Chapter 13

The Quest for Identity in Teaching and Teacher Education

Robert V. Bullough, Jr.
Brigham Young University, USA

> For us to change how we teach requires us to change who we are as teachers.
> (Feldman, 2003, p. 27)

Certainly since Decartes famously asserted, "Cogito ergo sum," questions of identity have been at the center of the Western quest for meaning. What and who is the "I" that thinks and therefore is? While in college in the late 1960s, the stream of the Western tradition continued to flow as my generation sought to discover and then express our true selves, an indubitable but original grounding that echoed a Platonic ideal. By breaking one's chains, chains of illusion, then turning and facing the light emanating from the mouth of the cave, a true self could be found. But how does one know that the self found is the "true" self? Does rebellion against parents and other bearers of "the establishment" necessarily result in self-discovery? I recall participating in protests that were publicly principled but privately just good excuses to party. Yet phoniness was high treason, an affront to the self and to the sincerity of others' quests for authenticity. True to Enlightenment traditions, and despite a growing presence of Eastern thought via the likes of Alan Watts and other cultural translators, the myth of self-creation first so powerfully portrayed by Henry David Thoreau in *Walden*, endured. One could not only find oneself, but, in an act of autogenesis, like Jay Gatsby actually create oneself.

One wonders, as John Murphy quarried, "is this search for an identity proof that a self exists?" (Murphy, 1989, p. 116). Does a generation seeking authentic expressions of the self mean there is a self to seek? No, Murphy argues: The self is a fragile fiction. Identity is merely linguistic, an expression of using a first-person singular pronoun, a habit of speech and of behavior, a performance that ultimately cannot be sustained. Indeed, he suggests, we are inevitably multiple selves depending on the range and variety of contexts we inhabit, each of which calls forth a different self. For some (Gergen, 1991), the discovery of multiplicity is cause for celebration. For others, at its extreme, it is a source of crisis, of severe disorientation and confusion (see Glass, 1993).

G. Hoban (ed.), The Missing Links in Teacher Education Design, 237–258.

What is one to make of this situation? And why are questions of identity and selfhood of such consequence to teachers and to teacher educators?

FROM A STUDENT'S POSITION: A STEP BACKWARD

To begin to answer these questions it is first necessary to step out of the teacher and teacher educator position and into the student position where we confront full-faced the weight of our moral responsibilities as educators. When asked why they decided to teach and to be a teacher (a statement about identity), teachers give a range of responses. Typically they recall their own experience as students and speak of their teachers. For those teachers I have spoken with, content area backgrounds are seldom mentioned. Rather, mention is made of the teacher as a person who, for good or ill, deeply touched their students' lives. Qualities, both positive and sometimes negative, are listed: caring, interested, passionate, curious, engaged, involved, humorous or, alternatively, disorganized, mean-spirited, disengaged. From my own schooling experience I can put human faces to these qualities and in doing so my judgment says something profound about my teachers as persons, about how I interacted with their self-presentation and they with mine and how together we engaged in a process of mutual self-definition.

To my great benefit, some of my teachers were *fully present* to me in the classroom. But each and every one of my teachers' lives presented an argument for a way of being with and in the world and for others. Some of these ways of being influenced my conception of who I was, how I should and could live, and what I might become. It was a teacher, Michael Arvanitas, whose passion for history helped turn me toward imagining myself as a historian. David Patterson (1991) nicely makes the point: "those of us who are teachers cannot stand before a class without standing for something . . . teaching is testimony" (p. 16). This is true whether one is a first grade public school teacher or a teacher educator in a distinguished private university. Parker Palmer extends and deepens the point: "Teaching, like any truly human activity, emerges from one's inwardness, for better or worse. As I teach, I project the condition of my soul onto my students, my subject, and our way of being together. The entanglements I experience in the classroom are often no more or less than the convolutions of my inner life. Viewed from this angle, teaching holds a mirror to the soul [or the condition of one's inner self] (1998, p. 2). Parents certainly are wise to ask of their children's teachers, "What sort of person is he?"

Stepping back into the teacher educator position, questions of identity have profound importance for the kind and quality of professional communities that we form as well as the programs we develop. As will be discussed shortly,

the subject positions opened to us by the institutions we serve and the duties we perform shape the kind of lives we live and in turn the kind of lives we live shape the kind of persons we become and the institutions we serve. Thus, program decisions not only have to do with what students learn and do but how we live and whether or not we are able to live undividedly. In turn, the lives we live and the subject positions we occupy and play out define for our colleagues, particularly our younger colleagues, models of professional being and provide conditions of membership. If they are to join with us, beginners must find acceptable and recognized subject positions which may require that they conceal conflicting aspirations. Having long histories, subject positions appear natural, but they are not. They are human creations sustained in multiple and often unrecognized ways through various forms of institutional labor including simply going about our daily business and doing our jobs. And so, a genuine concern with teacher educator identity and identity formation necessarily leads to both self and institutional criticism and perhaps to change and renewal.

MEANING, SELF AND IDENTITY

Already I have used two very slippery terms, "self" and "identity" which require definition and grounding if I am to say anything of value about teacher education and the quest for identity. As a point of departure I draw on the work of Harre and van Langenhove who helpfully distinguish between two senses of self: "There is the self of personal identity, which is experienced as the continuity of one's point of view in the world of objects in space and time. This is usually coupled with one's sense of personal agency, in that one takes oneself as acting from that very same point. Then there are selves that are publicly presented in the episodes of interpersonal interaction in the everyday world, the coherent clusters of traits we sometimes call 'personas'... One's personal identity persists 'behind' the publicly presented repertoire of one's personae" (1999, p. 7). Often these two senses of self are confused. In my own work I have found it helpful to distinguish between "core" and "situational" selves (Bullough, Knowles & Crow, 1991). The result of this view is that under "normal circumstances each human being is the seat of just one person, but of many personas. The same individual can manifest any one of their repertoire of personas in clusters of behaviour displayed in the appropriate social context. Taken over a period of time it becomes clear that each person has many personas, any one of which can be dominant in one's mode of self-presentation in a particular context" (Harre & van Langenhove, 1999, p. 7). This said, the extent of any one individual's repertoire will vary, sometimes dramatically.

