Professional Lives in Context:
Becoming Teacher Educators

By Susan Finley

Katharine, Scott, and John are untenured but tenure track teacher educators in a large United States research university who have participated in a life history study of their socialization experiences.[1] In this article, I turn to statements and comments that capture their visions of their futures as well as of the future of education. I am interested in uncovering something fundamental about the ways in which these teacher educators address their projects as university faculty: their epistemologies, their worldviews, how they come to the world and try to understand it. I am interested in their life stories for what they can show us about the process of **becoming** faculty. I am interested in how they respond to the value systems, social structures, norms, and folkways of academic life and whether (and how) their responses might be of a type to influence transformations in schools of education. I am particularly keen to identify change efforts that may lead to radical reforms (Cuban, 1990; Goodman, 1995; Romberg & Price, 1983), those that might substantially alter the foundational social structures of their departments, their school of education, or even their discipline.

Paradoxically, the rhetoric of reform frequently casts beginning faculty as catalysts for change (*e.g.*, Ducharme, 1993; Fullan with Stiegelbauer, 1991; Lanier & Little, 1986) in the face of repeated reaffir-

Susan Finley is a doctoral candidate in higher education with the Program of Higher and Adult Education at the School of Education, The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

mations of claims that institutional processes and cultures, like individual outlooks and ways-of-being in the world, stubbornly resist most change strategies (*e.g.*, Clark, 1984; Goodman, 1995). The real question is: Do schools of education merely perpetuate traditional norms and values? For Katharine, Scott, and John (to varying degrees), their socialization has been a struggle between self and the dominant, existing culture of their university or their discipline. Yet, each has initiated some challenge to the accepted norms.

Probably the most radical reform efforts that I can envision are those that resist sexist, racist, classist, and conformist educational practices, that recast power relationships, and that could thereby warrant substantive restructuring of underlying values, practices, and social structures. These are the types of radical reforms necessary to have impact on what Goodman (1995) argues are four core principles that perpetuate the status quo in education and undermine school restructuring efforts—social functionalism, efficiency and productivity, individualism, and expertism. The question remains: Can radical reforms take place in a structure that rewards "fit"?

Studying *Becoming*

William James (1907) once told an anecdote about a student, graduated from "some Western college," who lamented that his "street life" and his university life were "supposed to have so little to do with each other that you could not possibly occupy your mind with them at the same time" (p. 13). James recast the graduate student's dilemma to argue that "principles of reason" together with "logical necessities" cannot explain "the world of concrete experiences to which the street belongs...multitudinous beyond imagination, tangled, muddy, painful, and perplexed" (p. 13). Whatever meaning can be made about the experience of the individual must be situated, at least to a degree, within social contexts. "There is, after all, a dialectical relation marking every human situation," wrote Maxine Greene (1988), "the relation between subject and object, individual and environment, self and society, outsider and community, living consciousness and phenomenal world" (p. 8).

Socialization research, then, needs to take into account shared understandings that emerge between newcomers to the culture and its existing members (Rhoads, 1993). Thus, even as it recounts interactions in the individual/social dialectic, socialization research must simultaneously discover the connecting strands of an individual's personal experiences. Transformations of self are continual and identities emergent (Dewey, 1916). For beginning faculty the processes associated with role acquisition may engender some of these changes in personal identity. In a book called *On Becoming a Social Scientist*, for instance, Shulamit Reinharz (1975/1991) recalled that "my experience of socialization was the attempt to retain a sense of self as I adopted a new identity" (p. 371; see also, Aisenberg & Harrington, 1988; Bucher & Stelling, 1977). Indeed, living in a living-world we continually engage

in processes of self-definition and re-definition. Likewise, as we make ourselves, we make and re-make our social structures, defining and re-defining (constructing and deconstructing) those structures over time. As Sartre (1956) has demonstrated, in making our own futures we also create the history of humankind. This is Browning's (1965) meaning as well in his avowal that "to be is to create oneself and thereby to influence the self-creation of those by whom one is known" (p. xi). It is with similar concern, in writing about theories of organizations, that Karl Weick (1979) observed:

> Events inside organizations resemble events outside organizations; sensitivities of the worker inside are continuous with sensitivities of the worker outside. Since people have as much desire to integrate the various portions of their lives as to compartmentalize them, what happens inside affects what happens outside, and vice versa. (p. 31)

In this report about the socialization experiences of teacher education faculty, I recast James' story of the graduate student's dilemma (how to find compatible intercourse between one's own worldview and the worldview of another—whether the other is individual or institution) as a question about socialization. Specifically, I am concerned to discover ways in which beginning teacher education faculty reconcile (or do not) their life experiences, worldviews, personal expectations, and feelings (multitudinous, tangled, muddy, painful, and perplexed as they are) with academic life, that is, how they integrate their personal lives with their professional lives (Weick, 1979). What Greene (1988) said about individuals is equally true of organizations, they both "devise their life projects in time—against their own life histories and the wider human histories into which those histories feed" (p. 23).

