

Chapter 2

Exploring Theoretical Frameworks of Problem Based Learning Through Aoki's *Curriculum-as-Plan* and *Curriculum-as-Lived*

Jeannie Kerr

Introduction

Before getting to the discussion, it's important for me to be clear about my relation to the subject and the place from which I write. I am an emerging theorist and scholar in educational studies/curriculum theory and have been teaching in the Teacher Education Program in many of the cohorts at UBC since 2010. I consider place and relationships as fundamental to my work in education and acknowledge that I do this work as a first-generation settler on unceded, traditional, and ancestral Coast Salish territory.¹ I generally teach courses that consider the social experience and complications of schooling and education through engaging issues of social equity, cultural and linguistic diversity, and place – as each relates to teaching practice. I am now in my third year working with the TELL-PBL cohort as an instructor teaching a recently developed course *Aboriginal Education in Canada* and this year also teaching the course *Teaching and Learning with English Language Learners*. I accepted a contract position as tutor and faculty advisor in the program this academic year after completing my PhD. Thus I have the interesting position of having multiple roles within this cohort, and specific educational priorities in diversity and social equity, but also a scholarly practice of engaging theory and philosophy in the field of teacher education. From my experiences in the TELL-PBL cohort, I have developed a significant appreciation for the benefits of this approach and a practical sense of the complications of planning and implementing this approach in teacher education. It is

¹I use the term “settler” following the work of Paulette Regan (2010) to denote my social position as a person that has settled on indigenous lands but also to forefront my educational priorities in decolonization. The Coast Salish people in the territory in which I live and work are the Musqueam, Squamish, and Tsleil-Waututh First Nations.

J. Kerr (✉)

Department of Educational Studies, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC, Canada
e-mail: Jeannie.kerr@ubc.ca

from these priorities and experiences from which I write these theoretical considerations.

Framing the Discussion: Curriculum-as-Plan and Curriculum-as-Lived

Ted Aoki makes this distinction of *curriculum-as-plan* and *curriculum-as-lived* partially to bring into relief the multiplicity and complexity that emerges when educational plans are brought together with real people that breathe life and meaning into what are often abstract ideas (Aoki 1993, p. 258). Over the last 30+ years, PBL has been developing a body of scholarship that consists of both formal curricular documents, as well as the narratives of implementation of these ideas in different disciplinary contexts in real places. This book continues to build on this tradition and engages in a *complicated conversation*² of PBL as it is being lived in a teacher education program at UBC. Aoki suggests that to truly understand educational ideas, our formalized inquiries should consider the ways these ideas become artfully lived by people with unique histories, motives, intentions, and orientations (Aoki 1993, p. 257). In my view, this book embodies Aoki's distinctions through sharing the narratives of the people who are living the PBL curriculum here at UBC and the ways they make sense of themselves and PBL theory and methodology as they do so. In this sense, this book is a formal study of the art of living PBL in a specific teacher education cohort at UBC, and therefore I felt the theoretical framework would be best conceptualized in this way to resonate with the structure of this book.

In following through with these ideas, this chapter will be organized into three major sections. In the first section I will look at PBL in a more abstract way and consider the broader discussions of theory and practice that underlie PBL programs as discussed in the scholarship. I will also offer some of my own thoughts on a philosophical grounding for PBL in hermeneutics. In the second section, I will move to the lived curriculum and discuss the ways that teacher education offers a unique venue for PBL. I will also consider how the educational priorities of the people living PBL curriculum in TELL-PBL have influenced a shift in the theoretical framing of PBL. In the third section, I will end this chapter with a brief summary and conclusion and some thoughts on the benefits of PBL in terms of issues of social equity.

²I use this term "complicated conversation" to draw on William Pinar's original meaning and to refer to the way Anne Phelan positions this term in teacher education as a needed conversation that "can extend current discussions to concerns about subjectivity (human agency and action), society, and historical moment" (Phelan 2011, p. 213).

PBL: Curriculum-as-Plan

Maggi Savin-Baden (2000) warns that attempting to define PBL and contain it within boundaries unnecessarily tends to position PBL as a progressive approach to learning set in opposition to what are deemed problematic, traditional notions of learning (p. 16). To avoid this sort of dichotomous and limited understanding, she recommends seeing the key characteristics of the approach holistically and then considers PBL as ideologically located in experiential learning discourse (p. 17). In this section, I will consider PBL as emerging from a particular context and set of concerns in higher education, asking more specifically – What is PBL seen *as response to* in an ongoing consideration of the education of adult students for professional practice? In this section, I will provide the structure of PBL as a cohesive set of responsive practices that are initially identified with the work of Howard Barrows in a medical education program at McMaster University in the early 1970s and then assemble a theoretical framework that locates this set of practices.

