Alan Ovens
Tim Fletcher   *Editors*

Self-Study in Physical Education Teacher Education

Exploring the interplay of practice and scholarship

Springer

Self-Study in Physical Education Teacher Education

Self-Study of Teaching and Teacher Education Practices

Volume 13

For further volumes:
http://www.springer.com/series/7072

Alan Ovens • Tim Fletcher

Editors

Self-Study in Physical Education Teacher Education

Exploring the interplay of practice
and scholarship

Editors
Alan Ovens
University of Auckland
Auckland, New Zealand

Tim Fletcher
Brock University
St. Catharines, ON, Canada

Acknowledgements

Contents

About the Editors

Alan Ovens is currently a Principal Lecturer in the School of Curriculum and Pedagogy at the University of Auckland, New Zealand. He has held a range of roles within the faculty, including Deputy Head of the School of Critical Studies in Education, Head of the Health and Physical Education Group, and Acting Programme Leader of the Bachelor of Physical Education. He is the immediate Past President of Physical Education New Zealand (2006–2012) and has also carried out the role of being the editor of the *Journal of Physical Education New Zealand*. He has been an active contributor to the self-study conferences held every 2 years at Herstmonceux Castle Conference in England and was recently appointed as a co-programme chair for the 2014 conference and editor of the conference proceedings. He is also on the International Advisory Board for *Studying Teacher Education: A journal of self-study of teacher education practices*. His key research interests are in complexity, teacher education pedagogy and methodologies for self-study research.

Tim Fletcher is Assistant Professor in the Department of Kinesiology at Brock University, Canada. He recently completed his doctorate at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education/University of Toronto. Tim has been an active member of the self-study research community, regularly contributing to *Studying Teacher Education*, the Castle Conference, and the S-STEP Special Interest Groups at the American Educational Research Association and Canadian Society for Studies in Education annual conferences. Like Alan, he is also on the International Advisory Board for *Studying Teacher Education: A journal of self-study of teacher education practices* and sits on the Editorial Board for *Physical Education* and *Sport Pedagogy*. Tim's research interests are in teacher/teacher educator socialization and identity, pre-service teacher education, and self-study of practice.

List of Contributors

Karl Attard is a Lecturer and researcher at the Institute of Physical Education and Sport at the University of Malta. He holds undergraduate and graduate degrees in Physical Education pedagogy and Educational Leadership, including a Ph.D. in teacher professional development from Loughborough University. His research interests are in career-long professional development of teachers, in-service and pre-service teacher education, reflective practice, teacher-research, informal workplace learning, collaborative learning communities, narrative inquiry, and self-study methodology. He has sat on various scientific conference committees and is co-chair of the Research Development Centre focusing on teacher professional development within the Association for Teacher Education in Europe.

Trent D. Brown is a Senior Lecturer in the Faculty of Education at Monash University, Australia. The primary purpose of his research is to advance empirical, theoretical and philosophical insights into the study of physical education. This is expressed in research streams, namely: movement and meaning making, curriculum development, and professional learning. Most recently his research has examined the pedagogical intent and enactment of teachers working in the Senior Physical Education space. He is involved on the Editorial Board of the *Asia-Pacific Journal of Sport, Health and Physical Education* and beginning 2014 will act as Assistant Reviews Editor for *Sport, Education and Society*.

Judy Bruce lectures in physical education, professional studies, and sport coaching at the University of Canterbury College of Education in New Zealand. He research draws on a range of interdisciplinary studies with a particular focus on critical studies in education. Judy is currently undertaking research study which applies global citizenship education knowledges to service-learning and physical education teacher education practices.

Erin Cameron is a Ph.D. candidate in the Faculty of Education at Lakehead University in Thunder Bay, Canada. Her research and teaching interests include social justice pedagogies, critical theory, feminist theory, public health, and health and physical education. Her dissertation focus is on creating safe learning spaces for

all students, regardless of size, and examining effective teaching practices that disrupt weight-based discrimination.