Life history research is especially appropriate in a study about socialization experiences because it places people's lives in social, community, and institutional contexts (Cole, 1991). As a research approach it increases the depth of authenticity in stories about individuals' lives by extending the temporal dimension of the research to encompass life-long and systemic developmental processes that may incur as long-held beliefs, desires, and attitudes are uncovered and understood as part of the transition necessary to acquiring a new social identity (Denzin, 1989). Greene (1988) notes:

> The effects of early experience survive, along with the sedimentations of meaning left by encounters with a changing world. There are the effects of environment, class membership, economic status, physical limitations, as well as the impacts of exclusion and ideology. (p.8)

Writing about autobiography and biography, Derrida (1985) observed that "the science of life always accommodates a philosophy of life." As such, the life history approach accommodates the participant's philosophy of life—**and** it accommodates the **researcher's** philosophy of life. Accordingly, let me be clear that this inquiry is largely situated in postmodern, hermeneutic paradigms: Follow-

ing Ricoeur (1981, 1991), organizational constructs, processes, and actions of participants are regarded as social texts through which I seek to discover and clarify meanings while simultaneously attempting to understand the unique perspectives (Gadamer, 1984) of the collaborating participants. Our method has been to establish a dialogue with faculty, to share experiences and to encourage reflective inquiry in order to uncover both cognitive and emotive aspects of their experiences with socialization processes that they associate with becoming faculty. One of the interesting things about research based in recall is that, in highlighting certain memories, certain interpretations, it leaves out or backgrounds other experiences, other interpretations. As a result, life history, like all biographical and autobiographical modes, "is not to be in any way confused with the so-called life of the author, with the corpus of empirical accidents making up the life of an empirically real person" (Derrida, 1985, p. 41). Rather, life history images a continuum of an individual's experiences, but from the (somewhat selective) perspectives of memory and analytical purpose. As anthropologist Edward T. Hall (1993) begins his autobiography: "This book is a record of one of the several stories of my life" (p. xiii).

In constructing their life history accounts about their experiences as beginning faculty, Katharine, Scott, and John each participated in approximately 25 hours of audio-recorded interviews. They allowed classroom observations and provided archival data (*e.g*., videotapes of classes, appointment books, annual performance evaluations, syllabi, dissertations, research papers presented and articles published, including working drafts, and tenure review materials). Information also included archival data about the university, school of education, and teacher education department(s) in which they work (Scott holds a joint appointment with teacher education and special education), and we have interviewed colleagues, family, and students.

Footraces, Fried Eggs, and Learning

Two points of consensus (regarding the individual) are widely shared in the literature about socialization: first, it is generally agreed that socialization involves learning; and, second, that socialization is a construct of human development and is, therefore, life-long, maturational, and systemic. Despite this base of agreement, there are still widely disparate theories entertained about developmental continuity and the personal identity of the individual. Strauss (1962, pp. 64-67) offers three metaphors to explain researchers' differing views of the transformational aspects of developmental processes. Without much manipulation, I have found that it is possible to recast the experiences of Katharine, John, and Scott to align with the research paradigms captured by Strauss's metaphors. Thus, in this "telling," I have utilized Strauss's explanations as an expository devise.

First, in a metaphor for developmental stage theory, Strauss describes a footrace along a path with a clearly marked beginning and end, and with other runners at various points all along the course. As an observer of the race, the researcher

evaluates the runners' performances as they approach the goals along the continuum of the pathway. For Katharine, the footrace analogy applies: she explains her emerging, changing personal identity in terms of developmental stages. Indeed, Katharine frames a developmental structure to explain her pedagogy (to teach, according to Katharine, is to facilitate students' development as learners) and her primary research interest is adult development. Consequently, it is no surprise that she draws on developmental theory to explain her own socialization experiences. In Katharine's schemata, the path of her professional development is conceived of as sequential and progressive, a series of intermittent stages of maturity (*e.g.*, childhood, high school, college, teaching years, graduate school) that have been experienced and learning tasks that have been performed before her journey culminated in the position of professor. The position, accordingly, is an object, a goal that one hopes to attain, a role one hopes to "fit." (Is it irrelevant that Katharine has considerable theatrical experiences?) To illustrate, Katharine resorts to a parable, which she bases on the story of the "Ugly Duckling," as it is told in *Women Who Run With the Wolves* (Estés, 1992). Katharine tells her story:

> Many, many, many people have to find their swans. That you're born into this family, into this culture, into this world, and you don't fit! I mean, it's not such a bad thing, that to the degree that you can see that you don't fit you're impelled to leave and go in search of the people that you do fit.... [Think of] all the moves the little duckling tries to make along the way and the really lousy choices the little fellow makes of places to settle in—all that happens to him is that it's very clear he can't stay there—move on. Move on. Move on. And what a shame it would have been had he found the comfortable place before he found the swans, because if he had, he would have stopped. And he would never have discovered what he was. So, it was a good thing that he never fit. He kept moving, and he kept moving. And then he sees the swans and he realizes that he's one! [But], then, there is this awful moment of: Oh, my gosh, if they don't keep me here, what will I do? Because the ante goes way up. Because once you actually find your swans you have got to stay.... I am surely not so afraid now that the swans are going to peck me out, but I have discovered that there are nice swans and not so nice ones. And there are swans whom I prefer and swans whom I don't and we all live in the same pond and we're all swans together, but I don't have to like all of them to still be a swan. We don't have to share all of the same values to still be swans.