Howard Barrows is often considered one of the founding promoters of PBL. His work started with a desire to engage medical students more thoroughly with the complexity of medical practice. Barrows' role heading the team "The Project for Learning Resources Design" worked systematically to develop the PBL approach which soon migrated to other medical schools, diverse programs of professional practice, and then moved into to the K-12 education system in multiple subject areas (Barrows and Kelson 1993, p. 6). Howard Barrows and Anne Kelson note that the PBL approach is a total and systematic response to common complaints that students in all levels of education are passive, scoring poorly on national examinations, have little world knowledge, are apathetic and disconnected, and more generally cannot retain and use what they learn in flexible ways (p. 1). The authors identify six practices/dimensions to the PBL process: (1) through posing ill-structured real-world problems, students are engaged with a process of generating, inquiring, and refining hypotheses methodically; (2) through problem design that avoids explicit objectives, students recognize that they require more knowledge/skills to "dig out" the problems themselves, and with experience in the PBL curriculum, students develop a richly elaborated base of "integrated knowledge and skills" and cognitive flexibility; (3) through teacher facilitation rather than lecture or providing answers, students develop self-directed learning skills; (4) through group structured inquiry, students develop collaboration skills and appreciate the value of multiple perspectives to address problems; (5) "overarching" across the experiences in PBL is that all processes are student-centered and geared to being interdisciplinary – having students take personal and group responsibility for their learning; and (6) through posing the question as a continual instigation, students generate self-appraisal and self-reflection habits (pp. 1–2).

A small number of scholars have concentrated on pulling out the theoretical grounding for PBL based on Barrows' commitments. Alastair McPhee (2002) distinguishes a PBL educational approach as one that provides a fully interlocking web of experiences based in *constructivism*, where the problems constitute the basis of

learning (p. 62). Similarly, Wim Gijselaers (1996) states that theories in cognitive psychology on metacognition are closely aligned with PBL-based education programs (pp. 13–14). He draws on the work of Glaser (1991) which highlights that learning is a *constructive and metacognitive* process – one that requires the learner to construct knowledge and also be aware of this in a way that relies on self-monitoring of goal setting, strategy selection, and evaluation (Gijselaers 1996, p. 16). In this theoretical orientation, the importance of social and contextual factors in learning is emphasized – pointing to the need for learning in higher education to be set in collaborative group situations and to mirror the uneven and ill-fitting nature of the real world in which the curriculum will need to be understood (p. 16). As real-world problems defy disciplinary boundaries, McPhee concludes that PBL necessarily engages an interdisciplinary educational approach (McPhee 2002, p. 63).

Savin-Baden emphasizes the similar theoretical perspective within PBL for complexity and student-centeredness as aligning with the cognitive theoretical tradition but also with the philosophical approach of Socrates and Dewey. Savin-Baden (2000) draws on Carl Rogers' *humanistic* work that marks the importance of the learner having control of the learning context (p. 7). Savin-Baden also draws on the roots of the PBL approach as locating in the philosophical tradition of Socrates via the *Socratic method*. As she notes: Socrates presented problems to students through questions, which “enabled him to help them explore their assumptions and values and the inadequacies of their proffered solutions” (p. 3). Savin-Baden also makes meaningful theoretical links to PBL through John Dewey's (1938) philosophical writing on the active requirements of knowledge generation in *experiential learning theory*. She notes we understand knowledge in this perspective “not as something that is reliable and changeless, but as something we engage with and do” and is “bound up with activity” in real-life complex contexts (pp. 4–5). In this sense, to learn with complexity is not to engage in straightforward answers but to make real-life connections to the area of study and the complexity of the ways it manifests in the world.

