable decision to become involved.

This project is being completed by Jodene Dunleavy and will be used as the basis for my Master's thesis. The purpose of this study is to understand how professors and student teachers personally define and evaluate the goals of teacher education. There are a large number of groups (school boards, the Ontario Ministry of Education, Profession Teacher Associations and so on) who contribute ideas in regards to what teacher education should accomplish. As students and instructors you experience the outcome of these expectations in the form of program goals, program organization and more specifically, course objectives or goals. I would like to learn from you a bit about how you personally define the goals of teacher education in a broad sense and also how you experience your roles as a student teacher or professor. For example, what knowledge and skills are important to becoming an effective teacher? What knowledge and skills are less important? What factors limit and support professors' attempts to teach and students' ability to learn?

By means of an interview of 60 to 90 minutes I would like to ask you some questions about your work and experiences as a faculty member/teacher candidate at the (Name of Faculty of Education). With your permission our interview will be taped and transcribed. There is no intent to evaluate your work or your views and you may withdraw your cooperation at any time. You may refuse to answer any particular questions and/or request that certain information be kept “off the record”. Once the interview has been transcribed I would be happy to provide you with a copy for review at which time you may request that any information be omitted or clarified. Care will be taken to ensure that individuals cannot be identified in any reports or publications; all names of people and places will be replaced by pseudonyms or codes. Raw data and transcripts will be kept in my personal residence in locked files.
Thank you for your consideration of being a participant in this project. If you have any questions concerning the nature of the study or the details of your participation please call me at (----). Please indicate your consent to participate by signing the attached letter.

Sincerely,

Jodene Dunleavy
Statement of Agreement to Participate in Research Project

Ms. Jodene Dunleavy
The Ontario Institute of Studies in Education,
Department of Sociology in Education,
252 Bloor Street West,
Toronto, Ontario,
M5S 1V6

Dear Jodene,

I would like to confirm that I am willing to take part in the interview process which you have proposed. I accept the conditions of confidentiality suggested by you.

____________________________________  _______________________
Signature of Participant                   Date
Appendix B
Interview Schedule A - Teacher Educators

Please feel free to tell me if you would prefer not to answer any of the questions that I ask or to ask for clarification on any of the questions. I will use the results of our interview for my master's thesis and your name will not be mentioned or recorded anywhere. If you would like to review the transcripts before I analyze them for my thesis I would be happy to meet with you after they have been typed up.

1. **Background Information** Before we discuss your specific experiences as a course instructor for (name of course) could you tell me a bit about your background and how you came to your current position?

   **MAKE SURE THAT ALL OF THESE QUESTIONS ARE ANSWERED**

1.1 How long have you been a course director/instructor at (name of faculty)?

1.2 Since working at (name of faculty) have you always been the instructor for (name of course)?

1.3 If no, what other positions have you held?

1.4 If no, how did you find yourself coming to the job of course instructor?

1.5 Can you tell me a bit about what you did before coming to (name of faculty)?

1.6 What attracted you most to becoming a course director/instructor at (name of faculty)?

2. **Experiences as a Faculty Member**

2.1 What is it like to be a faculty member at (Name of Faculty)?

   **Probe 1:** As a member of the faculty at (name of faculty) what are the range of duties or responsibilities that you are expected to take on?

   **Probe 2:** Which part(s) of your job do you find most satisfying?

   **Probe 3:** Are there any aspects of your job that you find frustrating or challenging (constraints)? How do you deal with these frustrations?
3. Experiences as a Course Instructor

3.1 As an instructor how would you personally define the general goals of teacher education?

Probe 1: Do you think that it is possible to achieve all of these goals through a one year teacher education program?

3.2 In your own course what are the main goals that you hope to achieve? OR What are the main objectives of your own course?

Probe 1: Are there any areas that you feel are important for students to know about but are not included in your course (for any reason)?

Probe 2: What gets in the way of your ability to include these areas?

3.3 How do you deal with a situation where students have different expectations of the course than the ones you have set?

4. Closing Comments

4.1 What are the strengths of (name of faculty) teacher education program?

4.2 What, if any, changes could be or have been made to improve the program?

4.3 [If TE has indicated tensions around goals] What do you feel could be changed with teacher education, in general, to help bring together the goals of students with those set by instructors and the administration?
Interview Schedule B - Teacher Candidates

Please feel free to tell me if you would prefer not to answer any of the questions that I ask or to ask for clarification on any of the questions. I will use the results of our interview for my master's thesis and your name will not be mentioned or recorded anywhere. If you would like to review the transcripts before I analyze them for my thesis I would be happy to meet with you after they have been typed up.

1. Background Information Before we discuss your experiences as a student teacher at (name of faculty) could you tell me a bit about your background and how you came to be a student here?

MAKE SURE THAT ALL OF THESE QUESTIONS ARE ANSWERED

1.1 What undergraduate degree did you receive before coming to the Faculty?

1.2 Where did you complete your degree?

1.3 At what point did you decide to apply for the Bachelor of Education program?

1.4 Before you started at (name of faculty) can you remember what you expected to learn/experience through the program?

2. Perceptions of Program Goals

2.1 From your perspective what are the main goals of (name of faculty)'s program?

2.3 How do these goals match with what you hope to learn before becoming a teacher next year?

3. Experience as a Student Teacher

3.1 Tell me a bit about your experiences as a student teacher at (name of faculty). Just the things that stand out most.

   Probe 1: In general, what are some of the highs and lows of your experiences at (name of faculty)?

3.2 What part of the program (university course work or practice teaching) do you think are most beneficial to becoming a teacher?

   Probe 1: What makes them beneficial?

   Probe 2: Which areas of teaching do you feel most knowledgeable or strongest in through your experiences at (name of faculty)?
Probe 3: Are there any areas of teaching that you feel you need to know but are not taught through your courses at (name of faculty)?

4. Closing Comments

4.1 What are the strengths of (name of faculty)'s program?

4.2 Do you feel that there are any areas that could be improved?

4.3 If yes, how would you change the program at (name of faculty) that would help you to become a more effective teacher?
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