Ashley Casey is Lecturer in Pedagogy in the School of Sport, Exercise and Health Sciences at Loughborough University and an Adjunct Senior Lecturer in the Department of Physical Education and Sport Sciences at the University of Limerick. As a former physical education teacher, whose Ph.D. explored changing practice in physical education, Ashley is a dedicated exponent of reflective and self-study practices. His other research interests revolve around teacher professional development, models-based practice (both students learning and teachers engagement), and the meaningful use of technology in physical education. He writes a weekly blog at www.peprn.com about the junction between theory and practice and how this relates to teaching, and is a regular contributor to twitter @DrAshCasey.

Rachel Forgasz teaches and researches in the Faculty of Education at Monash University, Australia. Her current research interest is in embodiment and emotion, two subjugated but critical knowledge forms in teaching and in higher education. She is especially interested in the potential of drama as a form of embodied reflective practice for engaging teachers and teacher educators in reflection on their emotional experiences of teaching.

Dawn Garbett is an Associate Professor and teacher educator at The University of Auckland, New Zealand. She teaches early childhood, primary, and secondary student teachers through the curriculum area of science. Dawn is an active member of the Self-Study of Teacher Education Practices community where she has focused on innovative pedagogies for teacher education, and the scholarship of teaching and learning in higher education. Her strong commitment to practicing high quality, research-informed teaching underpinned her National Tertiary Teaching Excellence award for sustained excellence in 2008 and Post Graduate Certificate in Academic Practice studies in 2012.

Ann MacPhail is the Head of the Department of Physical Education and Sport Sciences at the University of Limerick in Ireland. Ann's main teaching and research interests revolve around physical education teacher education, curriculum development in physical education and teaching, learning, and assessment issues within school physical education. Ann is Associate Editor for the journal *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy* and a member of the Editorial Board for the *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*. Ann has recently co-authored *Research and Practice in Physical Education* (Routledge) and *Building Effective Physical Education Programs* (Jones and Bartlett).

Michael W. Metzler is currently a Professor in the Department of Kinesiology and Health at Georgia State University in the USA. He teaches in the undergraduate and graduate programs in Health and Physical Education in that department. Dr. Metzler holds a Bachelor of Arts degree in English Education from Tufts University, a Master of Science degree in Physical Education from East Stroudsburg University, and a Ph.D. degree from The Ohio State University in Physical Education Teacher

Education with a cognate in Applied Behavior Analysis. His areas of research and scholarship include teaching and instructional models; and research on teacher education programs, with an emphasis on program assessment. His teaching expertise is in the areas of instructional models for physical education, research methods for teaching and teacher education, and the history and principles of physical education.

Mary O'Sullivan holds the Professorship of Physical Education and Youth Sport in the Department of Physical Education and Sport Sciences and is Co-Director of the PE PAYS Research Centre at the University of Limerick. She is Dean of the Faculty of Education and Health Sciences at the University of Limerick and prior to returning to Ireland she was Associate Dean of the College of Education at Ohio State University in the USA. Mary's major research interests are in teacher education and teacher professional development from both a policy and curriculum perspective. Her current research, in which she is collaborating with her postgraduate students, is looking at sport and education policy implications for teachers and students, and the physical education and sexuality aspects of the health curriculum.

Richard Tinning is Professor of pedagogy in the School of Human Movement Studies at the University of Queensland, Australia. He is also Professor of physical education in the School of Curriculum & Pedagogy at the University of Auckland, New Zealand. His research interests are informed by a socially critical perspective and have focused on issues related to knowledge, identity and the professional development of HPE teachers. Since his early work in the late 1980s and early 1990s Richard has been an international leader in the development of critical pedagogy in physical education. His recent book *Pedagogy and Human Movement: Research, Practice, Theory* (Routledge, 2010) focuses on pedagogy across the field of human movement in relation to physical activity, the body, and health.