The focus on Dewey's *experiential learning* theory is taken up in a more detailed way, as well as linked to Carl Rogers' *client-centered therapy* (CCT), by Kareen McCaughan in her theoretical exploration of the guidelines Barrows established for PBL tutors. McCaughan (2013) points out that within Dewey's theory he explicitly addresses the behaviors of teachers that promote student inquiry, problem-solving, and self-direction and that Rogers aligns and extends Dewey's theory within a therapeutic context (p. 12). She argues that Barrows emphasized that teachers in PBL are tutors that require a mix of direct and nondirective facilitation techniques built on humanistic attitudes (p. 13). McCaughan asserts that the list of techniques Barrows suggests for tutors invites the student to self-assess by engaging more deeply using questions that probe a student's metacognition combined with statements that challenge the student to confront her own understandings. Although McCaughan points out that the focus in CCT is learning about the self, emotions, and psychological issue, CCT as considered in PBL would be focused on learning concepts in a curriculum and metacognition (p. 20). She finds the PBL tutor guidelines align well with Rogers' CCT where the therapist uses careful listening,

acceptance, empathy, and reflection, and the client is encouraged to take the lead and be able to “explore and seek answers to his or her own problems” (p. 15). McCaughan notes that CCT also aligns with PBL in that there is the assertion that learning occurs for the client when a dilemma causes disequilibrium, and the client is then motivated to reorganize her thinking to regain equilibrium (p. 17).

McCaughan also finds that PBL aligns with Dewey’s vast works in educational theory and philosophy – particularly commitments to scientific inquiry and within experiential philosophy. She points out that PBL methods are strikingly similar to Dewey’s inquiry and problem-solving process (p. 18). She particularly notes the observation and collection of data, developing a reasoned hypothesis or ideas, experimental application and testing, and a conclusion and evaluation (p. 19). McCaughan also argues that Dewey’s experientialist philosophy is based on the idea that individuals learn “truths” through this kind of structured experimentation in social groups (p. 19). McCaughan compares the focus in Dewey’s ideas on the qualitative value of the freedom of the individual within democratic social contexts with PBL’s student-centered, collaborative approach. For Dewey, experiential learning is significant, but it needs to be aligned with the quality of the learning experience – in this case a respect for the autonomy of the learner and avoidance of undue control (p. 19). For McCaughan, it is the student-centered and nondirective approach within the systematic PBL structures that focus on real-world messy challenges, approached systematically in collaborative (social) groups, that aligns strongly with Dewey’s theoretical and philosophical ideas.

Within a broad consideration of *constructivist pedagogy*, Virginia Richardson (2003) takes a comprehensive look at the common features of educational orientations that fall under *constructivist learning theory*. From her work it is possible to locate PBL firmly within a constructivist orientation – where constructivism is generally understood as “a theory of learning or meaning making, that individuals create their own new understandings on the basis of an interaction between what they already know and believe and ideas and knowledge with which they come into contact” (Resnick 1989 in Richardson 2003, pp. 1623–24). The pedagogical practices that Richardson (2003) identifies as emerging from a comprehensive consideration of constructivist theory (student-centered, facilitative dialogue, metacognitive awareness) are also completely consistent with pedagogical practices identified in the PBL scholarship (p. 1626).

Through considering theoretical scholarship linked to PBL in its broader sense, some of the theoretical commitments are quite distinct, but I would argue that it could also be elaborated through hermeneutic scholarship. From the exploration in this chapter, PBL can be seen as grounded in a web of practices and commitments to experiential constructivist learning theory and pedagogy with an emphasis on Socratic dialogue and inquiry. In my view, the resonance of PBL with Gadamerian philosophical hermeneutics is striking. I note that this has not yet been explored in the PBL scholarship, but feel that these theoretical ideas reach out to disciplines in the humanities, and believe it would be worth exploring so as to engage PBL more broadly.

While I do not have the space to get into more depth with Gadamer's position here, I would highlight a key feature of philosophical hermeneutics as the potential for transformation of the subject (in this discussion the learner) through an event of understanding that occurs through experience (Kerr 2012, p. 373). For Gadamer, participating in experience is an ongoing integrative process where an encounter widens our horizon by overturning an existing perspective. In this view, an experience is not a thing you *have*, but something you *undergo* to overcome your subjectivity and be drawn into and changed by an encounter (Weinsheimer and Marshall 2004, xiii). In this sense, knowledge is not something deliverable in propositional form, but emerges from our relation and immersion in the world and our attempts to make meaning through asking questions. Significantly for this discussion, Gadamer emphasizes the example of Socratic dialogue as creating the conditions for the question to emerge in the learner (Gadamer 2004, p. 359). Gadamer's ideas engage the themes of real-world experience, a focus on meaning-making rather than propositional knowledge, the priority of the question to make meaning from experience, and transformational potential of the subject rather than acquisition of propositional knowledge. As such, there is strong resonance with PBL conceptual themes and Gadamerian philosophical hermeneutics, although I would argue that Gadamer would insist that there is no specific method in creating these conditions, as a Deweyan scientific method would suggest, but that setting the conditions for the question is more art than science (p. 359).