It is within interaction that personas reveal themselves, are or are not recognized by others, and are judged as fitting–contextually appropriate or inappropriate to the rules, duties and meanings of an established storyline. Thus, through interaction speakers constitute and reconstitute one another in a kind of moving symbolic dance with contextually set rules and established but ever shifting boundaries. For instance, teachers and students position one another, often oppositionally. To be a good student or a poor one is to act and speak in certain ways which are recognized and confirmed or disconfirmed by teachers. When a young person judged to be a good student fails to act in accord with expectations and challenges a teacher's authority the teacher responds in a way very different from when the disruptive student is judged to be failing. But in both instances, the teacher asserts the rules and duties that bind teachers to students and that make their interactions congruent. Students may resist, but resistance comes at a cost. Conversely, if a teacher fails to act teacherly students will subtly press the teacher to a return to the *proper* teacher position, to the teacher subject position made available by the specific cultural and institutional context of schooling.

THE QUEST

Whether identity is real or imagined, the quest for it is experienced as real. We recognize the quest as simultaneously constructive and destructive both personally and socially and that it takes inclusive and exclusive forms. "I am this sort of person but not this sort." On their part, institutions favor and support some forms of identity and some personas over others. One cannot, then, simply chose oneself–we are all caught, trapped by the limitations and possibilities of the human networks within which and through which we live, the "Das Man" self as Heidegger characterized it, but we are not wholly determined by our location within those networks. We are tugged in multiple directions and are sites of clashing possibilities and conflicting impulses and social demands. As Thoreau argued: There is always the possibility of disobedience, of imagining things not as they are, not as given. This said, social networks and institutions both limit and enable identity formation, and in the limiting and enabling there is the possibility of severe and serious personal and social dislocation as well as of self-discovery and of rebirth.

Locating the self of personal identity as the experience of continuity of a point of view and as a source of agency and embracing self-as-multiplicity-of-personas, quasi-role enactments and self-presentations, brings two very distinct but related sets of problems. Problems of origin, content, and form, come with the first. Problems of consistency and congruence come with the second. Both sets of questions point toward the need to explore biography

and moral position, the history of interaction and of the contexts within which interaction takes place and by which rules are and have been set, and the rules and skills of interaction located in episodes, "structures of social encounters" (Harre & van Langenhove, 1999, p. 5) or sequences of "happenings in which human beings engage which have some principle of unity" (p. 4). Episodes "include thoughts, feelings, intentions, plans . . . of those who participate. As such, episodes are defined by their participants but at the same time they also shape what participants do and say" (p. 5).

The stories we tell of ourselves are spoken to specific persons, to an audience, and shifts in audience and of place result in changed stories each of which might be recognized as true and as belonging to a single, whole, embodied, life—stories that speak of identity not merely of one's passing personae. When written, however, the narrative is frozen and becomes a thing, reified and resistant to change. Textual coherence reduces multiplicity and "conflates the self as perceiver with the self as perceived" (p. 69). In effect, the order imposed by writing a story of self, a linear unfolding, stands in for the self itself. This is important for how I will compose the body of this chapter. To avoid the reification that comes with the written story form, narratives that have beginnings, middles, and endings, in what follows I will present and reflect upon several episodes that illuminate the challenges of teacher and teacher-educator self-formation and point toward the importance of attending to identity formation when thinking about teaching and learning to teach and of being with children. On the surface, the episodes will seem to be distinct but what binds them together is their place in the unwritten storyline of becoming a teacher educator. Drawing on C. Wright Mills' (1959) insight, I will seek to join biography and history.

EPISODES, IDENTITY AND PERSONAE

This section presents seven episodes, organized under three headings which represent different, but closely related, aspects of identity formation, social processes that shape who and what we are. I should mention up front that there are other fruitful ways of parcing the quest for identity. I have settled on these because they resonate with my experience and seem to be shared. They certainly are not comprehensive although I hope they may prove to be useful and perhaps provocative. The headings are: 1) *Identification and Membership*; 2) *Subject location: Rules and Duties*; and, 3) *Self-Expression and Enactment*. Each of these points toward questions useful for thinking about one's own identity and for considering how one might assist another to better understand what he or she has become or is becoming and why. *Identification and Membership* leads to these sorts of questions: With whom

and with what do I identify? To what do I belong? Who or what claims me as a member? *Subject location: Rules and Duty* points toward these questions: Where do I fit, what institutional spaces are open to me? What rules do I follow and duties do I perform and how is my performance connected to and recognized by others? *Self-Expression and Enactment* raises questions related authenticity, to how I feel when I play my part and whether or not the part I play is found to be life affirming and enabling of a sense of self coherence, as well as to whether or not I possess the skills needed for self-enactment. Before proceeding, I must mention that I will have little to say about temperament, which nevertheless has an important place in identity formation. Institutions favor some temperaments over others and temperament has a dramatic influence on recognition and membership. It also has a great deal to do with our ability to tolerate ambiguity and manage contradiction and incoherence, a point nicely illustrated by the life of the philosopher David Hume, for example. While this is an extremely important topic, I can only touch on it very briefly in this essay.

While the seven episodes presented overlap in various and multiple ways across the three headings, they are intended to emphasize one or another point about the teacher and teacher educator quest for identity. I explore the quest itself when I reflect upon each of the episodes.