Part I
Considering Self-Study in, Through and for Physical Education

> Those who are supposed to have, acquire, and employ the knowledge of teaching are quite capable of identifying, generating, understanding, theorizing and communicating it.[1]

Part I is framed by a consideration of self-study methodology and how it may open a potentially rich space for physical education research. The three chapters that comprise this section explore self-study as the interplay of practice and scholarship in pedagogical contexts. This discussion considers self-study as a highly reflexive form of inquiry that includes locating the 'physical' in practices of knowledge production and enacting a politics of action that accommodates the highly complex, fluid and human nature of educational contexts.

---

[1] LaBoskey, V. K. (2004). The methodology of self-study and its theoretical underpinnings. In J. J. Loughran, M. L. Hamilton, V. K. LaBoskey, & T. Russell (Eds.). International handbook of self-study of teaching and teacher education practices. (pp. 817–869). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer.

Doing Self-Study: The Art of Turning Inquiry on Yourself

Alan Ovens and Tim Fletcher

Introduction

This book is about the possible relevancies of self-study to physical education. In the past three decades, self-study has emerged as a considered, reflexive way of researching teaching and teacher education practices. It is not a form of doing research that seeks to simplify or reduce teaching to its core constituent elements, nor does it position teaching as a process capable of being understood from the outside by neutral and detached observers. Rather, self-study brings sensitivity to the importance of the embodied individual-in-action and positions teaching as a practice that is 'simultaneously the thing we know about, the thing we do and the thing we research' (Ham and Kane 2004, p. 104). It is a research practice defined more by its focus of study rather than by its methods for conducting inquiry (Loughran 2004) and offers potential for ways of understanding that embrace uncertainty, non-linearity, and the inevitable 'messiness' that is inherent in pedagogical settings. However, exploring its relevancy for physical education is far from straightforward. Indeed, it is not clear if self-study should be labeled a community of practice, a research methodology, or a particular attitude towards doing research. Nonetheless, self-study has captured the interests of many researchers whose studies seek to develop a critically reflective approach to understanding teaching practice grounded in the everyday practicalities of their own unique situations.

As an educational practice, physical education increasingly finds itself challenged by 'new times' (Kirk 2009; Tinning 2010). For both teachers and teacher educators, these new times can be characterised as being highly complex, infused with multiple constraints, and constituted by participants who are diversely interconnected. These

A. Ovens (✉)
University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand
e-mail: a.ovens@auckland.ac.nz

T. Fletcher
Brock University, St. Catharines, ON, Canada

characteristics can be observed in the increasing uses of technology, increased focus on graduate standards, multiple educational imperatives (including competing health and sporting outcomes), new expectations for the nature of teachers' work in schools, reductions to funding, facilities and support, and a changing culture towards more personalised, self-paced, and school-situated approaches to learning (Kirk 2009; Ovens et al. 2013). Individually and collectively, each of these characteristics challenges traditional models of teaching and learning. What emerges from such challenges is an increasing need for teachers and teacher educators to ensure that practice continues to adapt, evolve, and be coherent with the principles that characterise quality in each setting. In other words, there is both a need and a niche for examples of how practitioners can research the situational and complex nature of what they do and explore the interplay between scholarship and practice.

Our aim in this book is to promote discussion and reflection by engaging scholars already employing self-study in their work with others who can reflect upon and critique its potential use in the field of physical education. The book explores self-study as the interplay of scholarship and practice in teaching and teacher education, and considers its value in highlighting the emerging conflicts, dilemmas, and incongruities arising within the pedagogies for contemporary practice. Each of the following chapters help illuminate the diversity in how physical education scholars view and use self-study to carry out and inform their scholarship and practice, to-ing and fro-ing between changes, impacts, and implications for self, practice, students, and programs. This involves communicating newly gained understanding with others in the teaching and teacher education communities, and enacting these new and improved understandings of self, practice, and learning in the classes they teach.

In this initial chapter we provide an overview of what we mean by self-study, outlining the essential features that characterise this way of doing research. We then consider how self-study opens a potentially rich space for physical education by exploring how the methodology of self-study involves examining the concepts of practice and self. This discussion then enables consideration of the key features of how to undertake self-study before we conclude with a suggestion that self-study is a highly reflexive form of inquiry. Concluding in this way serves to remind readers of the difficulties of doing research on messy subjects like teaching. Overall, our aim is to provide an introduction to self-study for the non-specialist audience and, at the same time, to form the foundation from which the following chapters and future research and practice may build.

