Professional Lives; Institutional Contexts:
Coherence and Contradictions

By Rosebud Elijah

Rosebud Elijah is a postdoctoral fellow in the Preservice Teacher Education Program at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education at the University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada. *She thanks Ardra L. Cole and J. Gary Knowles for assisting to clarify her thinking about the implications of the coherence and contradictions between professional lives and institutional contexts.*

My purpose in this article is to make evident the central place that pedagogy has in teacher educators' lives and to examine the coherence and contradictions this causes for them as they attempt to live within current institutional contexts. The importance of pedagogy in teacher educators' work became evident from the findings of a larger study (Elijah, 1996) in which I used the life-history approach to explore the socialization processes involved in becoming a tenure-track teacher educator.[1] The findings of this larger study not only point to the centrality of pedagogy in teacher educators' university work, but illustrate the importance of interrelatedness and congruence between their personal and professional lives: Teaching is not simply preferred by teacher educators, it is at the very **heart** of preserving and enhancing their identities and roles within university contexts.

On the surface, this finding may be dismissed—

previous researchers have documented teacher educators' preference for teaching (see, *e.g.*, American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1989; Cruickshank, 1990), and the criticism that teacher educators do not meet university expectations of research and scholarship (see, *e.g.*, Clark & Guba, 1977; Joyce, Howey, Yarger, Harbeck, & Kluwin, 1977) which, in large part, accounts for their low status within the university hierarchy (see, *e.g.*, Ducharme & Agne, 1982; Judge, 1982; Lanier & Little, 1986). Yet, my purpose is to illustrate the extent and intensity of teacher educators' preference for teaching. In fact, merely advocating a shift in preference (to research) in order to improve their status and meet university expectations may be problematic. Understanding that pedagogy[2] is the essence of these teacher educators' work helps in rethinking how institutional expectations need to be broadened to facilitate teacher education reform (see, *e.g.*, Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991; Hendrick, 1990; Holmes Group, 1986). In this article, I first illustrate this finding by drawing on the life-history narrative of one participant from the larger study—a tenure-track teacher educator in a large, research university in the United States. I then examine the implications of this finding for teacher educators, institutional contexts, and the field of teacher education.

Understanding Through a Life-History Approach

Katharine (a pseudonym), volunteered to participate in the study as a self-identified tenure-track teacher educator[3] working within a research institution. Data included more than 25 hours of audio-tape recorded conversation with Katharine, focusing on understanding the evolution and development of her pedagogy and research epistemology within the context of socialization.[4] I also observed Katharine four times in classrooms teaching undergraduates and once when she helped a graduate student plan a course. Archival information collected consisted of syllabi and course documentation, student evaluations, lesson and course outlines, conference papers, published and unpublished articles and drafts, annual reviews, departmental memos, and other information. In addition to understanding the university context through our conversations (such as expectations and commitments), contextual information from the School of Education and related departments contributed to data. Conversations with others working within the university context provided another source of information.

Katharine was in her fifth year at the university when she participated in this study; she obtained a tenure track position two years after her original non-tenure-track appointment. During the time she participated in this study, Katharine said she was "unhappy" with her life at the institution. Talking with Katharine over a period of six months, I came to understand some of the tensions and ambiguity she experienced within the university context. I came to understand that the tensions and conflicts she experienced arose from a need to develop and preserve a coherent identity within the institutional context—an identity that was congruent with other

aspects of her life. I began to put together a framework within which her notions of development, loving, teaching, inquiry, research, and service came together under a theological and spiritual view of the world. I began to understand why Katharine questioned her efficacy within the university in spite of being supported and valued by her close colleagues. I came to realize why she felt confident and efficacious teaching undergraduate preservice teachers, and why she felt more ambiguous about her research and service activities. I never ceased to be amazed at how much she was willing to share, not only through archival data and being welcoming in situations where I could observe her pedagogy, but by her holistic descriptions that interwove the personal and professional which vividly portrayed the difficulties of her situation. Often, Katharine started our conversations with what was uppermost on her mind, sometimes her voice filled with emotion about feeling "dysfunctional" within the university context. I often had to blink back tears, reframe questions and agendas, and rethink my responsibilities as researcher and human being.

Below, I provide a description of Katharine's pedagogy as "loving," "developmental," and "mediational." I make explicit the connections between these fundamental aspects of her pedagogy to her life experiences. I locate this pedagogy within a theological framework—the acting superordinate theory within which Katharine attempts to work out every issue—including her research and service endeavors. I show how her research and service is based in these fundamental pedagogical constructs, and the ways in which her attempts to work within a superordinate theory cause her much stress, anxiety, and pressure, contributing to her feeling "dysfunctional" within the institutional context.

Teaching as "Development," "Loving," and "Mediation"

The ambivalence about how to "live her life" within the university context was evident in Katharine's descriptions of her experiences, descriptions that were filled with angst and tension, and overcast with unhappiness. In our first conversation together, she made evident that she had given a lot of thought to her work in the academy:

> I have identified a range of...things that...I just don't think count. I just don't think they matter and if they happen to be the [price to remain at this institution], then, that's just too damn bad. If it means that I don't get tenure then it's worth it not to get tenure because it's that important to not spend my time in those ways. And then there are things that I think I could do. [I hope to] think through all of that [with you because] I'm really unhappy with this job.

Yet, Katharine is sure that the university is a context within which she belongs, because she "fits with thinking people." She draws on Estès (1994) reframing of the story of the ugly duckling in *Women Who Run with the Wolves*:

> You're born into this family, into this culture, into this world, and you don't fit. That is not a...bad thing [because] to the degree that you don't fit you're impelled to leave and go in search of the people that you fit [with]. The story about the ugly

> duckling is about the journey to find one's family.... That's sort of what [this university] represents to me. I know where the swans are, they are in universities.... They are thinking people who live in the world of ideas.

Over a period of six months, this ambivalence about her feelings and attitudes toward her work was a central theme in our conversations. Embedded within these feelings was a central concern for the "other": for example, concern about facilitating the development of preservice teachers, concern about facilitating the development of her colleagues, concern about facilitating our development as researchers by sharing these stories of ambivalence.