Identification and Membership

We know who we are in part by who and with what we identify and to whom and to what we belong. Through identification with other teachers and with teaching we take on teacher-like qualities and speak in teacher-like voices and with teacher-like authority when with children and sometimes with parents, particularly less well educated parents. When we see teachers we simultaneously see ourselves. We recognize one another as belonging. Formally, teacher education is charged with facilitating the process of identification through socialization, particularly through field experience. But not all intending teachers need help seeing themselves as teachers, some, particularly young women who "played" school when small, already think of themselves as teachers; they are "called" to teach. A calling is a "form of public service to others that at the same time provides the individual a sense of identity and personal fulfillment" (Hansen, 1995, p. 2). For these persons, teaching is the avenue through which they find the fullest, deepest, and richest expression of their identities. They literally *are* teachers, they are not playing at teaching, even though they never have taught.

I was not called to teach. Nor was I called to teacher education. In some respects I fell into teaching and teacher education as a response to the political

and socio-economic period within which I was born and matured. My father was a junior high school art teacher who made a point of telling me that of all things I should avoid teaching as a career. I was acutely aware of the financial struggles of my parents and often resented the fact that my father, a Phi Beta Kappa university graduate, had to work multiple, and what seemed to me demeaning, night jobs to make ends meet. Still, I became a teacher, sensing in it hope for the future and a place within which a moral impulse for social betterment could be expressed. A professor, Florence Krall, helped me to see these possibilities by opening an avenue into alternative education.

As an alternative educator, I had great difficulty identifying with "regular" teachers and with the institutionalized practice of teaching. What I did with my classes probably would not have been recognized widely by others as teaching. I developed a school recycle center. My "students" and I studied the court system. We organized an anti-Olympic protest. We made movies. We wrote lousy poetry. Made pots. Played football. Grew a garden. Visited the state penitentiary. And we argued over issues under a widely spread parachute that draped over the classroom and produced a sense of intimacy and encouraged feelings of belonging. For me, teaching was a form of social action which was central to my identity formation, of finding my own place and way of being with others. Because I worked with young people who would not have attended school without the existence of the program and the program more than paid for itself since student attendance was the basis for funding, I was given remarkable leeway by school administrators to experiment and to explore and build a shared world.

Episode 1

During fall term of my first year of teaching a faculty dinner was planned. I attended knowing that some members of the faculty doubted that an alternative program should exist within what historically had been an elite, but, because of shifting demographics, a rapidly changing school. At the dinner, others were polite but only the special education teacher, Fern Register, spoke openly and was warmly friendly toward me. She recognized and responded to me as a fellow teacher. Fern's program and mine occupied the same floor of the building along with the lunchroom and auditorium. The serious academic programs occupied the top floor, far removed from us and our students. Auto mechanics occupied the basement. Despite dressing up and wearing for the one and only time my Phi Beta Kappa Key, I sensed my place: I was and would continue to be on the fringes of the faculty, which I thought was all right. I was an outsider, one whose position was determined by the limited value placed on my students by other faculty members (but not, I should mention, Principal Joe Richards or especially Vice Principal Mary Caffey).

I found freedom on the fringes. That I taught students who were of so little concern to so many faculty members produced a liberating benign neglect. That established institutional teacher subject positions were not fitting or did not exist for me proved exhilarating. That I was outside of the boundaries and was seen as not belonging meant that I was often criticized, but because of the protection offered by the two building administrators, the net effect of the criticism was only to increase the distance separating me from other teachers and to remove even the faint possibility that I would identify with them as teachers. Instead, I affiliated with other alternative educators who saw themselves as being counter-cultural and looked toward the university and toward my students' well-being for confirmation of myself and of my teaching personae, such as it was. That university faculty members were intimately involved in the program and in the school made identification with them easy. Naively, I dismissed other teachers as "traditional" and their work as morally lacking as I formed my teaching personae in opposition to the institutionally preferred patterns.

Reflection

Stepping into a rapidly changing and dynamic teaching situation profoundly influenced my development as a teacher (or non-teacher). I recall only an occasional tension between my deeper, biographical, sense of self, my identity, and the school personae I developed. I came to appreciate being seen by others in the building as odd, as belonging elsewhere. That many (not all) of the faculty did not understand nor seem to value what I did confirmed the worth of the work; had they embraced me, had they recognized me as one of them, I suspect I would have had to reject their association in order to have maintained my identity. In opposition, I found self-confirmation and strength. Yet, paradoxically, by defining myself and being defined as "not-teacher" the institutionalized position of "teacher" defined me. I played a counter melody to the melody of schooling, and counter melodies exist only in relationship to melodies.

Our patterns of identification and affiliation reveal a great deal about who we are, at base. We do not seek out others whose lives call forth from us an uncomfortable personae or whose expressions of self shake our own, at least not frequently. Yet, we do not only seek confirmation of our identities and the personas we have assumed; we are also animated by other motives, the desire to understand and be understood, for example, as Habermas has argued in his discussion of the conditions for communication. In desiring to understand others, including our students, we may discover ourselves to be a location of distorted meanings. We might even find that we are oppressors, that our identities and the personas we project have been constructed in such a way that

to confirm our worth requires the negation of someone else's sense of worth. In any case, if we attend carefully to those whose call we hear and to which we resonate, we learn a great deal about who we are and about the moral space we occupy. Later, I will have something to say about the seduction of teacher educators by the call of the arts and sciences and about the educational and personal cost of this identification.

Episode 2

A few months ago, a colleague who needed to speak with me left his card tacked to my door. It read, Professor so and so, "Professor of Children's Literature." It did not read, "Professor so and so, Professor of Teacher Education." Several years ago I read the obituary of a friend who suddenly died. For years he had taught methods courses in a teacher education faculty but in his obituary, which he wrote, he described himself as a "Professor of Child Development."