John's case follows Strauss's analogy of an uncooked egg: whether we boil it, fry it, poach it, or make it into an omelet, an egg is still an egg. The metaphor captures the essence of social psychology models in which it is theorized that individuals (eggs) are the composites of their life experiences (still eggs, but bearing the effects of their experiences). For John, there has been less of an effort to "fit" the professoriate; rather, since joining the university he has worked steadily at those projects that interest him most, especially his teaching and service functions. John recognizes great continuity in his worldview. He notes that his "farm-boy upbringing" gave him a practical orientation that has served him well in several work settings,

including the professoriate. From the foundation of his experience he has given a name to his worldview: philosophical pragmatism. As a graduate student he was introduced to the writings of the pragmatic philosophers by a professor who observed similarities between John's thinking and theirs. Upon reading the pragmatists, especially Rorty and Dewey, John was able to put a name with his already well-developed pattern of thinking and problem solving: "I recognized a pattern of thought and action into which I had been largely trained." "That is the way I was taught," he continued, "so, there is a set of habits of mind that go with it."

Strauss's third metaphor is a learning comparison in which he likens a child's increasing verbal acumen and methodological understandings to identity transformations associated with adult careers. In his example the child becomes a qualitatively different person by virtue of what he or she learns. Knowledge changes identity.

Similarly, Scott recounts his life experiences as ongoing processes of formation and reformation; for instance, he observed that, "I've changed and I've extended and...I'm looking at things from a broader perspective." Moreover, Scott has consciously worked to adjust his behaviors since he became a teacher educator:

> I think this is the best class that I have taught since I've been here. And a lot of it is because of how I've changed and how I've really thought about my teaching.

He frequently compares his current perspective with viewpoints he has held in the past, and he often recounts incidents as learning experiences. (He wishes he knew as a teacher what he knows now.) Consequently, his introspections led him to identify "cognitive constructs" that make him uncomfortable (*e.g*., "that's the kind of thinking that I need to change"). He is especially adamant to change his teaching behaviors from those that imply intellectual authority and which lay claims to expert knowledge (c.f., Boyer, 1987, p. 120). Instead, Scott prefers to regard himself as a teacher-learner.

In our conversations, Scott frequently uses evolution as a metaphor to describe his personal growth as a teacher educator:

> Evolution, I guess is a word that I would use to describe it also. I think that it evolves. I think you can evolve as a professor, if you so choose to.... I know it's happening with me. I just keep adding on and extending and broadening and finding better ways, more efficient, more effective ways to do what I have to do. So, in being **here**, I think that one of the advantages and one of the things that I think sort of has speeded up that evolution in me as a professor is that I'm older. I have that experience that I had as a teacher and I know what the barriers are.... This whole notion of evolution—personal and professional—it's just helping me to further cement my thoughts and beliefs about my role here and my role outside of here—the need [for me] to continue to reflect and to grow and to build.... I guess one of the things that I think about a lot is that who I am influences the way that I teach. My experiences—all the things that I have experienced have shaped the way that I think and the way that I teach. The realization that it is evolution, that it doesn't stop at some point, that, I think, has caused me to get better at what I do.

Scott's evolutionary metaphor is consistent with what he describes as his "holistic perspective about the world."

> I'm at my best when I'm positive, when I'm balanced, spiritually, physically, emotionally, mentally. When I'm reading my novels, when I'm engaging in meditation and prayer, when I'm involved in church, when I'm exercising regularly, and spending time with family regularly, that's when I'm best at what I do.

And, he concludes, "In order to be successful here, I have to maintain those aspects of my life."

In his research, Scott tends to make connections between the topic of his study and their social, cultural, familial, historical, and economic implications. In his teaching, he draws upon his experiences as a student, a teacher, a school administrator, and a parent. He notes in an annual review that "reflections about my experiences as an African-American...have influenced my beliefs about educational reform."

Fitting the Frames—Or, Framing Reforms

Scott further links his own evolutionary patterns with developments in his field. He has drawn the evolutionary metaphor from its professional context, "we call it evolution in special education," he notes, and describes how, in the field of special education evolution has "moved [special education] from more segregated to more inclusive settings." Leading into a discussion about his preference for self-reflective, action-based research, Scott criticizes the special education research field for not thoroughly investigating its own development:

> When we've studied the impact of those [policy] innovations, you don't see a lot in the literature about what takes place in schools where kids are Latino, or kids are African-American, or kids are poor. So, if we continue to ignore it, then we will just continue to develop these innovations and those kids will continue to be left out of the discourse. So, to me, it's very important that we study...these innovations.