This concern for the other, in fact, drives her teaching:

> Teaching is essentially the act of taking the point of view of the other. That is the first move. The second move of teaching is then taking the point of view of the discipline. And then...[I] simply mediate.

It is in the thinking, articulation, and practice of her pedagogy that Katharine feels most confident and successful (and student evaluations pronounce her the same). In the classroom, with preservice teachers, Katharine works within a developmental framework to mediate their beliefs, and facilitate their growth and "personal independence as learners." Her task, as she sees it, is to help them so that "they can make good on their visions of becoming the teachers they hope to become." The autonomy she feels in the classroom enables her to teach in a manner that is consistent with her beliefs and values that have developed through her experiences mostly beyond the university context.

Katharine's teaching is contained within a developmental framework embedded within a loving epistemology. She says, "When you move yourself...to see the world as closely as you can from the point of view of another, that's...technically, loving." Teaching undergraduate preservice teachers from this perspective is the aspect of her work that brings Katharine the most certainty and enjoyment. Attempting to grasp Katharine's "point of view," I came to understand why she believes that "learning to teach is...the development of a persona in which a great deal of self is invested." Through our conversations, I also came to understand that this pedagogical framework of development, loving, and mediation had a great deal of self invested as evidenced in the connections to her life experiences.

A Theological Rubric: Coherence of Life-History

Growing up in a religious household in the South defined Katharine's life in many ways. Her religious upbringing was embedded in "tent revival [tradition]." Katharine says, "Real tent, real band, real guy in the white suit with the red tie, with the spot light.... I lived that." Her father was a Southern Baptist minister. She makes explicit the connection to her belief in active learning, a tenet she takes very seriously in her classroom: "My father's work is in religious education. He defined

the field of teaching Sunday School teachers how to teach."

> He believed in active learning. He believed that the more senses that the learners employed in the classroom the better the learning would be, which [was] way ahead of its time [especially in] religious education circles. I have no idea how my father knew this. But the conversation around our kitchen table was frequently about how to convince these teachers that if they just stood there and talked, kids weren't going to learn anything.

Katharine uses her religious upbringing as a basis to explain why "attention to superordinate process rather than directly noting particulars became the hierarchy of [her] life."

> Evangelical preaching follows [a] kind of algorithm. The algorithm is [that] you start with the text, ...the Bible, ...and then you reason away from it to contemporary living situations. You use it as allegory, (that would be...heresy to say), but you make some sort of connection to your own life based on this story of other people, which is a pretty sophisticated literary move. It was part of my upbringing and...I...heard a variety of preachers every time we moved. The [literary] move stayed the same. [However] the points of the story shifted, which is an interesting problem for a young person to solve. [For example, how can the story of Zaccheus mean one thing in Evansville and another thing in Louisville?] What I pulled out was the...**process** that the preachers...used which is a real important piece of my life. When faced with a choice between naming people hypocrites and pulling out processes, I pulled out process. I tried to pay attention to [the question], "At what level does this hold together and make sense?"

This focus on process was reinforced in trying to "survive" an unstable home life; one in which her mother "framed the world" in different ways within a single day: "[I decided to imagine] how mother must understand the world as being a separate move from how I must understand the world." Katharine points to the need for this "separate move" as being "the roots of good ethnography...the roots of point-of-view taking, [even though] it wasn't that that [was] a healthy use of it." In Katharine's mind, form and substance became separate, different things. And, Katharine made a choice to focus on substance, not form. For her, mental, cognitive processes became a representation of substance.

Years later, in graduate school to complete her doctorate, Katharine began to deeply question her religious upbringing and the tenets of Southern Baptist Doctrine that she had lived. This questioning led her to realize that "[she] tends to work every major problem out at a theological level first." She explains:

> It was how I discovered [that] I wasn't Southern Baptist anymore, and it happened in class.... I noticed that I was a developmentalist, and I noticed that [it is] in conflict with the theory of original sin. You can't be both those things. Either man is inherently flawed (which is...a deficit model of the world—that's Christianity the way I grew up with it [and] I don't think I ever believed it). I don't think [there was this] moment when I changed my mind. It was more a moment when I noticed it

> [in class].... [I think] about people as inherently good and that the goal here is to develop. Baptists talk about conversions [that they liken to death, and resurrection to a new life] which you can only have in a deficit model. Baptism is not about development,...at least not in a Southern Baptist church.

In addition, Katharine explains how a developmental view of the world rather than a deficit one provides her with a basis for continually engaging in the "processes [of comprehending] how others understand the world." She strongly believes that "the only reason that other people look weird, or dumb, or inept is because [she] cannot perfectly understand their world." Engaged in trying to understand preservice teachers' points of view, she explains that this perspective enables her to think about them as "unfinished product[s]," developing along a continuum. This enables her to be "loving":

> Teaching as loving...doesn't mean stamping or validating everything that comes [from preservice teachers] but it does mean an attitude of real reverence for all that shuffling around that they're doing.... They're not inside me, they're not on top of me. They are over there [at a distance].

It is because of this distance that "mediation" becomes an important pedagogical construct for her to understand preservice teachers' points of view. She believes that "loving and supporting [other people], and seeing people as developmental rather than as deficit are so bound up that [she is] not sure that [she] can untangle... where one thing stops and the other picks up."

Even as she was questioning the substance of her religious upbringing and rearranging the basis of her beliefs, it was important for Katharine to hold on to the theological framework that was so fundamental to her life. She explains the ways in which this thinking and questioning led her to reframe her teaching within a religious framework:

> [I started] down the road to reframing...a universe view. It's part of why I feel completely safe pushing young adults to imagine multiple truths. [It's] because I am real sure that it doesn't have to topple anything.... The only thing it would have to topple is the most conservative fundamentalist theological perspective that there is. That has got to go. There is no way to preserve that, but we don't have to lose deity, we don't have to lose Christ, we don't have to lose prayer, we don't have to lose any of that to imagine that reality is constructed and that truth is constructed.