TELL-PBL: Curriculum-as-Lived

I introduced this chapter with Ted Aoki's distinction between *curriculum-as-plan* and *curriculum-as-lived* to highlight the idea that PBL will emerge as something quite unique based on the histories, priorities, and interests of the people living the curriculum. In the previous section, I provided a theoretical framework from the scholarship of PBL and provided a brief consideration of philosophical hermeneutics that might lend a philosophical and interpretative emphasis on PBL scholarship. In this section, I will consider the theoretical commitments that have emerged as PBL becomes lived in the UBC Teacher Education Program (UBC-TEP) in the TELL-PBL cohort. As Savin-Baden (2000) emphasizes, PBL has "many guises and differences" that can stem from the discipline or professional knowledge base into which it is introduced and/or the structural and pedagogical decisions that have been made during implementation (p. 16). In this case, I will initially consider the theoretical alignment of this cohort with PBL frameworks as noted in the first section. From this position, I will look more specifically at the disciplinary context of teacher education and the discourses here at UBC, as well as the priorities of the individual instructors and tutors as they are shared in this book, to frame the theoretical distinctions in TELL-PBL.

In a broad sense the theoretical positions that emerge in the TELL-PBL cohort align quite strongly with the theoretical positions identified in the PBL scholarship.

The chapters in the book reveal a commitment to the PBL structures as identified in the scholarship and priority on *constructivist* theory and pedagogy and the related significance of Socratic method and the priority of the question. The chapters also reveal a priority of engaging complexity through the structure of the cases themselves as they embody interdisciplinarity through the messy context of professional practice. In this sense, the emphasis on experiential learning theory and collaborative learning is present in the theoretical framing of the work. However, also emerging in the chapters, and based on my own experience, are disciplinary concerns that move the theoretical framework in TELL-PBL beyond the theoretical frameworks identified within the PBL scholarship.

I would argue that implementing PBL into a program of teacher education presents a complication to PBL theory and methodology, not found when compared to other professional programs such as medicine or engineering. More specifically, teacher education programs are not only concerned with the teaching and learning of preservice teachers per se but also can be seen as spaces that seek to *represent* teaching and learning itself. In this way, tutors and instructors engage reflectively with preservice teachers on the process of PBL for their own learning, but also as educationally generative in their practicum placements and their ideas of professional practice. In my view, the degree to which PBL theory might align with their practicum placement, and also the preservice teachers' own educational history and beliefs about education, is something that everyone grapples with throughout the program. The metacognitive dimensions of engaging with PBL, I find, are quite pronounced in conversations with preservice teachers. The professional focus is on teaching and learning, and thus PBL is not only a method to the preservice teachers but becomes an educational commitment to be engaged in both personally and as an emerging professional.

The TELL-PBL cohort is also located within the UBC Teacher Education Program (UBC-TEP) that has recently been entirely reframed emphasizing *inquiry*. I would argue the sense of inquiry in this place emerges from a history of critique in the field of education and the preparation of teachers for practice. From the on-line text of the UBC-TEP regarding inquiry shown below, it is possible to see the commitment to inquiry as moral and intellectual open-ended activity in contrast with more systematic and methodical approaches:

Inquiry Seminar (I) is designed to engender:

- An understanding of teaching as a moral and intellectual activity requiring inquiry, judgment, and engagement with multiple others – students, parents, colleagues, and scholarly community
- An appreciation of the importance of research in understanding curriculum, teaching, and learning
- A desire to engage in one's own educational inquiries – to become students of teaching (Faculty of Education, University of British Columbia. [n.d.])