What Is Self-Study?

Schulte (2009) suggests that self-study research is difficult to define because it neither prescribes a particular method nor does it promote a particular goal. Zeichner and Noffke (2001) avoided defining self-study, preferring instead to describe it as using 'various qualitative methods' to focus practitioner inquiry on a 'wide range of substantive issues' (p. 305). Cole and Knowles (1998) do slightly better in suggesting that self-study is 'qualitative research focused inward' (p. 229), while

Hamilton and Pinnegar (1998) argue it is postmodern in perspective since self-study scholars attempt to embrace uncertainty and challenge what counts as research, knowing, and knowledge. This lack of lack of clarity stems, in part, from the variety of qualitative traditions that self-study researchers draw from. Much like bricoleurs described by Denzin and Lincoln (2005), those engaging in self-study often employ methods from different disciplinary fields such as narrative inquiry, action research, discourse analysis, and interpretive phenomenology. It is also due to the fact that 'Self-study' is a colloquial abbreviation used among colleagues and that 'Self-study of Practice' or 'Self-study of Teacher Education Practices' may be better representations of what these researchers do.

While definitions may be difficult, it is important to acknowledge that those who label their work as self-study share a common set of characteristics that enable their research to be identified as such. While the methodological features of these characteristics will be explored in more depth later in this chapter, we begin by focusing on three features in particular to help frame the broad nature of self-study research.

A Community

Firstly, self-study is a wide-ranging professional network of practitioners who share, research, and evolve their own practice as teachers and teacher educators. According to Loughran (2004), the Self-Study of Teacher Education Practices (S-STEP) network emerged in the early 1990s as teacher educators began discussing the challenges they experienced as teacher educators involved in teaching about teaching. As Pithouse et al. (2009) point out, 'what brought researchers together was a shared but tacit acknowledgement that because teaching is messy, complicated, contextualized – hard to pin down, we need to be innovative and creative in the search for more suitable ways to understand and improve our practice as teachers and teacher educators' (p. 46). Since finding common threads between their work, the S-STEP network has grown to be a highly active community as one of the largest special interest groups (SIGs) within the American Educational Research Association (AERA). The community also launched its own biennial 'Castle' Conference in 1996 and this has enjoyed growing attendance and support each time it is held (Young et al. 2012).

This professional network has been essential in evolving the self-study concept and for supporting its various practitioners. As Zeichner (1999) noted, 'the self-study in teacher education movement … has been probably the single most significant development ever in the field of teacher education research' (p. 8). The evolution of self-study is reflected in its increasingly widespread exposure and reporting, with examples of self-study research (whether empirical or conceptual) now seen in publications that: (a) reach audiences who are specifically interested in self-study (such as *Studying Teacher Education* or the Springer Series of which this book is a part), (b) reach audiences in the broader educational research community (such as *Educational Researcher*) or (c) might be viewed by some as holding 'traditional' or rather conservative views of what counts as research. Clearly, the value and utility

of self-study research is being recognized as a powerful tool to help improve our understanding of the processes of learning to teach, and the problematic nature of teaching about teaching (Borko et al. 2007).

Stance

Secondly, self-study represents an inquiry-oriented stance towards researching one's own practice. A main aim of self-study for teachers and teacher educators is to conduct systematic research of the self-in-practice in order to consider and articulate the complexities and challenges of teaching and learning to teach (Loughran 2004). As Hamilton and Pinnegar (1998) explain, self-study is, 'the study of one's self, one's actions, one's ideas … It is autobiographical, historical, cultural, and political … it draws on one's life, but it is more than that. Self-study also involves a thoughtful look at texts read, experiences had, people known and ideas considered' (p. 236). Conceptualised in this way, self-study is less about prescriptive methods for generating sets of data and more about the insights and questioning that researchers bring to making sense of the empirical material emerging from their inquiry. Positioned simultaneously as the subject and object of research, Kelchtermans and Hamilton (2004) note that the researcher can bring, '… an interpretative, interactionist and contextualised view. Only from an in-depth analysis of the meaningful specificities of the local context, can we expect to develop insights that have relevance beyond that situation' (p. 786).