Reflection

I understand the desire to distance oneself from teacher education which even in colleges of education remains low status, labor intensive, and unappreciated. Identifying with work and with others judged second rate comes at a cost to self. What sort of person wants membership of this kind? Teacher education is not judged to be serious intellectual work, as John Goodlad concluded from his study of teacher education: "The preeminence of scholarly work and the faculty prerequisites that go with it are pronounced on the campuses of the major public and private universities. It does not take long even for the previously uninitiated to pick up on some of the subtleties of prestige differentiating fields of study, kinds of publications, awards, and the like. And it does not take much probing to find that gaining campus wide recognition as a scholar is exceedingly difficult if one is connected with a school, college, or department of education" (1990, pp. 192). I felt these pressures and recognized the status system even as a graduate student in education and I too distanced myself from teacher education although I knew that if I was to find employment in higher education it would be in a teacher education faculty. I thought of myself as a curriculum and foundations person and not a teacher educator. My dissertation was a historical and theoretical work, a portion of which later became a book on Boyd H. Bode, an important American pragmatist who moved to education from academic philosophy in the hope of strengthening the cause of democracy.

Following graduation I obtained a one year appointment at the University of Utah. During the year I supervised student teachers and taught methods courses tolerably but not exceptionally well and looked forward to a time when

I might have secure employment, which required publication, and teach foundations courses. As a beginning faculty member, I felt deeply divided. Despite my best efforts, I had not escaped the demands of teacher education even as I felt distanced from them. In 1982 I published an article on "professional schizophrenia." The opening few sentences of that piece read: "In schools and colleges of education there are surprisingly few individuals who claim to be teacher educators. They are almost everything but. They are psychologists–'educational psychologists'–or evaluators, historians or whatever. In any case, it is difficult to find anyone who claims to be a teacher educator. For most of these individuals it just happens that education is a vehicle for pursuit of their academic interests; when this vehicle does not serve these interests, it is easily abandoned" (Bullough, 1982, p. 207).

Despite my best efforts at distancing myself from teacher education, I could not fully. For one thing, on campus I was recognized as a member of the education faculty, and this meant I was treated as though I was a teacher educator. One response to such situations is to seek to have others recognize us as the sort of person we think we are. But, this was impossible. I was deeply and profoundly conflicted. I felt disconnected from the courses I taught, alienated. My identity, partially grounded in the experience of having worked in alternative education, insisted that I be engaged with students and committed to their development but I could see little of worth in the content of my courses and in my practice. I knew I had to spend more time publishing if I was to survive, and this seemed to require a reduced investment in teaching and in students.

Episode 3

Human Interests in the Curriculum (Bullough, Goldstein & Holt, 1984) was published at the end of 1983. *Human Interests* was the result of an ongoing study of critical theory with Stan Goldstein and Ladd Holt and of a fellowship spent sitting in on foundations courses with Walter Feinberg, Paul Violas and Harry Broudy at the University of Illinois. In the book Stan, Ladd, and I critically analyzed a range of school programs and did so with a sledge hammer. For a short time following the book's publication I felt very good about my work and my place in the department. My place in foundations and my personae as a foundations person seemed to solidify somewhat. But then one afternoon, Florence Krall, who was now a colleague, stopped me in the hallway near my office to talk. In her inimitable and always straightforward manner she said that she found the book "disappointing" and then remarked, as I recall her words, "there isn't any 'you' in it." I was stunned. I could not help but think carefully about what she had said and why she might have said it. She knew me and my history. Gradually, I came to realize that she was

right. In many ways the critic's role well suits me, but what she sensed was that I was hiding in the role and behind a borrowed ideology. Criticism was a form of disengagement, in this case a form of disassociation from parts of myself that she knew. Recalling my past, she invited me to engage in an act of self-recovery. I was in bad faith, as Sarte would way. One cannot simply escape history by denying it.

Reflection

Life as a teacher educator in a university requires a double-identification and membership, one with teachers and schools and one with the academy. Teacher educators stand between two "communities of practice" (Wenger, 1999). To describe this divide as merely a matter of an inevitable tension between theory and practice, as is so commonly done, is to miss the real point. The struggle is over membership and identity—indeed, "formation of a community of practice is also the negotiation of identities" (Wenger, 1999, p. 149). Sometimes schizophrenia results—in asserting oneself, one denies oneself. One lives incoherently. Various attempts have been made to create institutional contexts within which resolution is more rather than less likely. The Holmes Group (1995), for example, championed professional development schools as a way of "forming a tighter bond between scholarship and practice" (p. 60). The promise was that stable, satisfying, and consistently principled professional personas could be formed and that better teachers and schools would result once the divided loyalties of teacher educators were resolved. New loyalties and by inference new identities, members of the Holmes Group seemed to have realized, required new institutional commitments. But the divide continues and in some respects deepens. As the attack on teachers and teacher education grows increasingly shrill and irrational the temptation to withdrawal grows apace.

Affiliation with teachers assures low status within the academy. Strong identification with the academy and with the arts and sciences produces a crisis of authority with school teachers who often and not wholly inaccurately see academics as foreign invaders. In the teacher education classroom, strong identification with teachers, seeing oneself first and foremost as a teacher and being recognized by teachers as part of their world, leads to telling stories about teachers and teaching from one's own experience as a way of establishing authority claims. In contrast, identification with the academy leads to lists of disembodied and decontextualized generalizations and principles and, inevitably, to charges from students of irrelevance. Charges of irrelevance may prove hurtful, but identification with the academy and with the work of the academy is the only road to tenure. It is deeply ironic that even as teacher educators mimic the arts and sciences and seek a strong

identification with the academy, the academy consistently refuses to recognize teacher educators as legitimate members. Still, we seek membership and to get it many of us distance ourselves from students and teaching. It is little wonder, as Robert Boice (1991; 1996) has noted, that resentment of the demands of teaching is common among beginning professors across university campuses even as one's greatest professional pleasure may come from teaching.