In my view, the form of inquiry prioritized in UBC-TEP emerges in response to educational discourses that critique technical rationality and forefront teaching as moral endeavor. Donald Schön defines technical rationality as “instrumental problem

solving made rigorous by the application of scientific theory and technique” (Schön 1987, p. 3). The idea of teachers’ application of formulas, rubrics, and checklists that are derived from a body of *expert* objective knowledge that teachers *possess* had been a widely accepted notion in Western ideas of teaching in the twentieth century (Furlong 2000, p. 17). Philosopher Joseph Dunne takes up Schön’s critiques in the context of teaching and teacher education and conceptually links his work to Aristotle and postmodern critique. He focuses on teaching as a complex, moral engagement that resists reductive technical-rational approaches, but instead relies on attentiveness to the particulars and the moral nature of teaching as a human engagement, and an ability to undertake practical judgment anew in each aspect of practice (Dunne 1993, p. 250). Anne Phelan (2005) argues that the intent of inquiry in teacher education “is to make learning to teach, and teaching itself, a complex and uncertain enterprise that demands, ongoing, thoughtful inquiry and discernment” (p. 340). Each new experience invites reconsideration and reconstruction that illuminates many aspects of practice (p. 343).

I would argue that this context and history in teacher education provides a different theoretical orientation to inquiry than the Deweyan method highlighted in PBL scholarship. The inquiry orientation fosters an opportunity for preservice teachers to grapple with a morally based profession that offers no systematic answer to complexity. Within the specific TELL-PBL cohort, the curriculum is interdisciplinarily organized around the cases, which are designed in ways that invite preservice teachers to inquire into key educational concepts as they emerge in the messy context of teaching practice. Concepts return repeatedly throughout the case cycles, thus inviting preservice teachers to reconsider and re-imagine the complications of lived concepts and their own evolving understandings. While there is a somewhat formalized and methodical approach to working with each case, preservice teachers are invited to understand the case in more detailed and practical ways through their questions – not to solve the case. Through the cases, the context is set for preservice teachers to understand the challenges of practice more holistically, understand and illuminate key concepts in practice more knowledgeably and personally, and continually engage with more refined questions in practice. This process is theoretically distinct from the PBL Deweyan-influenced scientific method of inquiry that highlights the steps of hypothesis, experimental method, evaluation, and conclusion.

The TELL-PBL cohort draws on instructors from different departments (Curriculum and Pedagogy, Educational Studies, Language and Literacy, and Educational Psychology), as well as directly through the Teacher Education Program (Aboriginal Education and Inquiry Seminars) for its programming and interdisciplinary instructional focus – thus bringing together many (and at times competing) educational priorities and commitments as embodied by the various instructors. A clear concern among the instructors is negotiating the tension between engaging processes that reproduce current inequitable social relations and identifying and critically questioning such processes (Giroux 1997, p. 108). Throughout the chapters in this book, it is clear that a number of instructors in TELL-PBL identify with the desire to engage preservice teachers in disrupting educational assumptions and

engaging critically with cultural and linguistic diversity, issues of social justice and relations to place and the more-than-human others. I too share these priorities emerging from critical pedagogy, critical discourse studies, and indigenous scholarship, but it is at this juncture that TELL-PBL moves from a purely constructivist and experiential pedagogy prominent in PBL scholarship, focused solely on student learning, to reintroduce the role of the teacher more substantively than is present in other PBL frameworks.

Gert Biesta takes on the notion of constructivist theory and pedagogy quite critically in a recent article and ironically reveals to me that TELL-PBL is actually more involved in teaching than I previously would have thought. Biesta acknowledges there is a need to shift from instructional paradigms focused on the transmission of content knowledge but he expresses concern that constructivism implies teachers have nothing to teach and only draws out what is already in the student (Biesta 2013, p. 451). I recognize these concerns and complications within the TELL-PBL cohort, in that the course instructors admittedly have something to teach within their own disciplinary areas that come from complicating those things that preservice teachers feel they already know about education, diversity and society. As Deborah Britzman points out: “Teachers bring to their work their own deep investments in and ambivalence about what a teacher is and does ... [yet] the teacher’s work brings new and conflictive demands that well exceed the resources of her or his school biography” (Britzman 2003, p. 2). It is this excess and disruption that the instructors grapple with in their work in TELL-PBL – myself included. In this role, the instructor is not merely drawing out what is already in the preservice teacher but is also intentionally disrupting and complicating the preservice teacher’s unacknowledged assumptions and commitments by introducing something entirely new. It is this piece that moves beyond the tenets of constructivism, which holds that learning is within the student.