In this sense, self-study draws from similar philosophical and epistemological commitments as other forms of practitioner inquiry, such as action research, reflective practice, autoethnography, life-history, visual and narrative inquiry (Mitchell and Weber 2005; Pithouse et al. 2009). This can lead to confusion about how self-study differs from these other forms of inquiry. While there are similarities, the essential differences relate to how each form of inquiry deals with core tensions created by situating inquiry within the practitioner's context of practice. For example, in clarifying the differences between action research and self-study, Samaras and Freese (2009) explain that 'action research is more about what the teacher does, and not so much about who the teacher is' (p. 5). What stands self-study apart from other forms of practitioner inquiry is the simultaneous focus on understanding *self* as it enacts *practice* (Bullough and Pinnegar 2001). Self-study researchers therefore investigate themselves with the intent to improve personally and professionally (Samaras and Freese 2006).

Desire

Thirdly, self-study enacts a disposition of desire. The notion of 'desire' being invoked here is not that of a feeling or emotion but, as Zembylas (2007) argues, 'a *force* influencing the subject's modes of existence' (p. 336). Framed in this way, the

act of turning the critical gaze on the 'self' reflects a desire to *be more*, to *improve*, to *better understand*. As Loughran (2007) notes, desire provides the productive momentum for self-study since, 'it is this overarching desire to better align theory and practice, to be more fully informed about the nature of a knowledge of practice, and to explore and build on these "learnings" in public ways that appears to be an underlying common purpose in self-study – a tacit catalyst for self-study' (p. 14). Desire thus renders the complexity of the relational encounter between researcher and researched as a source of transformation. This can potentially be an uncomfortable and disconcerting process for the self-study researcher, especially 'when the "self" we come to see in self-study is not the "self" we think we are, or the "self" we would like to be' (Dadds 1993, p. 287). In this sense, there is duplicity in the desire embodied in self-study: while desire exposes the uncertainties, inconsistencies and risks involved in putting the self-in-practice as the focus of inquiry, it can also bring pleasures when alternative and possibly subversive positions are enabled.

Focusing on the Self-in-Practice

We now turn to focus on how to conceptualise the existential setting and activities in which the self is engaged. We suggest this opens a potentially fertile space for physical education scholarship because of the possibility of rethinking the body, self, knowing, and agency, particularly in relation to engaging in pedagogical work. Contemporary social theory has increasingly brought into question the appropriateness of theorising any social action, like teaching or teacher education, on either the basis of free and independent actions (methodological individualism) or as determined by structures or social wholes (methodological holism) (Schatzki 2001; Rouse 2007). Self-study avoids the extremes of either approach by instead turning towards the concept of *practice*. As a way of conceptualising social order and agency, the concept of practice itself emerges from a history of culturally-oriented social theories sensitive to the way symbolic structures of knowledge are enacted into being as individuals engage with their lived worlds (Reckwitz 2002). Practices can be thought of as culturally bound configurations of activity that individuals perform in doing a particular profession, work role, or craft. In this view, the activities being undertaken by an individual are not performed because they have complete unrestrained agency or are being compliant to normative expectations. Rather, these social activities are embodied in collective and symbolic performances that enable a socially shared way of ascribing meaning to the world (Reckwitz 2002).