In addition to identifying how her pedagogy has been shaped by her life experiences, Katharine recognizes that her religious upbringing and childhood experiences are partly responsible for her feeling "unsupported" within the university context. She explains: "The long habit of my life is to say that there's something dreadfully wrong with me." Attempting to work with this problem, she has begun, for instance, to value the importance of acknowledging and taking care of self. This is contrary to a Southern Baptist upbringing:

> I've discovered that there is this category of stuff called "entitlement" which I didn't know existed. It wasn't like I thought it was there and that I wasn't entitled. [When I look back] the only way I knew about [what I can now label a sense of entitlement] was from Baptist sermons that claimed, "If you notice someone is mistreating you then you are not loving."...You're not supposed to notice things of the flesh, only things of the spirit. Well, that means you can't notice things like you've got a bad office and somebody else has a good one and [question] why. You're not supposed to care about that, and if you do, that's bad, that's a sin. Well, I bought that, I really, really lived it, and I was really good at it. I took it to its neurotic limit. And I did it as an act of faith and of religion because I thought [that] was the way the world was. This is a consistent character trait. If I think this is the way the world is, I will work really hard to make that the way the world is.

In addition, Katharine began to question the tenet of "carnal and spiritual duality." She says,

> I was [finally] able to put together a theological statement that admits to a God by coupling it with this notion that 'I am one with Him.'... I am not a separate entity struggling to be like the Father. I am an expression of the Father.

She explains how this belief created a "big tangle" with Southern Baptist tenets and caused her to question the denial of self:

> Why would we want to suppress the Father's expression of [Katharine]? That's not sensible, but [it] is Southern Baptist.

Research and Service as Facilitating Development, Loving, and Mediation

In our conversations about her work within the institutional context, Katharine consistently returned to focus on her pedagogy. For instance, conversations about research often turned into conversations about how the research topic emerged from her teaching practice, or about how she attempted to implement the findings of her research in her teaching practice. In conversations about work related to mentoring graduate students (a service endeavor), she often emphasized the pedagogical elements of nurturing and development that were related to mentoring. Because of this interrelatedness and her focus on pedagogy, I came to understand that Katharine's primary interest came from viewing "teaching as content." Her primary intent was to facilitate the development of individuals (for example, preservice teachers, graduate students, other faculty). I also slowly recognized that the pieces of "Katharine as teacher" that fit together within a spiritual framework—"teaching as development," "teaching as loving," and "teaching as mediation"—were the same ones she applied to her other work within the institutional context.

This framework forms the rubric for all Katharine's work at the university. She is happiest when her research and service endeavors emerge from and contribute to

her pedagogy. Katharine is clear that the traditionally defined categories of teaching, research, and service are artificially separated, and part of what makes her life so discontinuous at the university and which adds to its ambiguity:

> The academy has a vested interest in continuing to act as if research and teaching and service are distinct unconnected categories. It makes [administrators' lives] all clean and neat and simple and it makes our lives a real wreck. [We need to] get the academy to budge and begin to think that what [they] have got is the life of a professor and it may have parts, but that the professor might be the one that gets to decide what they are and how they work together.

Despite this artificial institutional framework, Katharine realizes that "I'm in charge regardless of how it looks." Aware that, in part, her life experiences lead her to feel unsupported within the university context, Katharine is working on taking charge of the manner in which the defined categories of teaching, research, and service work for her.

Research as Pedagogy

Katharine makes explicit the ways in which the separately defined categories simply do not work for her. Involved in two large research projects with other teacher educators, Katharine feels valued in both, yet would like to devote all her time and energy to the one which investigates her teaching (rather than devoting her time to the other project which explores preservice teachers' definitions of a particular discipline). This partiality to the former project is aligned with Katharine's belief that research is an integral part of teaching: "Research is just the first part of teaching." Because, for Katharine, inquiry is integral to good teaching, her thinking about research forms an important base for her pedagogy. She says:

> When I teach, it's really more like data analysis than it is like design. If [I] set up the task well, then [I] elicit the data that [I] need to know [about] what's going on in [preservice teachers'] heads, or [I can] at least make a good guess. And if [I] can't make a good guess then [I] set the next task to narrow the field, just like [I] would with a series of questions in a protocol. Writing a series of questions in a protocol and writing a lesson plan look a lot alike, if what [I] have got going is any kind of elicitation from students, if [I] expect students to make meaning [and I do]. If [I] don't [and just] expect students to sit there, [I] may as well do questionnaire research, it's the same thing.... I wouldn't do that kind of research, but I don't do that kind of teaching either.

Katharine explains that prior to being a doctoral student she believed that research **was** teaching:

> I just thought it was all teaching,...until [I began working with my graduate study advisor]. [Then] I discovered that there was something called research that people thought was different than teaching. And maybe that's the only reason why I [can see how people] think of them [as different]. [Because for me,] becoming a

> researcher is a derivative of pulling out some piece of...teaching and saying, "Oh, that's what **they** think research is," slicing it off [to] call it research.

Further, she provides insight into why she so resists the separated categories:

> Research is just the first part of teaching, which is why...I resent writing about it all of the time, as if it were some thing in and of itself. It's not. The point of research is not to say, "and now we know it." The point of research is the first move in teaching. It's simply "point of view taking," and once you construct the world of the other it doesn't mean anything by itself.... The real finding is in what you do next as a teacher, it's in the mediational move. The world of research does not see it that way. They think the finding is in telling the story of the other. It's not. It's just mildly interesting.

Katharine likens a research finding to the text of the Bible, simply the "algorithm" from which one "reasons away" to practice: "It's just a story, and the story by itself isn't anything." In fact, Katharine sees "research methodology as classroom pedagogy." She explains why this is important for her:

> This [is the] place I'm trying to push...the field [of teacher education]; to do research and to do teaching are synonymous activities. [This way] teacher educators begin to learn to use elicitation devices that they would normally use as research, but [they would] use them in a classroom context to elicit research quality data about the conceptual features of their course. [This type of teaching and research is] much more vital to me. It stands to push everybody's thinking in a way that one more article about how neophytes learn to change their practice and do something different just doesn't.

And she makes evident that while research is integral to her teaching, she is foremost a pedagogue:

> [To ask these questions: "How come?" and "So what?"] is what good teaching is. And, lo and behold, it's what good research is. I never wanted to be a researcher, I always wanted to be a teacher. It was sort of a fortuitous meeting.... I...call myself a researcher because it serves my life as a teacher. And it [is] simply another way of talking about my life as a teacher.