Biesta points out that the activity of teaching is to introduce something that comes from the outside and adds rather than just confirms what is already present in the student (Biesta 2013, p. 453). He makes the distinction of *learning from* and being *taught by* as radically different phenomenological experiences based on the willingness of the student to engage in what is new and challenging (p. 457). He acknowledges the critique that what is taught is not necessarily what is learned and instead frames being *taught by* as receiving the gift of teaching: “To be taught – to be open to receiving the gift of teaching – thus means being able to give such interruptions a place in one’s understanding and one’s being” (p. 459). Biesta advocates seeing teachers not merely as instructional resources drawing out what is already in the student but as those who pose difficult questions and introduce difficult knowledge, in a context where they are invited to be open to the gift of teaching and welcome what is at times unsettling (pp. 459–460).

In my view, the course instructors in TELL-PBL seek to open preservice teachers to being *taught by* them in this sense. This is done through activities that seek to cause disequilibrium within course seminars and subject area workshops. An example of this is the Place-Based Relational Educational Autobiography that was developed as a workshop during orientation week and has been in place for two academic

years. The goal of this activity is to have the preservice teachers connect to their assumptions and unstated educational commitments and then narrate their educational biographies through text, visuals and audio. The purpose of the activity is to have this biography available for instructors to use with preservice teachers as a way to narrate their emotional/intellectual educational landscape and also document shifts in their educational commitments after having engaged in activities meant to disrupt by introducing something that challenges their ideas. Within PBL scholarship disequilibrium is sought through the cases to inspire motivation and learning. The TELL-PBL program promotes disequilibrium through instructor activities that help guide preservice teachers through what will be presumed to be resisted course content. Although the course instructors commonly use the title “resource specialists” to describe their work with preservice teachers, and as a way to emphasize student activity and responsibility, I would argue there is actually theoretically more going on in terms of teaching than that label would imply.

The centrality of the question and interdisciplinary focus in TELL-PBL is very similar in structure to the PBL model. However, it offers a different twist on the popular idea of Socratic questioning which provides a model of *facilitator* or *guide on the side* rather than teacher. I still find that the language of *facilitator* is used within the cohort but that teaching is more implicitly in play and not as explicitly acknowledged. The continual focus on refining and reframing educational questions is the primary activity within the case structure and tutorial activities. The questions emerge from the preservice teachers through Socratic dialogue with tutors and instructors, but the cases themselves are structured and worded so that specific questions are likely to emerge. Such questions may emerge from those new to specific disciplinary areas; others remain and are reformulated by those who have been deeply engaged for considerable periods of time with these disciplines. The tutors are provided with these *planned for questions* so as to guide the tutorial dialogues. I would argue that this is similar to the ways that Sharon Todd is able to show that Socratic dialogue is in fact *planned teaching* and not simply *facilitated learning*. She argues that the moment where Socrates demonstrates to Meno that learning does not happen through didactic teaching, but through questions he poses to a “slave boy,” and this is in fact Socrates teaching Meno of this idea through persuasion and demonstration (Todd 2003, pp. 21–25). It is this meta-level where the questions in TELL-PBL are already known to the “teacher”; yet they are skillfully brought out in the learner through tutorials, activities and in-class presentations that disrupt and complicate the presented texts, and make this process quite unique. It is a PBL approach that brings a more active sense of teaching within a case based context.

Summary and Conclusion

Through drawing on Aoki’s distinction between *curriculum-as-plan* and *curriculum-as-lived*, I have attempted to complicate the discussion of the ways that PBL theory and methodology is understood quite broadly in the scholarship, and the ways it

aligns and contrasts with the theoretical framework in the TELL-PBL teacher education program at UBC. My review of prominent PBL scholarship revealed a theoretical framework that emphasizes constructivist theory and pedagogy. PBL methodologically is comprised of a mutually reinforcing set of practices that have strong resonance in constructivism but also Deweyan experiential learning theory and Socratic dialogue – as a reflection of the pedagogical priority of the question in PBL. The motivational aspects for student learning were theorized through principles of Rogers' client-centered therapy. I concluded this review by drawing out some resonances with Gadamerian philosophical hermeneutics, to highlight the ways that PBL might have resonance with disciplines in the humanities. In the TELL-PBL cohort, the PBL *curriculum-as-lived* shares these priorities, structures and theoretical framing but also moves beyond it. The disciplinary context of teacher education offers a unique consideration of PBL as both methodology and professional practice for preservice teachers. The TELL-PBL cohort is immersed in an inquiry program, with many instructors forefronting a critical lens on education itself and introducing practices within PBL that resonate with these priorities and context. In my view, these practices influence a shift in the PBL framework to admit a more implicit but necessary role for the value of teaching within the theoretical framing of the TELL-PBL program.