   In self-study the term practice refers to all the activities someone engages in as part of a particular profession (like teaching), or specialised endeavour (such as sport), including the responsibilities, beliefs, and knowledge that informs and gives meaning to those activities (Pinnegar and Hamilton 2009). The embodied self then becomes a performer of practices. Performances not only embody patterns of bodily

action, but also certain routinised ways of understanding, knowing how, and being from the perspective of a particular discursive community. A practice is thus a routinised way in which bodies are comported, artifacts are created, knowledge is manifested, relationships are identified, and spaces made meaningful places to occupy (Schatzki 2001; Rouse 2007). Importantly, a practice is not a quality of the individual, but is inherently social in that it is a mode of behaving and understanding that appears at different temporal and spatial localities and is performed by different practitioners of that craft, profession, or role (Reckwitz 2002). The productive space here for physical education scholars is that this form of social theory takes the human body to be the nexus where the practices that practitioners perform become embodied as part of the everyday, messy and mundane realities of 'doing' their role (Schatzki 2001; Green 2002).

It may surprise some that we describe teaching as messy and mundane. By messy, we mean that the complexity of teaching ensures an ongoing precarious balance between stability and chaos in each moment of the encounter (Ovens et al. 2013). No two situations, classes, or students are the same. What works in one setting may not work in the next setting. Practices then emerge as ways of managing the diversely interconnected elements in each setting. By mundane, we mean that teaching becomes routine and non-consciously performed (Rossi and Cassidy 1999; Green 2002). While we concede that the teaching act is orientated towards the instrumental, we suggest it is more generative to think about the daily performances of teaching as more unreflexive and habitual. In this sense, the ubiquitous features of our teaching contexts tend to be unreflexively negotiated, our identities enacted without self-consciousness, and regular routines are followed unquestioningly.

At the same time, it is important not to lose sight of what is meant by 'self' in the title 'self-study'. The concept of 'self' can be distracting, particularly since it can imply that in this approach the researcher is simply focused on doing research on themselves informed only by their own perspective. Conceptualisations of selfhood that are limited to the individual's internal point of view can lead to misunderstanding self-study as a confessional story about one's experiences of practice or a criticism that it is simply 'navel gazing'. While not trying to disparage the epistemological value of either narrative inquiry or contemplating one's navel, the purpose of foregrounding 'self' in self-study is a deliberate act to acknowledge that it is the self who is producing knowledge of practice while simultaneously enacting that practice. Relationality is central to framing the self in this way since the actors in any setting are inter-dependent with both their practice and others who co-participate with them in that practice (Ovens et al. 2013). A focus on relationships shifts attention away from the individual components involved in a practice towards the constitutive nature of how these components are linked in the production of practice (Osberg et al. 2008). Pinnegar and Hamilton (2009) assert that having 'self' in the title, '… positions the researcher as a particular kind of inquirer and declares the relationship of that inquirer both to the practice and to others who are engaged with the inquirer in constructing the practice' (p. 12).

Turning Inquiry on the Self-in-Practice

How do we study the self? Is there a way of taking the broad sketch of the terrain outlined above and converting it into a map for 'doing' self-study? There are a number of very good resources that outline the nature of doing self-study, such as Bullough and Pinnegar (2001), LaBoskey (2004), Loughran (2007), Pinnegar and Hamilton (2009), and Samaras (2011). In addition, perhaps the most authoritative source of information on self-study is covered in the two-volume *International Handbook of Self-study of Teaching and Teacher Education Practices* (Loughran et al. 2004). Given that these publications outline the rich myriad of ways of implementing self-study research, the following description only serves as a brief introduction.

The starting point is typically to acknowledge that in self-study it is the self (embodied and relationally situated) who is responsible for setting the research agenda and acting on the subsequent findings. LaBoskey (2004) states that a characteristic of self-study is that it is self-initiated and self-focused. The teacher or teacher educator initiates the research process, focuses inquiry on the self-in-practice, generates appropriate empirical material for analysis, interacts with different viewpoints (both published and shared personally), and takes responsibility for producing knowledge capable of informing and reframing future practice beyond the self (Loughran 2007). In this way, the process of doing the research is shaped by what the researcher knows in, of, and about practice, and by his or her ability to take up new, contradictory or subversive positions in respect to their practice. In a similar manner, Ham and Kane (2004) suggest that self-study, 'derives not from a passive romantic remembering in tranquility of a single experience, but from the iterative and consciously self-analytical reflection on, repetition of, and gathering data about, the purposeful social actions that are the center of the study' (p. 129).