Service as Pedagogy

Katharine attempted to apply the same pedagogical framework to her service endeavors—yet, these service endeavors contributed to Katharine's feeling of dissatisfaction and dysfunctionality within the institutional context. Except for a few close colleagues, she felt undermined and disempowered in a number of her interactions with other faculty. She described situations in which assistant professors were unintentionally put in powerless situations (her work as secretary on a committee constituting full professors, for example), or systems of accountability that seemed antithetical to the work the institution intended to encourage (for example, encouraging collaborative work yet having to account for one's part in the

collaboration in one's annual review).

I began to understand that Katharine felt "taken advantage of" because she strongly believed and attempted in her service endeavors to "facilitate" the development of "the other"—teachers in the high school, colleagues with whom she collaborated, graduate students she mentored—and for them, in turn, to facilitate her development. Katharine felt that this "facilitation" and "support" was almost never reciprocated.

In struggling with the confusion and dissatisfaction she feels with regard to service to the institution, Katharine speculates about her own development ("It's about having an adequate sense of self"; "it's about resolving the tension between the need for inclusion and expressing the self"), about her feelings toward the institution as an organization ("The university is the beast; I don't have a metaphor, anywhere, where the university is not the antagonist;" "It's a sucking mall, its needs are infinite"), and her beliefs that working collaboratively for "The Program" is a futile effort ("It's always a pleasure to discover that I can advocate the system less and the people more"). To provide an example, I elaborate on Katharine's perceptions of the need to collaborate for the purposes of implementing "The Program."

Within the School of Education, faculty collaborate within the teacher preparation program which graduates 450 to 500 preservice teachers a year. While collaboration is currently a major part of the program, Katharine believes:

> [There is] nothing on the table to support that [collaboration]. Suddenly it is a rhetoric that we have vested interest in preserving and...there's no way it's going to be real. So, when I say that it's rhetoric I'm not necessarily faulting anybody. I'm just saying that in reality you can't pull it [off], you can't move, it freezes everybody. Our program at the moment is so interconnected. The needs that we have for one another are artificial. So, what we are really looking for is a way to say "Yes, we are still collaborating." But [we need to] cut some of the lines so that [we] can move. So, it is becoming more of a rhetoric that we need to keep serving for the sake of having the rhetoric.

She explains how, in order to "preserve the rhetoric," faculty have to actually adopt narrow and more defined plans in order to implement anything:

> There is nothing that any of us does here where we have autonomy. It is **so** entangled. So you [have to] figure out a way to work that adjusts to the fact that there are all of these other people. One way to do it is to just make a plan, and demonstrate that the plan will reach the objective. If you make your plan soon enough and if you defend its ability to reach the objective loudly enough, [then] nobody can find fault with that [and you win].

She says:

> It's wrong to hear me say that I don't want to collaborate, but it's a trap. It's a real trap here [because the program is supposedly dependent on collaborating in] real and authentic [ways that] actually gets good teaching done.

Katharine explains what this means to her in theological terms, making explicit the notions of love and development:

> When you consistently choose things that...curtail [life] and that make life more and more and more narrow rather than more and more expansive, then you choose less life. You're moving toward sin and error.... I'm not particularly guilty of that [in collaborating], but I do have [the] temptation to constrain, to make less life where it's possible for me to make a move that makes more life. [For example, referring to her teaching in other instructors classes which turned out to be a "nightmare" of negotiations which undermined her authority], if I had simply presented the other faculty with a syllabus of what I would teach in their classes and had not been willing to discuss it with them]...there would be less options [and] less life. What I am looking for is a solution that [provides more options. This fits within the] larger framework of [loving] because...love is...simply the bringing of the option of more life rather than less life.

Katharine explains how "servicing the needs of the institution," and collaborating to structure and implement a large teacher education program are antithetical to her theological beliefs, her notions that people are important, and that people need to be facilitated and loved:

> It's not the way I live at all.... People are the keys to understanding the processes that they use. Processes are people specific.... The processes themselves have no intrinsic value. I [believe that] organizations just get in the way. They tend to perpetuate a set of processes, as if those were the most important thing, and make the people fit them. That just makes me mad. So, my decision that I told you about earlier—to only lend myself to organizations that are within one step of people—is a way to try to combat the sucking need of the organization and the impatience I have with servicing a committee.

This decision to attend to people is reflected in the following comment which also vividly portrays Katharine's feelings about contributing to "The Program":

> I like [coordinating a course]. I like that role, it's the best job I've had here because it is at least close to where the rubber hits the road. It matters what we are doing there. But this thing called "The Program" [is] bad. It's not just that our program is bad, [but] "The Program" as a way of teaching teachers is a flawed idea. It's so completely flawed that I don't know how to fix it or even how to continue to operate within it. There is no way out of it, because as long as we agree to crank through 400 [undergraduate preservice teachers] a year we can't do that with anything but a program. So we need "The Program" to do the teaching and the program cannot do the teaching. There is no amount of putting the right stuff into "The Program" or in the right order that will make it do the teaching, and I am really beginning to feel that it's a waste of my time to keep trying to make "The Program," because "The Program" is never going to work.... We can't get all of the pieces to even fall down in order, [but even if we did,] it wouldn't work, and I...know it. [Even if] we get the bugs worked out...and "The Program" works, [we're never going to be] educating teachers.

Believing that preparing teachers is not about "producing" teachers, Katharine wishes she was in a place where they at least prepared "handcrafted" teachers. She wishes that within the institution they did not "mass produce plastic models."

> The worst thing about it is not that we...turn out people who can't deliver what they know. I'm not even thinking about how much school children are disserved. The people who I am most worried about are the preservice teachers who thought they were going to learn to teach from us, and who...want to teach as badly as I want to teach them, and are going to leave and not be able to do it (and not even have the potential to teach in the way they envision).... I think that's criminal, and I don't know how long I can stick around and be a part of that. I really don't. It looks different when I look at the table of people who are doing it. My colleagues [are] not mean people. It's not collusion.... These are people who [are] honest and ["The Program"] springs from an earnestness that I find real in this place. [This is what] keeps me from leaving. These people that I work with here, for the most part, earnestly and truly want to teach. [The people make the institution] what it says it is, [but the institution] doesn't deliver.