There are also deeply personal reasons behind Scott's commitment to develop educational policies and practices that ensure educational equity. As an African-American male who grew up impoverished in the rural south before moving north, he has both witnessed and experienced racism and classism. Scott is very clear that his goal is to be an advocate for "kids...who aren't...getting their fair digs in the education system." He has vowed to "include something of himself" in all of his writing, and to avoid taking a Eurocentric view in his research.

"I am an agent of change!" Scott enthuses. He understands that his greatest impact as a teacher educator will be in finding the largest audience possible for his message. It frustrates him only to influence the behaviors of the preservice teachers who take his classes, and the teachers with whom he works in an action research setting. Sometimes his frustrations lead him to speculate about moving on; he

theorizes that there may be some other position which would increase his audience and his persuasive sway. As Scott sees it, the problem "if we stay in the same place as teacher educators...and researchers in teacher education" is that reforms that will bring about educational equity will be stymied. "Then we'll just keep spinning our wheels," he says, and "this whole notion of the pendulum swing...reforming again and again and again...we'll just continue to do that."

As part of his argument that educational researchers (and especially those that champion the cause of equity) need to reach broader, more diverse audiences, Scott stridently advocates acceptance of a comprehensive array of research perspectives, especially greater acceptance of qualitative research paradigms—particularly among special education researchers. Scott describes this segment of the education professoriate as having become mired in their positivistic research frameworks. He says:

> With the changes in the structure of the populations and the demographics of this country, and the problems that we face in this country in terms of just quality of life and education for children or for the poor, we can't just continue to look at things through the same lenses. We can't continue to study things from a linear perspective—looking at or developing a hypothesis—looking at discreet, specific components, or aspects of schools. It has to become more qualitative than quantitative. The researchers have to become more diverse in terms of their race, ethnicity, gender, beliefs about paradigms. All of those things are going to have to change if we want to begin to provide some quality education in a very pluralistic society.

Further, Scott promotes acceptance of alternative modes of writing and data display for their potential to initiate reforms (compare Tierney, 1995). For instance, he greatly respects innovative researchers such as Sarah Lawrence-Lightfoot (whose book *I've Known Rivers: Lives of Loss and Liberation*, 1994, prompted several conversations with us about writing). Scott declared: "When I read her stuff, I say, 'she has taken the kind of writing that I like to do and made it very scholarly **and** it's respected in the educational community.' I'm thinking, 'man, **you** can do this!'"

Although his primary emphasis is on reforms in the broader context of the discipline, Scott is also concerned with local[2] (departmental) reforms. He is very enthusiastic about efforts that are taking place to restructure the school of education where he works:

> I think that we're beginning. I mean this program is new and they've changed it. I think they started working on the change my first year here, and I think that there are a lot of kinks that we need to get out of the program, but I think it has a lot of potential.

Katharine is far more cynical about her ability to influence departmental restructuring. It seems to me that her comments about departmental change reveal one area where a developmental schemata fails her:

> There is no way in heck I am going to continue to carry around and treat as if it were alive this thing called Program. It is not going to happen.... I can't fool myself about

things anymore like I could, like through some act of will and personal change I could make a difference in this place. I mean that's just not true. That's not true!.... Because there is no way that I am going to continue to breathe life into this corpse. This isn't even a corpse. It's a live entity. It's not real. The construction that people are treating as if it were a child that we should foster, "it's going to develop," "the program's going to develop." Programs don't develop!

Katharine and John are quite local in their orientations (John, for example, makes an argument for tenure based on his contributions to "oral and local" rather than "written" traditions.)[3] And, they are less interested than Scott is in disseminating their research to larger audiences. "To tell you the truth," Katharine lamented, "researching is something I do because I think I have to—official researching"; and: "If I thought that I could teach without having to engage in official funded research, I'd do it in a heartbeat." She continued:

Research wise, I'm least aware of expectations beyond the Center [a research site located at the school of education], and the Center simply expects you to crank it out all the time. Getting everything in your data and exploring it, and then getting it out there is just not the norm. Everybody talks about it and wishes for it, but it's not what the Center is. [At the] Center ...you get this huge pile of stuff. It's like coring a pineapple. You just take out the center and put it out there. You take that out and dish that out to as many high profile places as possible, and a lot of time is spent thinking about what those might be, because there is not infinite effort.

Despite her disdain for formal research, Katharine is particularly enthusiastic about a research project she intends for dissemination. She describes her proposal to write a paper, "where I talk about the research methodology as classroom pedagogy." "Does this sound like me or does this sound like me?" She continues: "This sounds like me!" She describes the research as meeting her larger goals for reform of teacher education programs:

It's this sort of place I'm trying to push the field—to do research and to do teaching are synonymous activities. And it's a kind of conversation that you would have with teacher educators where you would help teacher educators begin to learn to use elicitation devices that they would normally use as research, but to use them in a classroom context to elicit research quality data **about** the conceptual features of their course. I really think this is do-able. It's a lot more important to write about.... I'm sorry, it's just more important. It's a much bigger contribution to the field. It's 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.