Episode 4

In the spring of 1984 I found myself sitting in the Trustee Room of Teachers College, Columbia University, surrounded by a collection of deans that comprised the Holmes Group writing committee. In the first Holmes Group Report, *Tomorrow's Teachers* (1986), I am listed as a "participant in the development of the reform agenda" (p. 79). I was to present my view of the state of teacher education and teacher education research in America. Across from me sat Dean Judy Lanier, the force behind the Holmes Group, and above me hung beautifully framed portraits of T.C. notables of the past. With interest I read the nameplates. As I spoke I pulled no punches. What I said reflected my view, an admittedly conflicted non-member's view, of the state of the field. Had a young intending-teacher-educator been present I suspect he would have wondered, "Why would anyone want to affiliate with this field?"

Reflection

At the time I presented, this question was also my question. It was only while doing the research that resulted in *First Year Teacher: A Case Study* (1989) that I came publicly to refer to myself as a teacher educator and to understand the complexity and richness of teacher education problems and issues. I decided to conduct the research for *First Year Teacher* while driving to West Yellowstone for a brief family vacation. When back home I told a senior faculty member I highly respected of my plans. He was surprised and queried, "Why would anyone be interested in a book about an individual teacher?" He could see no possible value in the project, yet I persisted with it. I had come to realize that I could no longer continue to work in teacher education courses and with teacher education students and not try to do a better job for them. Despite consistently positive teacher evaluations, I was unhappy with much of my work and my teaching. To improve the situation, I had to embrace it, fully, and in doing so I found that almost despite myself I had left foundations and curriculum theory and moved into teacher education as an arena of action and of self-definition. I sought membership in the community of teacher educators. In retrospect, I believe the move was only possible because I could, in Parker Palmer's terms, "live divided no more" (1998, p. 168). To be sure, my foundations work had

lead to tenure, to institutional survival, and tenure opened the possibility of risking myself and seeking new membership and new forms of recognition.

Subject Location, Rules and Duties

What if, institutional membership brings with it rules and duties that are destructive to self and not just contrary to it?

Episode 5

Before leaving for Columbus, Ohio in the fall of 1973 for graduate study, I received a phone call informing me that I should plan on attending a meeting once I arrived that would signal the beginning of an effort to redesign the undergraduate teacher education program around specific competencies. I was stunned. My heart sank. I knew something about the competency movement in teacher education and I did not like it. Especially I did not like its underpinnings in behavioral psychology, its ontology or its simplistic epistemology. I had accepted a teaching assistantship and my duties included working in the undergraduate program. I was awarded a University Fellowship that would pay me to work full time on my dissertation when the time came. So, I left for Columbus feeling disheartened and, in some ways, trapped by the commitment I had made and duties I had accepted. Thus began my work with Professor Donald Cruickshank. One afternoon during our weekly seminar Professor Cruickshank and I had a disagreement. Over time we had many disagreements. He made a point that there was a need to measure outcomes in teacher education, and that, drawing on words he attributed to Edward Thorndike, he said, "Whatever exists at all, exists in some amount and can be measured." Immediately, without stopping to weigh my words, I corrected him. "No, it was William McCall (1922) who added the phrased 'can be measured' to Thorndike's statement." Then, to trump Professor Cruickshank, I added, drawing on John Dewey's Kappa Delta Pi lecture of 1929, *The Sources of a Science of Education*, that what is important in education cannot be measured.1 Professor Cruickshank ignored my insubordination, after all, I was merely a graduate student. On my part, I found myself increasingly feeling disconnected from the program, the direction being taken and the expectations I was to meet. I considered transferring universities, an action made unnecessary when Professor Paul R. Klohr took me under wing, but that is a story for another time.

Reflection

Peter Taubman (1992) writes of the subject positions open within teacher discourse, the dominate being what he characterizes as the position of the

"master" (p. 229). What if a teacher does not want and is not well suited to be a master or, in my case as a graduate student, a teacher trainer? What if the positions available do violence to one's identity? If the subject positions of a context are few and highly constrained by the distribution of rewards and punishments and one does not and cannot find place, what does one do? Clearly, as a graduate student, I was highly vulnerable. A sensible strategic move would have been for me to have kept quiet, done my duty, obeyed the rules, and engaged in strategic compliance until graduation. Through strategic compliance, I might have been recognized by my professors as belonging to them, as having a legitimate claim on them. I might have muttered to my fellow graduate students from a student personae even while presenting to my professors another, more compliant, personae, that of the eager and willing junior colleague. Or, I could have closed my classroom door and out of sight enacted a subject position more to my liking, more consistent with how I understood and presented myself. Each of these responses were then possible. I had genuine choices before me.

Now, it is much more difficult to hide behind a closed classroom door than it used to be. The greater emphasis on accountability in education generally and high stakes testing specifically has opened wide the classroom door and severely reduced the range of available teacher subject positions as well as tightened work rules. It is increasingly difficult to engage in role play and not be caught and judged deviant. Similar efforts are afoot in higher education, of which more will be said shortly. When outcomes are externally imposed and consistently enforced, when aims and means are kept separate and rules and duties carefully prescribed, it is very difficult to express oneself fully in teaching, to be passionate about one's work, and for many educators the distance between professional personae and identity likely widens as a result. I suspect it is for this reason that teaching is losing much of its appeal even to those initially called to teach. As a technology, teaching requires little investment of identity compared to teaching as an expressive art form. Narrowly prescribed outcomes stand between teachers and students and sunder many teachers' sense of coherence as their practice contradicts their moral commitments and identities.

Episode 6

Shortly after *First Year Teacher* was published it happened that David Berliner visited campus and met with my department chair. During the meeting, Professor Berliner, a former president of the American Educational Research Association and a quantitative researcher with sparkling credentials, mentioned that he had read and much admired the book. My chair, whose own scholarly tradition had led him to conclude that it was a soft study, not research

at all, was amazed, so surprised that he could not help but mention the meeting to me. It was as though he had been taken into space on an extraterrestrial vessel and just returned.