Framing self-study in this way orients it as a provocative activity undertaken with the express aim of improvement. LaBoskey (2004) notes that this aim has an extensive quality, particularly since self-study researchers 'wish to transform ourselves first so that we might be better situated to help transform our students, their students, and the institutional and social contexts that surround and constrain us' (p. 820–1). However, it is important not to be seduced by the illusion that improvement involves the quest for technical mastery or successful application of theory to practice. There are many layers to practice, and many layers of understanding of the experiences we have as teachers and students. The acts of provoking and being provoked involve the deliberate attempt to *call forth a particular response*. In self-study, being provocative in the interests of improving practice implies calling forth the forms of subjectivity involved in enacting good judgment rather than the reductive focus on refining skills and knowledge. Enacting good judgment generates two forms of knowledge in respect to improved practice: knowledge situated in the inquirer's embodied practices, and conceptual knowledge that can be shared with other practitioners and contributes to the academic field (Loughran 2010).

Another aspect of provoking and being provoked is the necessity of interaction. The study of self-in-practice is never a solitary endeavour since practices are sets of culturally bound activities emerging from the collective actions, culture, and relationships with others also working in the same setting or community of practice. The practice of self-study is always interactive, particularly in the way the researcher sustains a dialogue with others co-participating in the practice, with data sets, with related theoretical and research literature, and with co-researchers and colleagues. Although seemingly counter-intuitive, many self-studies are collaborative (Kitchen et al. 2008). In such moments of collaboration, it is the support of caring and sensitive critical friends that make it easier to remain open to reframing practice and developing professionally. However, support in this sense is more than just collaborating with or alongside others. It implies a sense of openness, honesty, cooperation, debate, and dialogue that is inherent to a collectivity committed to a common cause.

The messy and mundane nature of studying the self-in-practice typically necessitates a careful and systematic approach based on using multiple, primarily qualitative methods of inquiry. As Trumball (2004) notes, 'all of us work to ensure that the data gathered are not mere fictions, even as we acknowledge that our own views will affect how we see the world' (p. 1225). Self-study researchers utilise multiple means for defining, discovering, generating, and articulating the fleeting, complex interactions and musings that characterise pedagogical work. In a real sense, this means that self-study researchers have flexibility when selecting the methods and data sources that will best provide needed evidence for understanding practice. For example, such methods may include combinations of keeping reflective journals, taking field notes, collecting or generating artifacts (such as lesson plans or course outlines), or taking video recordings of teaching performances. While first-person data may typically evoke internal perspectives from the point of view of the practitioner-researcher, such data sources also typically reflect external perspectives represented by the author's perceptions of the perspectives of others (such as peers or students). When a critical friend or friends become/s involved, data may be drawn from recorded conversations, correspondence (such as emails or blog postings), or observations of one another's practice. Like all practitioner inquirers, how teachers and teacher educators come to understand and improve their practice is largely dependent upon reactions, feedback, critique, and responses from students (in tacit and explicit forms). Students' perspectives therefore typically call forth a response from the self-study researcher and serve as a springboard from which to question their assumptions about teaching, further explore their own practice, and share their insights. Student perspectives might be represented by traditional forms of data, gathered through interviews, formal or informal evaluations of teaching, or samples of student work. Self-study thus offers a unique perspective on the processes of learning to teach because students' and teacher educators' experiences of teaching and learning are inextricably linked.

As with all research, care needs to be exercised not only in the way any empirical materials are generated or collected for analysis, but also in the methods used for making sense of this information. There is always a risk that in providing an interpretative, interactionist, and contextualised view the researcher only attends to

the findings that support their beliefs, hopes, and dreams. Therefore, as Trumball (2004) advises, in self-study 'we work to ensure our interpretations are ones others could support, and this is the reason why self-study requires not only a critical friend, but also a critical community' (p. 1226). LaBoskey (2004) suggests that this is an exemplar-based form of validity since a study receives validation when other investigators become meaningfully involved and benefit from the self and collective reflections that a particular study provides. However, it is important not to assume that pure collaboration or enlightenment can be achieved; there is always a need for the researcher to acknowledge the ways in which his or her own interests and authority have favoured particular interpretations and representations. It is for this reason that self-study researchers should be cognisant of articulating how and why their interpretations should be considered trustworthy (Craig 2009). As Loughran (2007) suggests, 'if sufficient attention is not paid to trustworthiness in self-study, then regardless of the outcomes for the individual, the value of the work for the community of teacher educators as a whole is more likely to be brought into question' (p. 15).