Exploring the Tensions Between Role and Identity: A Developmental Process

It became evident that in describing her feelings of "dysfunctionality" and "unhappiness" within the institutional context, Katharine was describing more than not being able to adapt to, or adopt a role in order to meet institutional norms and expectations. Rather, it became evident that the difficulty and dissatisfaction within the institution arose out of not being able to feel a coherent sense of identity. For example, describing her sense of place and value at the institution, Katharine says:

> I feel valued here. I can tell you that. I feel **too** valued. I feel pulled in a million directions. There is no question in my head that my colleagues think that I should be someplace else or that they don't like what I'm doing. That's not it!

Yet, she laughingly admits:

> That doesn't translate into [my] feeling comfortable in any of the actual manifestations [of my work]. I can't find a goodness of fit, but I think I'm getting closer.

Katharine makes evident that she is in search of:

> Some sort of consistent Katharine that could sort of go across [spheres of my work and life], but I do know that you have to shift voice and role [depending on the task]. I am beginning to discover that there is sort of a superordinate [identity] that [I] can use most of the time. I am learning what it is but it is very, very hard.

This search for a coherent identity—a "superordinate Katharine" that could encompass the various roles that she has to play (in both her personal and professional lives)—is consistent with her belief about living a life that is coherent against a superordinate theory. She often refers to her own development in spiritual

terms. Explaining that she would like to acquire wisdom in the next ten years of her life, she laughingly explains, "it's a slightly less spiritual way of saying that I have to grow a soul." According to Katharine, translated, this means acquiring

> flexibility.... It's...a metacognitive set of decisions that one makes about how to be in the world given the context.

This view, according to Katharine, is consistent with a developmental view of the world. Her hope, in the next ten years, is to find this "superordinate Katharine" and simultaneously acquire the "wisdom" that comes with working through this task.

Katharine says:

> There are...things that I have managed to integrate in the past four years that used to be very separate pieces of my life. They are coming together, that's good news.

While she is clear that she wants to continue to develop into a balanced, wise, supportive, and facilitatory individual, she experiences tensions within the institutional structure. Katharine provided vivid, metaphorical descriptions of the stress, pain, disillusionment, and "misery" of her first two years at the university. She believes that she has learned through these experiences about university "norms" and the need to carve out her own niche and establish autonomy ("It was learning by fire"). She uses the metaphor of an underwater diver to describe these tensions that have to do with establishing a coherent identity:

> Maybe the right thing is to discover that I can breathe under water [and] that I don't need the air tanks. I don't have to worry about my air supply running out while I hunt...the way out. I could throw away the air tanks [and] have infinite time to hunt the way out because I can breathe under water and I didn't know that.

Yet, she is "not sure [she] wants to [breathe under water]. Breathing under water is not as much fun as breathing clean air."

Katharine casts this struggle of finding her niche within the institution as an issue of "role versus identity." She says:

> [In your study] I am most curious about...whether...carving out an identity as a professor [and] carving out an identity [for the self is a common experience among other faculty]. I am curious about...whether that's part of what happens to people when they make a career shift in the middle of their lives. Is it an issue of adult development?...[And] how much of [this] is tied to being [a] professor and how much is not?

Reflecting on what this experience means for her, and on the strengths and weaknesses she brings to the situation, Katharine says:

> I feel very fortunate, very blessed. In universe terms, what matters is the growth of [wisdom],...to be able to differentiate between self and role, to be able to be a good steward of one's gifts, to be able to manage the tension between the need for inclusion and the need...to express the self. I don't have that tension solved at all.

> It comes around and it zaps me. If I had that tension solved in my larger life, I think I would be in a much better place to see the difference between something the university just needs me to do and something that is really good for me to do. I can't tell.... I have this sincere desire to let go [of the need to be perceived as the good guy].

Katharine's childhood experiences and her religious upbringing are central to the development of the values, beliefs and attitudes she brings with her to the university context. These beliefs and values have altered and developed through experiences in graduate school and personal relationships, for example. Yet, her beliefs, values and attitudes all converge at a theological level, and a "superordinate theory" forms the crux of Katharine's identity. She is in the process of searching for a "superordinate Katharine"—a coherent identity that is consistently played out in all spheres of her life.

Katharine's life within the university context does not support her in the development of a coherent identity. Mostly, she feels that institutional values are antithetical to her own. For example, she would like to focus on preservice teachers as persons and individuals, instead she feels like she (and other faculty) are spending vast amounts of energies on "The Program." She would like to collaborate with other faculty in authentic ways that facilitate each other's development; instead, she feels that most collaborative efforts are intertwined with issues of power which makes it impossible to facilitate each other's development. The institutionally separate categories of research and teaching pose enormous problems for her because she believes her research is part of her teaching and not separate from it. For Katharine, the tensions between her identity, beliefs, and values, and institutional norms, are messy and vivid. For her, developing within the university context is a struggle.

Dismissing "roles" as a way to live within the university context, Katharine is striving to express a "consistent Katharine" across contexts. Katharine recognizes the tensions within the university context which cause her much discomfort and unhappiness (for example, the power play that sometimes goes along with service endeavors, the pressure to publish, the "production" model of preparing teachers, the unbalanced life-style that most faculty live). She also recognizes the effects of her prior experiences (such as "a wrong set of defense moves") that contribute to her feeling unhappy within the university context. Trying to evaluate and adjust to the university "norm" while still holding on to tenets central to her life is hard and often undermining work for Katharine. Determined, Katharine continues her struggle which, she hopes, will help lead to "wisdom."

Looking Forward: Examining the Implications of Coherence and Contradictions

Imbued in Katharine's narrative, both explicitly and implicitly, are representations of socialization processes. Katharine brings with her the powerful influences of prior life experiences that interact with university expectations to shape her work,

values, attitudes, and beliefs within the university context. In the reconstruction of her life, Katharine seems to want to retain elements of her past life within her current work. As a result, there seem to be tensions between issues of roles and identities (or in current postmodernist interpretations, an issue of "fragmented" identities; see, Hall, 1992; Berger, Berger, & Kellner, 1974). She is aware of the socialization process and the effects it has had on her within the university context. For example, she has learned institutional "norms," now she "just has to decide how much of that game [she] wants to play."