Katharine's enthusiasm for this project and its potential to initiate reforms contrasts sharply with her earlier discourse about her frustrations and impatience with an unchanging department. Role theorists Thornton and Nardi (1975) have observed in their research about graduate student socialization that there are periods of time, such as during graduate education, when the institution and the individual

clearly communicate expectations for behaviors. Such clear communication is unlikely, however, when faculty are in the throes of departmental reform. Perhaps as a result of her frustration, Katharine has withdrawn her attention from the politics of departmental reform in her school to plan reforms that cast a broader net over all of teacher education. In doing so, she has tempered, modified, or adjusted her work expectations (for research) to suit her individual perceptions of how her role should be defined. "Role acquisition thus comes to involve individuals imposing their own expectations according to their unique personalities" (Thornton & Nardi, p. 880). And, clearly, Katharine's expectations include involvement in educational reform.

She is especially concerned about organizational structures that separate research, teaching, and service. Consequently, she has little use for research that is not directly related to her teaching. "Research is just the first part of teaching which is why I guess I resent writing about it all of the time, as if it were some thing in and of itself," Katharine observed. Moreover, she wants her research to be useful in improving her own and other's teaching practices:

> I guess that's the thing that I most want to get is to feel whole. Like what I'm doing matters and it's worth something to me. It's worth something to a client somewhere, to a real person. I'm not opposed, in fact, I'm sort of pleased that if I write about it, somebody else can watch, but that's not enough. Just to write about it, to write about the stuff would satisfy me. It has got to count, and matter in somebody's real experience, life.

For me, Katharine's comments call to mind Jean Lave's (1991) analysis of situated learning, in which she argues the Marxist perspective that people are objectified by such labor divisions. Writes Lave:

> [A]lienation follows from the commodization of labor through the selling and buying of the labor power of human beings (wage labor) who having sold their labor power, no longer turn their hands primarily to fashioning solutions to their own needs. Alienation in this sense involves the idea of separation—of the abstraction or extraction of central forms of life participation (*e.g.*, work, knowing, or doing something skillfully) from the human lives that really produce them, thus mistakenly giving human agents properties of objects. In particular, this implies that human activity becomes a means rather than an end in itself; people become hired **hands** or **employees** rather than masters of their own productive activities. (p. 75-76)

By way of contrast, John once described himself as an "odd jobs man" as a way of expressing his contentment with the role he plays in his department:

> In a general way, I define myself now in the same way that I have for a long time. Most places where I have worked I have been sort of an odd-jobs-man who did what was around needing to be done, jobs that I thought I could do. And that's where I still think I'm kind of an odd-jobs-man.... My past history of availability is what has given me a set of skills that make it seem like, maybe, I can do a pretty

good job with it, whatever 'it' is. That's the definition of an odd-jobs-man. An odd-jobs-man is somebody who is hanging around with his hands in his pockets and who therefore is available to do things.

Whereas Scott proclaims himself to be an agent of change, John holds out little hope that he can force significant educational advances:

I'm unable to take up, what you might call a societal transformation stance, fully, although I guess my entire working history says that I have been in some sort of social change effort or another.... I'm also inclined to think that deliberate social change, if it happens, doesn't happen very fast; so, it's hard to line up in a sort of an 'arms open' social reconstruction idea. Also because I think as bad as things are, there are also some very good features in the way we're organized.

Despite John's reluctance to characterize himself as someone who will effect social reconstruction, that has been his role in his department. In his tenure application, John asserts that his service work with schools, his collaborations with colleagues whose purpose is to revise the curricular program for preservice teachers, and his program of inquiry into his own teaching practice, along with reflective papers that he has written for "in-house" distribution, should merit tenure. (Of course, John also published several pieces that enhanced his application, including, for example, one scholarly piece that was an extensive literature review.) In his application portfolio he includes letters from students and colleagues who supported his tenure application and his decision to stress teaching and service over research. Even so, John asserts that any inroads he may have made in the tenure process were completely inadvertent. In an e-mail message to me, he clarifies his position:

I had to make the kind of tenure application that I did because I had spent my time the way I had over the preceding five years. The way I spent my time over the preceding five years was not a thoughtful challenge to tradition. For example, my work in [local schools] was a good fit between my history and [the university's] initiatives at the time; I continued with it over the five years far more as a line of least resistance—a fairly comfortable niche—than as a "damn the torpedoes" assault on convention. Remember that this was "approved" activity through the years in question. My attention to undergraduate teaching reflects my general tendency to focus on a few things rather than scatter my activity, but was induced specifically by falling into association with colleagues at [this university] who make those same investments.... Unless I wanted to go away, I had to apply for tenure, I had to put the best face I could on the way I had spent my time.

Meanwhile, John has held onto the tenets of pragmatism that previously guided his life. For instance, he notes that, prior to his tenure application, he had not developed the habits of mind necessary to being a researcher, "and...I had not tried very hard to develop such habits, because I could keep busy doing stuff that used habits I already had." Besides, John proclaimed, "what's going on in the literature is not a matter of adding original stuff, because a whole lot of stuff in the literature

is not original." Clearly, in the broad scope of his work, John is a highly ambitious scholar who engages in thorough, ongoing inquiry of his own practice, who keeps abreast of the literature in his field, and who collaborates successfully with his colleagues. John's scholarship is precisely the type that Boyer (1987, p. 131) suggests universities should revise their structures to reward.