Reflection

This chance event proved to have an important influence on how my chair subsequently viewed my work, place, and status in the department. He reassessed me (he reassessed my work and therefore reassessed me), recognized me as a scholar who simply played by a different set of rules than his own, and, because of David Berliner's recognition, reassigned me to a higher status subject position. Suddenly, my institutional life was transformed and not because of any action of my own.

This event followed on the heels of what has sometimes been called the "quantitative/qualitative wars" that came somewhat late to my institution but came with vengeance. The central question was: What counts as research? The subtext was far from subtle which was the question of academic cachet and of what sort of work, or put differently, what sort of persons and identities, would be rewarded within the university and judged authoritative. Part of finding place within a field is finding place within the established modes of inquiry and then of following the rules of scholarship and doing one's duty as a scholar. As William James so well understood, questions of temperament are very important here. There is a close connection between temperament, identity, and scholarship—we study what strikes us, which is part of the "inner drama" of research, the "giving of one's self into the research undertaking" (Mooney, 1957, p. 155). We study best when we use methods that get at the full complexity of the questions that grab us. It was the failure of quantitative methods to do this, to get at the complexity of experience and to allow expression of the temperament of large numbers of educators who wished to better understand the nature of educational experience and not merely of human behavior, that led to the rise to prominence of qualitative methodologies. With the broadening acceptance of qualitative methods came new forms of recognition and new ways of being a professor. As an aside, it is this same uneasiness and lack of place that has led to the growing interest in "self study" in teacher education.

Since the late 1980s, there has been a dramatic expansion of the research subject positions of teacher education. A sea change. But, there are signs of a vigorous and growing backlash. Among the signs is the remarkably narrow definition of "scientific research" championed by the U.S. National Reading Panel and supported by the American president's education policy makers (Darling-Hammond & Youngs, 2002). In policy debates—now increasingly more like friendly insider chats than open debates—constricted definitions

of what counts as "data" are winning the day. Rules are tightening. Other signs of constriction include the shift of the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) toward performance outcomes as the basis for making accreditation decisions (Bullough, Clark, & Patterson, 2003). Seemingly unaware of the failures of the earlier competency movement that I first encountered at Ohio State, in the U.S. the Association of Teacher Educators has established standards for "master teacher educators" complete with an assessment model that includes portfolios, "Assessment Center Exercises" including written examinations and simulations, and interviews (see www.ate1.org). It is likely that one result of these developments, each grounded in an abiding distrust of teachers and teachers educators and deep doubt about the value of our work and therefore of us, will be growing pressure from a variety of sources internal and external to teacher education to reduce the range of available subject positions and to reorder the status of those positions that remain.

The implications of these developments for identity formation are far reaching. It appears that the institutional subject positions encouraged by these developments will have little if any connection whatsoever to the well-being of intending teachers or children and much to do with generating an inflationary political currency tied to standardized test scores. Finding place in these positions will take teacher educators away from their central moral responsibility to better serve children. But, we have choices about how we respond; and much is at stake for the well-being of children and of those who work most closely with them in how we respond (Bullough, 2001). Unfortunately, the present mood among the leaders of the various teacher education organizations is defensive and reactive, which does not bode well for teacher education or for children. Courageous responses can only come from strength of identity and clarity of commitment. Too many of us are, using the phrase C.S. Lewis used to criticize intellectuals, "men without chests" (1944/1996, p. 36). Such persons take established institutional practices as given, almost natural, not as historical and changing human creations.

Self-Expression and Enactment

Years ago I conducted a study of a beginning teacher who was uncertain about what sort of teacher she wanted to be and responded in chameleon-like fashion to the institutional demands of teaching, allowing the context to fully dictate her actions (Bullough, 1992). Since teaching is fraught with contradictions and paradox is the stuff of a teacher's life, she found herself facing the consequences of inconsistency. When grading, for example, teachers weigh quality of work against quantity and effort. What does

one do when a high achieving student puts forth little effort but produces an outstanding product? Conversely, what does one do when a less able student works diligently and invests extraordinary amounts of energy and time in a product that is good but not great? For this teacher, as I recall, what might be considered the normal paradoxes of teaching were debilitating. She spoke with many voices and stood for nothing. Many of her students, who expected consistency of thought and action from their teachers, were frustrated and occasionally angered by her actions. A strong sense of self, an established but not wholly rigid, identity, is the basis for moral action. Lacking stable identity, a strong personae may produce what appears to be moral action, but to call such action "moral" requires that it be more than a result of a person playing a temporary role—to be moral, action must be committed. As I sat in this beginning teacher's classroom, she lacked classroom presence, seemed timid, insecure and insincere, and uncertain. She waffled. Within the classroom, she could not enact a teacher personae.

Finding that students did not respond to him as he hoped and facing serious discipline problems, another beginning teacher (Bullough & Knowles, 1990) chose to adopt and enact the dominate subject position presented by his school and became a "policeman." To do this he had to set aside his sense of himself as a scientist born of years of experience working in a lab. When he did this, he temporarily lost his bearings, just as he lost himself. He was not a very good policeman, and did not enjoy the part at all. Still, he played it and became better at being a policeman over time because within the school both students and teachers understood and recognized as legitimate this subject position. But the policeman personae was ill fitting.

The first beginning teacher lacked a clear sense of herself as teacher. The second had a sense of himself as teacher but it was not one that he could enact in the classroom. In the urban school culture within which he taught, he could not be who he thought he was as teacher. Perhaps more importantly, he did not possess the skills requisite for enactment of his sense of self as teacher. For each, teacher education failed to address questions of self-as-teacher. A programmatic emphasis on teaching skills had not prepared them to confront the most fundamental problem of teaching–finding and making place and expressing self in teaching.