For Katharine, doing the work of a teacher educator is an integral part of her identity, and pedagogy is central in this work. In her descriptions, Katharine makes explicit the tensions between role and identity, and is clearly struggling to uncover an identity in the university setting that is congruent with herself, her beliefs, and her values. (For example, in accordance with her values, she consistently defends her investment of time in individuals as opposed to the teacher education program itself. Finding ways in which to constantly invest in individuals would allow her to play out her identity in the university context, consistent with her values and beliefs. Investing time in "The Program" forces her to adopt a role within the university context.)

If the meanings attributed to her prior experiences may be considered as constituting part of her identity (in the context of teacher development, see Britzman, 1991; Goodson, 1991; Knowles, 1992), Katharine provides examples of the choices she has made, or would like to make, in trying to preserve and enhance herself through her professional work. In ways that she believes are devalued at the university, Katharine attempts to preserve the importance of the individual through a pedagogy that embraces "development," "loving," and "mediation" as central constructs.

What meanings can we take from Katharine's narrative as one illustration of teacher educators' professional lives, as we look to reforming teacher education and institutional contexts? Anna Neumann (in press) eloquently hypothesizes, "thatprofessors tell stories of themselves and their lives through the medium of their work," and that understanding their lives and work in authentic ways will allow us "to make [university] settings more conducive to the construction of scholarly work that authentically reflects our selves." Katharine's narrative seems to substantiate this claim.[5]

One response to this claim is simply that university settings are not about accommodating authentic reflections of professorial selves; that institutional expectations and norms exist purposefully, and that the measure of an individual's success is the extent to which s/he meets institutional expectations. Yet, increasingly, researchers inquiring into faculty socialization, are recognizing that socialization is interactive; both individual and institutional norms shape the work that occurs within institutional contexts (*e.g.*, Tierney & Rhoads, 1993). And, especially in a time of reform, it makes sense to listen carefully to individuals who have some responsibility for bringing about change. I now explore the implications of the findings of this study for teacher educators, institutional contexts, and the field of teacher education.

Teacher Educators

The findings of this inquiry have implications for understanding teacher educators as pedagogues and individuals. If indeed, as this study points out, pedagogy is at the heart of teacher educators' university work then beginning teacher educators may need to carefully consider issues of context as they prepare to become assistant professors and accept the roles of untenured faculty members.

This study not only points to the centrality of pedagogy in teacher educators' work but, to the cohesiveness and congruency between teacher educators' lives and pedagogies. Not only may pedagogy form the heart of their university work, but the interrelatedness between their lives and pedagogies is central to living their university lives authentically. Not being able to work in ways that resonate with their thinking—their values, beliefs, and attitudes, their ways of being, and their hearts, as it were—causes stress and tension, a discontinuity of roles, and a fragmentation of identities. Finding contexts that support the integral nature of pedagogy as connected to their university lives and work may be a crucial aspect of feeling satisfaction in doing the work of a teacher educator. Finding contexts that facilitate their professional development as teacher educators—for instance, by focusing on pedagogy as a central construct of their scholarship—may be an important aspect of feeling autonomy and control within institutional contexts.

Yet, placing the responsibility on beginning teacher educators to find appropriate contexts is in itself problematic—currently, it may mean forcing them to choose between contexts which emphasize research or which emphasize teaching (neither choice however, honors the integral relationship between research and teaching, or values pedagogy as scholarship). Further, locating institutional contexts that express underlying and explicit values that have some basic similarity and congruence with their own understandings and values of scholarship is especially difficult in a time of reform, when schools of education are in states of experimentation and flux.

Institutional Contexts

Understanding teacher educators foremost as pedagogues has implicit and explicit implications for understanding, reforming, and restructuring institutional contexts. Institutional contexts which purport a commitment to teacher education and preparing teachers, yet which do not recognize that teaching is at the heart of teacher education and that teacher educators are foremost pedagogues, are not likely to support the sustained, long-term professional development of teacher educators, especially those who are untenured. Institutional expectations need to be modified to take into account the complexity and integral nature of pedagogy to teacher educators' university work and lives. If those who administer institutional contexts recognize the commitment that teacher educators have to teaching **only** in terms of rigid dimensions of scholarly research and publications, then teaching as

a scholarly activity—that is so central to teacher educators' lives—will remain devalued in institutional contexts. This simply means that teacher educators will continue to feel devalued within institutional contexts, therefore never feeling rewarded, satisfied, and autonomous in their work. It also means, I suspect, that teacher education as a programmatic construct is not likely to be given much weight or importance within such settings.

While researchers have studied various aspects of teaching in schools (see, Feiman-Nemser & Floden, 1986; Lanier & Little, 1986; Shulman, 1986 for various descriptions) and various aspects of teacher development (*e.g*., Cole, 1990; Ryan, 1970; Thiessen, 1991; all cited in Knowles, Cole, with Presswood, 1994), teaching in university settings remains a relatively scantly researched area. Only recently are teacher educators beginning to explore aspects of their pedagogy and their development within university contexts (Bird, 1992; Knowles & Cole, 1994; Diamond, 1988; Holt-Reynolds, 1991; Pinnegar, 1992; Placier, 1992; Yonemura, 1991). Our lack of understanding about the influence of institutional contexts on teacher educators' university lives and pedagogies, in turn, probably reflects institutional commitments to the place of pedagogy in higher education. Unless university communities and those responsible for administering institutional contexts begin to value pedagogical perspectives, the complexity of pedagogy, and the commitment needed to teach, they will remain hollow contexts for teacher educators.

Further, the criticisms levied on teacher educators for not meeting institutional expectations for research and scholarship (see, *e.g*., Judge, 1982; Schwebel, 1985), and the low status they have been accorded within university hierarchy (see, *e.g*., Ducharme & Agne, 1982; Judge, 1982; Lanier & Little, 1986) will remain unchanged as long as the unique nature of teacher educators' work is not recognized within institutional contexts. Institutional contexts that define scholarship solely as traditional, scientific research will never be able to value the work of teacher educators and commit to the field of teacher education. Teacher educators have unique responsibilities (both to schools and university contexts), and constructive scholarship necessarily requires an integration and application of theory and practice. It is no longer sufficient, within the context of school and teacher education reform, to simply research school contexts from a traditional, removed viewpoint and report the results as scholarship (see, *e.g*., Feiman-Nemser & Floden, 1986). The integration of theory and practice, and its application to real contexts is integral to bringing about reform in schools and teacher education (see, *e.g*., Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991; Holmes Group, 1986, 1990).