Contextualizing Experience

The basis for this article is to report some of the deliberate and not-so-deliberate experiences with discipline-level innovations, organizational innovations, cultural innovations, and personal transformations brought about by the introduction of these three beginning teacher educators into previously existing educational cultures. The difficulty in describing educational contexts is in the tendency to categorize, to draw separating boundaries between the department, the school of education, and the university, not to mention even larger influential social structures—for example, international, national, state, and local communities. (As Derrida, 1985, has said, there is nothing beyond context.) Instead, in this report, I regard these overlapping contexts, or settings, in exactly the same way as I view the individual in relation to the organization—that is, I argue that organizations themselves overlap, blend cultures, and iteratively and reflexively influence change and innovation one upon another. Thus, I have presented multiple educational contexts, tangled and muddied as they are, by attempting to re-present the situated character of experience.

I am not suggesting that the experiences of these three individuals will inspire fundamental changes in public schools, in schools of education, or even in their own departments. What I do suggest is that some of their experiences may be indicative of ways in which radical reforms can occur. For instance, Goodman (1995) argues that four core principles aligned with the Industrial Age still underscore our academic cultures—social functionalism, efficiency and productivity, individualism, and expertism—thus enuring "change without difference" (Goodman, 1995; Roemer, 1991).

Social functionalism refers to a philosophy of education built upon a market place rationale in which schools exist for the primary purpose of teaching children to be "good workers." Goodman argues that the social functionalist approach to education is contraindicated by educators such as John Dewey and Boyd Bode who called for a socio-utopian rationale for schooling. "What is most important," writes Goodman, "is the recognition that school restructuring efforts be built upon a discourse regarding the type of culture we wish to build and the relationship between schooling and this future society (p. 7)."

Efficiency and productivity are values that align with a market place approach to schooling and follow a model of a well-functioning business organization. Educational tools in this paradigm undermine social interactions among students and teachers. Says Goodman:

> In contrast to reform efforts centered on efficiency and productivity, an alternative school transformation movement would be based upon a concern for the students' and teachers' existential experience in classrooms. Rather than emphasizing how much students learn or how efficient teachers...are...a much more substantive concern would be the quality of experience teachers and students have during the time they are together. (1995, p. 15)

An ethos of **individualism**, according to Goodman, underlies the value structure of our society. It is the foundation for arguments to support individualized education according to a child's capabilities, and manifests in tracking, ability grouping, and standardized instruction. Focus of individual instruction is customarily on the students' weaknesses. Thus, restructuring to counteract individualization would stress utopian responsibility to the "common good," as well as shared experiences.

Expertism leads to reform and restructuring efforts without the involvement of students, parents, and teachers. With the rise of industrialization, Goodman observed, came the end of respect for the "renaissance man" or "jack of all trades" (p. 19).

> By focusing on a specialized domain of knowledge, given individuals could gain a level of expertise previously unheard of in science or industry. The invention of electricity, the internal combustion engine, air travel, and hundreds of other wonders of the modern age were seen as the direct benefits of experts having time to focus their efforts in a particular field of specialization. Because the expert was viewed as "an authority" in an ever-expanding list of knowledge domains (*e.g.*, medicine, management science, accounting, law, education), the expert increasingly came to be seen as the person with "the answer".... (1995, p. 19)

Where Goodman has looked at these tenets of social convention to explain third wave school restructuring, it is my position that any actions that these teacher educators have taken to resist sexist, classist, and conformist educational practices that recast power relationships, or that warrant substantive restructuring of underlying values practices and social structures, are moves against these enduring tenets of Industrial Age education. For instance, Katharine's efforts to help teacher educators become researchers of their own classrooms reflects her Marxist take on labor divisions, Scott's efforts to admit that he sometimes does not have the answers, and John's characterization of himself as an "odd-jobs-man" is a move against elitism. If, as for Katharine, "doing research" and "doing teaching" are synonymous activities, then there is no "caste of experts" who solve problems from on high. To argue that research should be valued because of its usefulness (a position that is taken by all three of these teacher educators), because it "matters in somebody's real experience," is to work toward community and the common good, as is the kind of collaborative work efforts that John has emphasized. John has initiated a quiet revolt against standards of efficiency and productivity such as are measured by publication output—this is clearly a move to recast power distributions. Scott is particularly devoted to moving special education from a "deficit model" to a model for education built around concerns for students' life-experiences. His recognition

of the need for him to harmonize spiritual, intellectual, social, and physical demands in his own life accommodates a worldview that envisages a culture of difference that lives in harmony. His emphasis on multiculturalism and educational equity and on defeating racist and classist preconceptions of students is a strong move toward recasting power relationships to include minority perspectives. Especially in Scott's efforts to find new ways of presenting material, in searching for forms of discourse that will reach wider audiences, or forms that break the conspiracy of silencing so frequently recorded by minority and women faculty, I find hope for a breaking apart of conformist educational practices. From the experiences of these three teacher educators, there may indeed be hope for teacher educators to be the much sought after catalysts for educational change.