Episode 7

Sitting in a colleague's office chatting, she suddenly realized that class was about to begin. After glancing at her watch, she looked up, smiled, and said to me, "time to put on my teaching mask." I asked: "You put on a mask?" "Yes, it's like playing a part. I have a teacher's face that I wear when teaching." She

left, and I began to ponder what teaching was like for me and what sort of teacher I was.

Reflection

Over years of teaching, my friend had developed a studied professional personae that she easily moved in and out of. She knew her part and knew it and played it well, sometimes brilliantly. She also knew the other players. When teaching she had a teacher's voice; and a teacher's look. Having observed her teach on numerous occasions, I noticed the difference between when she was "on" and when she was "off" stage. Within the classroom she employed a wide range of instructional strategies. Sometimes she modeled what she would refer to as "best practice." She would tell stories, have students engage in group work, work on projects, read research, and arrange then process field trips. As teacher, I realized she played many parts. As I came to know and appreciate her, I realized that her teaching personae reflected a committed point of view, an identity through which was woven a set of fundamental principles. She knew who she was and how she wanted to be with others which was a source of power and influence. Other's responded to her as she wished them to; they recognized her as professor. She had developed a variety of skills to support her effort to be. She was one person but she had multiple personas into which she invested herself fully. Each personae that I knew was an expression of the underlying unity of self, a life's trajectory and moral force.

As I have thought about my colleague and friend and compared my experience with her's I have realized that only when I am uncomfortable and uncertain do I grab hold of a mask and then my self-expression is stilted and my humor strained. The quality of a laugh is the best witness of the authenticity of an expression. Perhaps because I am older than she, and age matters, I seem to have fewer personas, fewer parts to play. After years of professing, I am what I do. Perhaps my habit of self is stiffer and less pliable than her's, less open to surprise and less likely to change. One result is that I am quite resistant to institutional demands and related subject positions that feel snug, tight fitting. For good or ill, having a point of view and a sense of agency, an identity, makes resistance possible; but it also, I am well aware, presents the danger of fundamentalism, of being closed to contrary experience and unable to grasp opportunities to unlearn the world.

CONCLUSION

> This then is our liberation from objectivism: to realize that we can voice our ultimate convictions only from within our convictions–from within the whole system of acceptances that are logically prior to any particular assertion of our

> own, prior to the holding of any particular piece of knowledge. If an ultimate logical level is to be attained and made explicit, this must be a declaration of my personal beliefs. I believe that the function of philosophic reflection consists in bringing to light, and affirming as my own, the beliefs implied in such of my thoughts and practices as I believe to be valid; that I must aim at discovering what I truly believe in and at formulating the convictions which I find myself holding; that I must conquer my self-doubt, so as to retain a firm hold on this program of self-identification. (Polanyi, 1958, p. 267)

Six years ago I had occasion to make a portion of my principles public (Bullough, 1997), the "convictions," as Polanyi states, "which I find myself holding." They represent a piece of my quest for identity as I journeyed from being an alternative educator and reluctant "teacher" to becoming a teacher educator. I shall not repeat what I wrote, but I recommend the practice of going public with one's principles and of systematically putting them to the test which is what Polanyi means by his phrase, a "program of self-identification." Polanyi's warning about the danger of self-doubt to self-discovery is crucially important here. In our time, self-doubt expresses itself in many forms including in the inability to make commitments–and the commitments we make, how we are invested and in what we invest our lives, as I have suggested earlier, are good measures of the persons we are and of our moral standing. Indeed, one manifestation of postmodernism is the ability to shift commitments quickly and to hold multiple and sometimes contradictory commitments and none too deeply. This is one reason why I find inspiring many of the teachers I know: They overcome self-doubt by reaffirming each day their central commitment to children; through their practice, they utter the holy words, "I am."

Often teacher educators ask beginning teachers to write a personal philosophy. The assignment produces flights of fantasy but the real task at hand, as I have suggested, is to consider questions of identification and membership, subject location, rules and duties, and forms of self-expression and enactment. One must dig for data into the ground of one's being and to consider the life lived, the commitments made, the forms and expressions of personal identification and recognition employed—including those that produce anger and disappointment, and inspire joy—and the beliefs that animate and give direction to action. One also must consider one's desired way of being in the world that seeks full expression and invites but never compels bold action. For beginning and experienced teachers alike this is a critical but risky practice; still it ought to be a central concern of both preservice and inservice teacher education and, importantly, of teacher educators. We must not excuse ourselves. Whatever the arena, in teaching and in teacher education the medium is the message and the message is the teacher's life and being, how the teacher makes sense of the world and stands within it. Oddly, this is one focus for reflection that often has been ignored in the teacher education literature and

practice yet it is the grounding of all that is important within the practice of teacher education. Perhaps this is so because inevitably to ask questions of this kind leads to sacred soil. In this chapter I have focused on three aspects of identity formation, *Identification and membership*, *Subject location with rules and duties*, and *Self-expression and enactment* and reflected on my own quest for identity as a teacher educator. The episodes are mine, as is the meaning I make of them. But I recognize that other meanings are also possible, other conclusions.

A warning is in order, however. Rather than lead to increasing moral action and greater courage of conviction, the habit of self-criticism can, like Jean-Baptiste Clamence in Camus' *The Fall*, leave behind a person frozen in inaction, lost to self and to others. In contrast, Polanyi's call is to act on the world, to be willing to put oneself at risk for the sake of the self and of the world. Such acts, usually based on only partial information or mere hunches and sometimes only on the judgements embedded in our emotions, point toward the heroic nature of the quest for identity.