It is evident from the findings of this study that teacher educators' needs for professional development require attention to the complexity of pedagogy, and may differ from the needs of other faculty groups within the institution. Institutions that do not respond to calls to make scholarship "broadened,...**individualized**, and **continuous**" (Boyer, 1990, p. 1; author's emphasis; see Boyer also for an explanation of a broadened view of scholarship of discovery, integration, application, and teach-

ing) will not be able to honor teaching (which forms the crux of teacher education), and the ways in which teacher educators integrate their research and teaching within the institutionally defined discrete categories of research, teaching, and service.

Further, if visions of scholarship are not broadened to include teaching (the core of teacher education) and service, and institutional contexts do not begin to honor the complexity of the construct of pedagogy (and its various articulations), any attempts at meeting teacher educators' professional development needs through orientations, mentoring, workshops, and other somewhat artificial ways will only serve as "functional responses" (Tierney & Rhoads, 1993, p. 57). These responses will not get at underlying causes but merely address issues in reactive ways. Unless institutions begin to acknowledge and address the complexity and comprehensiveness of pedagogy as it is integrally related to teacher educators' lives and work, they will not be able to sustain the professional development of teacher educators in meaningful ways.

For example, one way to characterize the pedagogy of Katharine in this study is with the notion of "engaged pedagogy" (hooks, 1994, p. 15). This

> progressive, holistic education...is more demanding than conventional critical or feminist pedagogy. For unlike these two teaching practices, it emphasizes well-being. That means that teachers must be actively committed to a process of self-actualization that promotes their own well-being if they are to teach in a manner that empowers students.

It remains for institutional contexts to be responsive to the centrality teacher educators give to teaching in order to actively support their "well-being," so that they in turn can support the enhanced preparation of teachers. The teacher educators' struggles, stresses, and tensions evident in this study, and represented here by Katharine, are **not** simply about inappropriate preferences, statuses, and choices. As the findings of this inquiry shows, their struggle is about authenticity, identity, and contributing in real and valued ways. Institutions need to address teacher educators' struggles in authentic ways if issues of their professional development are to be addressed in an on-going, valuable manner.

Teacher Education

In many of the calls for school reform (*e.g.*, Carnegie Forum, 1986; Holmes Group, 1986; 1990), teacher education has been considered the "keystone" (National Research Council, 1989). In advocating re-thinking, re-forming, and re-structuring teacher education, close attention has been paid to admissions, preservice, induction, and inservice phases of teacher education and professional development. In the rhetoric of teacher education reform, there has been little attention paid to teacher educators themselves—their work and their lives. (Recently, it is teacher educators themselves who are exploring aspects of their pedagogy in their attempts to prepare teachers as reflective and inquiring practitioners. See, *e.g.*, Bird, 1992;

Knowles & Cole, 1994; Diamond, 1988; Holt-Reynolds, 1991; Pinnegar, 1992; Placier, 1992; Yonemura, 1991). Again, this absence of attention to teacher educators in the context of reform seems symptomatic of institutional contexts that do not place adequate value on the pedagogical work of teacher educators.

In all the calls for reform in which teacher educators have been asked to assume responsibility for change in teacher education and public schools (*e.g.*, Holmes Group, 1986; 1990; Goodlad, Soder, & Sirotnik, 1990) there seems to be a lack of questioning about the assumptions and underpinnings of reform efforts (*e.g.*, Laird, 1988). In a similar vein, and as others (Knowles & Cole, 1994; Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991; Hendrick, 1990; Lanier & Little, 1986) have suggested, the findings of this study indicate that the rhetoric of reform fails to focus on the work of teacher educators themselves and aspects of institutional contexts that support and constrain their work. The findings also suggest that it may be useful for reform efforts in teacher education to work in conjunction with reform efforts in higher education (a point that seems obvious); in fact, changing reward structures within institutions while simultaneously working towards reform in teacher education seems to be the way to restructure and reform teacher education. Even as the Holmes Group (1986) believed that it was time to address "the failure of university faculty to assume corporate responsibility for the entire undergraduate program..." (p. 47), and acknowledged that "we cannot accomplish this task without changing the universities, the credentialing systems, and the schools themselves" (p. 23), university reward systems have lagged behind in supporting the reform initiatives. While the rhetoric of reform proposes to connect knowledge through interdisciplinary attempts, recombine content and pedagogy, integrate theory and practice (*e.g.*, Holmes Group, 1990; see Britzman, 1991 for a critique), it fails to explicitly critique institutional reward structures for not honoring the complexity of pedagogy and valuing the pedagogical work of teacher educators.

While reform rhetoric advocates the need to "professionalize teaching" and enhance the preparation of teachers (*e.g.*, Holmes Group, 1986; 1990), it merely looks to change school contexts even as it emphasizes the importance of teacher education as the change agent. The importance of pedagogy in teacher education and in teacher educators' lives is not emphasized in the discourse about the preparation of teachers. While improving the quality of teaching in schools is emphasized in the rhetoric, there are no explicit parallel calls to understand the crucial nature of pedagogy in teacher education.

The findings of this inquiry, and in this article by way of Katharine, provide evidence of an "engaged pedagogy" that teacher educators practice in attempts to preserve and enhance their identities and roles in and out of university contexts. It also provides evidence of reflective and inquiring teacher educators that serve as pedagogical models for preservice teachers. The importance of institutional contexts as they support and constrain teacher educators in their pedagogical endeavors that are central to their university work is also made evident in the outcomes of the

study. If indeed, the field of teacher education needs to be reformed and restructured, it might benefit by emphasizing the work of teacher educators within the reform context. If the centrality of teacher educators' pedagogy is to be recognized in bringing about change in teacher education, then institutional contexts must necessarily revamp their reward structures to include a broader view of scholarship. Only then will reform efforts in the field of teacher education be successful.