Summary

Previous writers have demonstrated that the graduate student's dilemma (how to interweave one's personal worldview into existing organizational structures and cultures) also applies to university faculty. For example, anthropologist Edward T. Hall (1993) observed that, at the point in time when he became an assistant professor, "a split had occurred between anthropology and everyday life" (p. 159). Several faculty have discussed the ways in which their own personal worldviews have "fit" (or not) with the structures of the university communities in which they work (*e.g.*, Aisenberg & Harrington, 1988; Delgado-Gaitan, 1993; Marx, 1990; Moses, 1989; Pleck, 1990). Reinharz (1975/1991) provides a detailed description of her personal development and changes in her worldview in *Becoming a Sociologist*, and Finley and Knowles (1995) explore the ways in which their individual experiences with art have influenced their approaches to doing educational research.

In light of these accounts and the narrative stories told by Scott, Katharine, and John, I envisage socialization as an intensely personal, continual process of self-formation and reformation, a process that involves self-reflection and self-understanding, brought about in large part through interactions with others (Reinharz, 1975/1991; Rhoads, 1993). Yet, for Scott, Katharine, and John, even "the most violent revolutions in an individual's beliefs leaves most of his [sic] old order standing" (James, 1907, p. 29). Says James:

> Time and space, cause and effect, nature and history, and one's own biography remain untouched. New truth is always a go-between, a smoother-over of transitions. It marries old opinion to new fact so as ever to show a minimum of jolt, maximum of continuity. (p. 29)

Indeed, each of these three teacher educators has retained elements of their old order (their personal worldview) at the same time as they have incorporated elements of the new. As such, the cases of Katharine, Scott, and John also support a cultural view of organizations (compare Tierney, 1992; Tierney & Rhoads, 1993), wherein the symbolic life of an organization undergoes changes brought about by

the introduction of new members, simultaneous and somewhat analogous with their personal developmental experiences. Thus, socialization is understood to be iterative and reflexive between individuals and organizations—each experiences some level of transformation during the process of assimilating new members into the professoriate.

Reinharz (1975/1991, p. 378) expresses concern that when universities stress conformity with the existing social structure and its incumbent mores, beliefs, and research paradigms, they may merely discourage innovation, experimentation, and "productive deviance." Katharine and Scott champion the kinds of radical reforms that confront racial, gender, and class distinctions. Nonetheless, they have each indicated discouragement in their attempts to reach beyond the existing order. That they contribute unique perspectives because of who they are—African-American male, Caucasian female, lower-level socioeconomic backgrounds (which Katharine indicates is more limiting than being female)—and their openness to innovative and alternative research paradigms may actually increase their vulnerability during their assistant professorships. In consequence, each has expressed some interest in leaving their institution, and Scott has toyed with leaving academia.

Their voices, Katharine's and Scott's, join those of others who have discovered that racism, classism, and ostracism of alternative perspectives formed barriers to their entry into academic life. (For example, the women whose experiences were recorded in Aisenberg and Harrington's *Women of Academe: Outsiders in the Sacred Grove* [1988] and Rosenblum's [1990] painful essay "Becoming an Arty Sociologist", and Tokarczyk's [1988] article, "Working Class Women as Teachers," and Moses' [1989 research project, *Black Women and Academe: Issues and Strategies*.) Perhaps schools of education should more closely consider changes that will "boldly confront cultural and pedagogical traditions and beliefs that underlie current practices and organizational arrangements" (Goodman, 1995, p. 2). Perhaps radical reforms are needed to alleviate the assistant, untenured professor's dilemma: to preserve the contradictions and complexities that occur in life, while encouraging among faculty a plurality of perspectives, points of view and experiences of the world.

Notes

1. This report is part of a larger collaborative study about teacher educator socialization. Rosebud Elijah investigated teacher educators' developing pedagogies; my investigation focused on teacher educators' developing research epistemologies.
2. For a thorough discussion of the concepts of local and cosmopolitan orientations and social identities, see Gouldner (1957, 1958), Tuma & Grimes (1981), and Mauksch (1986).
3. Happily, in the months since this article was written, John has been awarded tenure.

References

Aisenberg, N., & Harrington, M. (1988). *Women of academe: Outsiders in the sacred grove.* Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press.

Boyer, E.L. (1987). *College: The undergraduate experience in America*. New York: Harper & Row.

Browning, D. (Ed.) (1965). *Philosophers of process*. (With introduction by C. Hartshorne). New York: Random House.

Bucher, R., & Stelling, J. (1977). *Becoming professional*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Clark, B.R. (Ed.) (1984). *Perspectives on higher education: Eight disciplinary and comparative views*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Cole, A.L. (1991). Interviewing for life history: A process of ongoing negotiation. In I.F. Goodson & M. Mangan (Eds.), *Qualitative educational research studies: Methodologies in transition, Occasional Papers, 1*, (185-208). London, Ontario, Canada: Faculty of Education, University of Western Ontario, Ontario, Canada.