In my *lived* experience of working in various roles with the TELL-PBL cohort, I have found an amazing opportunity to engage meaningfully and interdisciplinarily with preservice teachers. I have taught in other cohorts in an inquiry-centered program, yet in my experience it is this PBL case format that has brought greater opportunities for transformative learning in preservice teachers. The set of interrelated practices resonate with my theoretical priorities. As instructors and tutors in TELL-PBL, we come together around the preservice teachers – we think about how the cases can bring out certain fundamental disciplinary concerns and questions – and also the challenges they may face in trying to understand discourses that will be new for them. This is certainly not an easy process, particularly as the larger structures of higher education tend to perpetuate disciplinary divides and limit instructor collaboration. I am impressed that the TELL-PBL cohort has come up with creative ways to work within the existing structures and implement this program. I am writing this chapter as I see the great potential in PBL methodology to contribute to a greatly needed transformation of our educational system.

References

- Aoki, T. (1993). Legitimizing lived curriculum: Towards a curricular landscape of multiplicity. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 8(3), 255–268.
- Barrows, H., & Kelson, A. (1993). *Problem-based learning: A total approach to education*. Urbana-Champaign: University of Illinois Press.
- Biesta, G. (2013). Receiving the gift of teaching: From 'learning from' to 'being taught by'. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 32, 449–461.

- Britzman, D. P. (2003). *Practice makes practice: A critical study of learning to teach*, (Rev. ed.). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education*. New York: Macmillan.
- Dunne, J. (1993). *Back to the rough ground: Practical judgment and the lure of technique*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Faculty of Education, University of British Columbia. (n.d.). *Course outline for EDUC 450-inquiry seminar I*. Retrieved from: <http://teach.educ.ubc.ca/students/courses/inquiry/educ-450/>
- Furlong, J. (2000). Intuition and the crisis in teacher professionalism. In T. Atkinson & G. Claxton (Eds.), *The intuitive practitioner: On the value of not always knowing what one is doing* (pp. 15–31). Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Gadamer, H. G. (2004). *Truth and method*, (J. Weinsheimer & D. G. Marshall, 2nd ed., Trans. and Rev. ed.). New York: Continuum.
- Giroux, H. (1997). *Pedagogy and the politics of hope: Theory, culture and schooling*. Boulder: Westview Publishing.
- Gijsselaers, W. H. (1996, Winter). Connecting problem based practices with educational theory. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 68, 13–21.
- Glaser, R. (1991). The maturing of the relationship between the science of learning and cognition and educational practice. *Learning and Instruction*, 1(2), 129–144.
- Kerr, J. (2012). Promoting dialogue on teacher professionalism: Opening possibilities through Gadamer's aesthetic judgment and play metaphor. In C. Ruitenberg (Ed.), *Philosophy of education 2012* (pp. 367–375). Urbana-Champaign: Philosophy of Education Society.
- McCaughan, K. (2013). Barrows' integration of cognitive and clinical psychology in PBL tutor guidelines. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Problem Based Learning*, 7(1), 11–23.
- McPhee, A. (2002). Problem-based learning in initial teacher education: Taking the agenda forward. *Journal of Educational Enquiry*, 3(1), 60–78.
- Phelan, A. M. (2005). A fall from (someone else's) certainty: Recovering practical wisdom in teacher education. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 28(3), 339–358.
- Phelan, A. M. (2011). Towards a complicated conversation: Teacher education and the curriculum turn. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society*, 19(2), 207–220. doi:10.1080/14681366.2011.582257.
- Regan, P. (2010). *Unsettling the settler within: Indian residential schools, truth telling, and reconciliation in Canada*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Resnick, L. B. (1989). *Knowing, learning, and instruction: Essays in honor of Robert Glaser*. Hillsdale: L. Erlbaum Associates.
- Richardson, V. (2003). Constructivist pedagogy. *Teachers College Record*, 105(9), 1623–1640.
- Savin-Baden, M. (2000). *Problem-based learning in higher education: Untold stories*. Buckingham: The Society for Research in Higher Education and Open University Press.
- Schön, D. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner: Toward a new design for teaching and learning in the professions*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Todd, S. (2003). *Learning from the other: Levinas, psychoanalysis, and ethical possibilities in education*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Weinsheimer, J., & Marshall, D. G. (2004). Translators' preface (xi–xix). In H. G. Gadamer (Ed.), *Truth and method* (2nd ed.). New York: Continuum.