Notes

1. This was a collaborative study with Susan Finley. Together, we sought to understand the processes by which tenure-track teacher educators develop pedagogies and research epistemologies. Susan's work focused on understanding how teacher educators develop their research epistemologies; my work focused on understanding how teacher educators develop their pedagogies.
2. I use the term "pedagogy" to refer to philosophical foundations, epistemological theories that underlie the practice, or activity that is "teaching."
3. Teacher educators who participated in this study were "those who hold tenure-line positions in teacher preparation in higher education institutions, teach beginning and advanced students in teacher education, and conduct research or engage in scholarly studies germane to teacher education" (Ducharme, 1993, p. 8).
4. The interviews occurred in three-way conversations: Katharine, Susan, and me.
5. In the larger study (Elijah, 1996), pedagogy was central to all three participants' work within the university context. I focus here on Katharine's narrative only, so that readers obtain a sense of the detail, coherence, and intensity of what this centrality means.

References

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. (1989). *Teaching and teachers: Facts and figures*. Washington, DC: AACTE.

Berger, P.L., Berger, B., & Kellner, H. (1974). *The homeless mind. Modernization and consciousness*. New York: Vintage Books.

Bird, T. (1992). After you. No, after you: A collision between two programs for getting through TE-101. In H. Featherstone & S. Feiman-Nemser (Eds.), *Exploring teaching* (pp. 159-180). New York: Teachers College Press.

Boyer, E.L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Britzman, D. (1991). *Practice makes practice: A critical study of learning to teach*. Albany, NY: State University of NewYork Press.

Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy (1986). *A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century. The report of the task force on teaching as a profession*. New York: Carnegie Corporation.

Clark, D., & Guba, E. (1977). *Research on institutions of teacher education* (RITE Occasional Paper Series). Bloomington, IL: Indiana University, College of Education.

Cole, A.L. (1990). Personal theories of teaching: Development in the formative years. *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 36(3), 203-222.

Cruickshank, D.R. (1990). *Research that informs teachers and teacher educators*.

Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa.

Diamond, C.T.P. (1988). Construing a career: A developmental view of teacher education and the teacher educator. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 10, 133-140.

Ducharme, E.R. (1993). *Professing teaching: The lives of teacher educators*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Ducharme, E.R., & Agne, R.M. (1982). The education professoriate: A research based perspective. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 33(6), 30-36.

Elijah, R. (1996). Professional lives in context: Teacher educators' pedagogies. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.

Estès, C.P. (1994). *Women who run with the wolves: Myths and stories of the wild woman archetype*. New York: Ballantine Books.

Feiman-Nemser, S., & Floden, R.E. (1986). The cultures of teaching. In M. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (3rd ed.), (pp. 505-526). New York: Macmillan.

Fullan, M.G., & Stiegelbauer, S. (1991). *The new meaning of educational change*. (2nd ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.

Goodlad, J., Soder, R., & Sirotnik, K. (Eds.). (1990). *Places where teachers are taught*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Goodson, I.F. (1991). Teachers' lives in educational research. In I.F. Goodson & R. Walker (Eds.), *Biography, identity and schooling: Episodes in educational research* (pp. 137-140). London, United Kingdom: Falmer Press.

Hall, S. (1992). The question of identity. In S. Hall, D. Held, & T. McGrew (Eds.), *Modernity and its futures* (pp. 274-323). Cambridge, United Kingdom: Polity Press.

Hendrick, I. (1990). Teacher education and leadership in major universities. In J.I. Goodlad, R. Soder, & K.A. Sirotnik (Eds.). *Places where teachers are taught* (pp. 236-286). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Holmes Group. (1986). *Tomorrow's teachers*. East Lansing, MI: Holmes Group.

Holmes Group. (1990). *Tomorrow's schools: Principles for the design of professional development schools*. East Lansing, MI: Holmes Group.

Holt-Reynolds, D. (1991). *Practicing what we teach*. (Research Report No. 91-5). East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University, National Center for Research on Teacher Learning.

hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to transgress. Education as the practice of freedom*. New York: Routledge.

Joyce, B., Howey, K., Yarger, S., Harbeck, K., & Kluwin, T. (1977). Reflections on preservice education: Impressions from the national survey. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 28(5), 14-37.

Judge, H. (1982). *American graduate schools of education: A view from abroad* (Report to the Ford Foundation). New York: Ford Foundation.

Knowles, J.G. (1992). Models for understanding preservice and beginning teachers' biographies: Illustrations from case studies. In I.F. Goodson (Ed.), *Studying teachers' lives* (pp. 99-152). New York: Teachers College Press.

Knowles, J.G., & Cole, A.L. (1994). Researching the "good life": Reflections on professorial practice. *The Professional Educator*, 17(1), 49-60.

Knowles, J.G., Cole, A.L., with Presswood, C. (1994). *Through preservice teachers' eyes: Exploring field experiences through narrative and inquiry.* New York: Merrill.

Laird, S. (1988). Reforming "woman's true profession": A case for "feminist pedagogy" in teacher education? *Harvard Educational Review*, 58(4), 449-463.

Lanier, J., & Little, J. (1986). Research on teacher education. In M. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (3rd ed.), (pp. 527-569). New York: Macmillan.

National Research Council. (1989). *Everybody counts: A report to the nation on the future of mathematics education*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Neumann, A. (in press). Ways without words: Learning from silence and story in post-holocaust lives. In A. Neumann & P. Peterson (Eds.), *Research and everyday life: The personal origins of educational inquiry.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Pinnegar, S. (1992, April). *Student teaching as a teacher educator*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Placier, P. (1992, April). Maintaining practice: A struggle of too little time. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Ryan, K. (1970). *Don't smile until Christmas*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Schwebel, M. (1985). The clash of cultures of academe: The university and the education faculty. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 36(4), 2-7.

Shulman, L.S. (1986). Paradigms and research programs in the study of teaching: A contemporary perspective. In M. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (3rd edition) (pp. 3-36). New York: Macmillan.

Thiessen, D. (1991, April). Student-teacher relationships and the emerging professional identity of a first year teacher. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Tierney, W.G., & Rhoads, R.A. (1993). *Faculty socialization as a cultural process: A mirror of institutional commitment*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 93-6. Washington, DC: The George Washington University, School of Education and Human Development.

Yonemura, M. (1991). Glimpses of becoming an early childhood teacher: A teacher educator's perspective. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 21(4), 417-438.