Cuban, L. (1990). A fundamental puzzle of school reform. In A. Lieberman (Ed.), *Schools as collaborative cultures: Creating the future now* (pp. 71-77). New York: Falmer Press.

Delgado-Gaitan, C. (1993). Researching change and changing the researcher. *Harvard Educational Review*, 63(4), 389-411.

Denzin, N.K. (1989). *Interpretive biography*. Applied Social Research Methods Series, 17, Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Derrida, J. (1985). Otobiographies: The teaching of Nietzsche and the politics of the proper name. In C. McDonald, (Ed.) & A. Ronell, (Trans.), *The Ear of the Other* (pp. 1-40). Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

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

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

Estés, C.P. (1992). *Women who run with the wolves: Myths and stories of the wild woman archetype*. New York: Ballantine Books.

Finley, S., & Knowles, J.G. (1995). Researcher as artist/Artist as researcher. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 1(1), 110-142.

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

Gadamer, H.G. (1984). The hermeneutics of suspicion. In G. Shapiro & A. Sica (Eds.), *Hermeneutics* (pp. 54-65). Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press.

Goodman, J. (1995). Change without difference: School restructuring in historical perspective. *Harvard Educational Review*, 65(1), pp. 1-29.

Gore, J.M. (1991). Issues and practices in inquiry-oriented teacher education. In B.R. Tabachnick & K. Zeichner (Eds.) *Practicing what we preach: Action research and the supervision of student teachers* (pp. 253-272). London, United Kingdom: Falmer Press.

Gouldner, A.W. (1957). Cosmopolitans and locals: Toward an analysis of latent social roles I. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 2, 281-306.

Gouldner, A.W. (1958). Cosmopolitans and locals: Toward an analysis of latent social roles II. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 2, 444-480.

Greene, M. (1988). *The dialectic of freedom*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Hall, E.T. (1993). *An anthropology of everyday life: An autobiography*. New York: Doubleday.

James, W. (1907). *Pragmatism*. Buffalo, NY: Prometheus Books.

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

Lave, J. (1991). Situating learning in communities of practice. In L.B. Resnick, J.M. Levine,

and S.D. Teasley (Eds.), *Perspectives on socially shared cognition* (pp. 63-82). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Lawrence-Lightfoot, S. (1994). *I've known rivers: Lives of loss and liberation*. New York: Addison-Wesley.

Marx, G.T. (1990). Reflections on academic success and failure: Making it, forsaking it, reshaping it. In B.M. Berger (Ed.) *Intellectual autobiographies by twenty American sociologists* (pp. 260-289). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Mauksch, H.O. (1986). Teaching within institutional values and structures. *Teaching Sociology*, 14, 40-49.

Moses, Y.T. (1989). *Black women in academe: Issues and strategies*. Washington, DC: Project on the Status and Education of Women, Association of American Colleges.

Pleck, E. (1990). The unfulfilled promise: Women and academe. *Sociological Forum*, 5(3), 517-524.

Reinharz, S. (1991). *On becoming a social scientist.* (Reprint of 1975 Jossey-Bass edition, with revised introduction). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Rhoads, R.A. (1993). A cultural view of faculty socialization: Reconceptualizing socialization/difference. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Atlanta, GA.

Ricoeur, P. (1981). The model of the text: Meaningful action considered as a text. In P. Ricoeur (J. B. Thompson, Ed. and Trans.), *Hermeneutics and the human sciences*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Ricoeur, P. (1991). *From text to action: Essays in hermeneutics, II*. (K. Blamey and J. Thompson, Trans.) Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press. (Original work published 1986).

Roemer, M. (1991). What we talk about when we talk about school reform. *Harvard Educational Review*, 61, 434-448.

Romberg, T., & Price, G. (1983). Curriculum change as cultural change. In G. Griffin (Ed.), *Staff development* (pp. 154-184). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Rosenblum, B. (1990). Becoming an arty sociologist. In B.M. Berger (Ed.). *Authors of their own lives* (pp. 285-297). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Sartre, J.P. (1956). *Being and nothingness*, (H. Barnes, Trans.). New York: Philosophical Library.

Strauss, A. (1962). Transformations of identity. In A.M. Rose (Ed), *Human behavior and social process*, (pp. 63-85). Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Thornton, R., & Nardi, P.M. (1975). The dynamics of role acquisition. *American Journal of Sociology*, 80 (4), 870-885.

Tierney, W.G. (1992). Cultural leadership and the search for community. *Liberal Education*, 78(5), 16-21.

Tierney, W.G. (1995). (Re)presentation and voice. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 1(4), 379-390.

Tierney, W.G., & Rhoads, R.A. (1993). Enhancing promotion, tenure and beyond: Faculty socialization as a cultural process. *ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, No. 6.*

Tokarczyk, M.M. (1988, June). Working class women as teachers. Unpublished manuscript, Rutgers-The State University, New Brunswick, NJ.

Tuma, N.B., & Grimes, A.J. (1981). A comparison of models of role orientations of professionals in a research-oriented university. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 26, 187-206.

Weick, K. (1979). *The social psychology of organizing*. New York: Random House.