A final thought. In some respects, identity might be thought of as a tendency toward the good, a quiet desire. In teaching, personal tendencies dress up and masquerade as authorized conceptions of the good, including judgements about the nature of those we teach. Discovering one's tendencies and uncovering one's pretenses is serious and humbling educational work. We recognize ourselves as deeply and inevitably contradictory creatures. Humility restrains our reproductive urge, the temptation to try and impose our identities on others, to colonize unto death another's personhood. Yet, we know, deep down, that colonization is not even possible let alone desirable and inevitably confront a simple truth: Education is always indirect and its results unpredictable. But in unpredictability resides hope—the possibility that something impossibly wonderful might happen, the miracle of learning, of a student accepting our invitation to engagement and becoming over time more interesting, more centered, better grounded, and more able than are we. There is also opportunity—new subject positions can be created, ones that invite communion inside of the academy and ever fuller expressions of human excellence. Facing my limitations draws me further inward to a deep desire, a longing widely shared by teachers—to enable for others what I seek most for myself: to discover and fully express what the ancient Greeks described as arete, one's particular and peculiar form of virtue or excellence, to be one's own best, that so concerned Socrates. To discover the virtue of self we need to witness virtue in others and in its many and various expressions. This is the teacher's testimony. Through such encounters we come to see that arete is possible, that there is a point to the quest for meaning even as there may not be a fully satisfying conclusion—a fully stable identity. Through identification with questing

others, through being allowed—or insisting that we be allowed (and allowing our students)—to occupy subject positions that sustain the quest, and through courageously expressing, investing in, and testing our sense of ourselves, we achieve ourselves for ourselves and for others. The challenge is to remain teachable, open, but not too open, to contrary data, and to stay in touch with the world, and to stay in touch requires staying deeply invested in those we teach and with those with whom we live and work.

1. The full Dewey quote follows: 'That which can be measured is the specific, and that which is specific is that which can be isolated. The prestige of measurements in physical science should not be permitted to blind us to a fundamental educational issue: How far is education a matter of forming specific skills and acquiring special bodies of informatino which are capable of isolated treatment? It is no answer to say that a human being is always occupied in acquring a special skill or a special body of facts, if he is learning anything at all. This is true. But the *educational* issue is what *other* things in the way of desires, tasts, aversions, abilities and disabilities he is learning along with his specific acquisitions' (1929, pp. 64–65).

REFERENCES

Boice, R. (1991). New faculty as teachers. *Journal of Higher Education, 62*(2), 149–173.

Boice, R. (1996). *First-order principles for college teachers*. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Company, Inc.

Bullough, R.V., Jr. (1982). Professional schizophrenia: Teacher education in confusion. *Contemporary Education, 53*(4), 207–212.

Bullough, R.V., Jr. (1989). *First year teacher: A case study.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Bullough, R.V., Jr. (1992). Beginning teacher curriculum decision making, personal teaching metaphors, and teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 8*(3), 239–252.

Bullough, R.V., Jr. (1997). Practicing theory and theorizing practice in teacher education. In J. Loughran and T. Russell (Eds.). *Teaching about teaching: Purpose, passion and pedagogy in teacher education*, (pp. 13–31). Washington, D.C.: The Falmer Press.

Bullough, R.V., Jr. (2001). *Uncertain lives: Children of promise, teachers of hope.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Bullough, R.V., Jr., & Knowles, J.G. (1990). Becoming a teacher: The struggles of a second-career beginnng teacher. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 3*(2), 101–112.

Bullough, R.V., Jr., Goldstein, S.L., & Holt, L. (1984). *Human interests and the curriculum: Teaching and learning in a technological society*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Bullough, R.V., Jr., Knowles, J.G., & Crow, N.A. (1991). *Emerging as a teacher*. New York and London: Routledge.

Bullough, R.V., Jr., Clark, D.C., & Patterson, R.S. (2003). Getting in step: Accountability, accreditation and the standardization of teacher education in the United States. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 29*(1), 35–52.

Darling-Hammond, L., & Youngs, P. (2002). Defining "highly qualified teachers": What does "scientifically-based research" actually tell us? *Educational Researcher, 31*(9), 13–25.

Dewey, J. (1929). The sources of a science of education. New York: Macmillan.
Feldman, A. (2003). Validity and quality in self-study. *Educational Researcher, 32*(3), 26–28.
Gergen, K.J. (1991). *The saturated self: Dilemmas of identity in contemporary life.* New York: Basic Books.
Glass, J.M. (1993). *Shattered selves: Multiple personality in a postmodern world*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
Goodlad, J.I. (1990). *Teachers for our nation's schools.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
Hansen, D.T. (1995). *The call to teach*. New York: Teachers College Press.
Harre, R., & van Langenhove, L. (Eds.). (1999). *Positioning theory.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
Holmes Group. (1995). *Tomorrow's schools of education*. East Lansing: Author.
Lewis, C. S. (1944/1996). *The abolition of man*. New York: Touchstone.
McCall, W.A. (1922). *How to measure in education*. New York: Macmillan.
Mills, C.W. (1959). *The sociological imagination*. New York: Oxford University Press.
Mooney, R.L. (1957). The researcher himself. *Research for curriculum development*, (pp. 154–186). Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
Murphy, J.W. (1989). *Postmodern social analysis and criticism*. New York: Greenwood Press.
Palmer, P. (1998). *The courage to teach: Exploring the inner landscape of a teacher's life*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
Patterson, D. (1991). The eclipse of the highest in higher education. *The Main Scholar: A Journal of Ideas and Public Affairs, 4*, 7–20.
Polanyi, M. (1958). *Personal knowledge: Towards a post-critical philosophy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Taubman, P.M. (1992). Achieving the right distance. In W.F. Pinar and W.M. Reynolds (Eds.), *Understanding curriculum as phenomenological and deconstructed text*, (pp. 216–236). New York: Teachers College Press.
Wenger, E. (1999). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. New York: Cambridge University Press.