Final Thoughts: Self-Study as a Provisionally Rational Form of Inquiry

We draw this initial discussion to a close by proposing the idea that self-study research represents a provisionally rational form of inquiry. At first glance, such a proposal may seem counter-intuitive to doing good research since one's beliefs should be derived in a rational way from available evidence and be consistent with one's reasons to believe. By suggesting that self-study is a provisionally rational project we are indicating the need to resist those forms of technocratic rationality that frame educational issues as easily defined, stable, and capable of being solved by generic principles or linear heuristics. In contrast, we are suggesting that self-study proceeds with sensitivity to the inherent difficulties of overcoming the contingent, interdependent, and embodied nature of human life. When viewed in this way, educational problems become difficult to define since the nature of the problem depends on the perspective of the stakeholder. It also acknowledges that educational problems may have multiple causalities and internal interdependencies that necessitate a range of coordinated and interrelated responses (Bore and Wright 2009; Ovens et al. 2013). As a consequence, we suggest there is a need to take a cautionary approach to both the way the existential set of practices the self is performing are problematised, and the rhetorical and narrative nature of making these performances available for analysis and generalisation.

Understanding the limits of rationality involves calling into question the nature of the relationship between reality-as-experienced and the textual representation of this reality. While poststructuralism has provided a valuable way of problematising this relationship by focusing attention on the centrality of language in the organisation of human experience (Barker and Galansinski 2001; Wood and Kroger 2000),

there is also a need to consider 'how the body is not only a physical location on which society inscribes its effects, but a material source of social categories and relations and a sensual means by which people are attached to or dislocated from social forms' (Shilling 2004, p. xvii). This sensitivity to embodiment recognises that the body is a medium for making sense and making connections with a world in people co-participate in creating (Macintyre Latta and Buck 2008). A sensitivity to the corporeal nature of organising human experience recognises that bodies are resourced with a range of cognitive, affective, and movement capabilities that generate both sensual and symbolic meanings as an acculturation process of living in, and inhabiting, the world (Evans, Davies, and Rich 2009). Such trends reject a simple mirroring thesis between reality and empirical facts, and shifts attention to the processes of interpretation, identity construction, and reflexivity as being central to research activity (Alvesson and Skoldberg 2009). These linguistic and embodied turns, where reality is taken to be 'created' in the sensual, social, and textual constructions of the researcher, directly challenges the key assumptions held in a rationalist social science that reality exists independently of researchers' attempts to render it through research methods.

While a sense of rationality ensures self-study is sensitive to issues of method to ensure that it is disciplined, open-minded and evidence-based, at the same it needs to allow the researcher(s) to bring creativity and insight to the process. When framed as a provisionally rational project, self-study becomes more than a set of techniques, or an exercise in patience, or application of intelligence, or accumulation of evidence. It values alongside these qualities the ability to sense, feel, think, and act with imagination in order to open up more useful interpretive possibilities. In self-study, imagination is a quality the researcher brings to the research process so that data works to spark and generate ideas rather than simply verify and support (Alvesson and Skoldberg 2009). Imagination foregrounds knowledge building as a 'fabrication' in the sense that the role of the researcher should be construed as a 'producer' rather than 'finder' of knowledge about the world (Foucault 1980). Findings, theories, and models are not representations of a universe that exists independently, but are only ever the provisional tools by which we negotiate our understanding and being in the world (Osberg et al. 2008). As those reading this book will come to see, when invoked as a form of inquiry in which the quest is not for more accurate understandings of a finished reality, self-study becomes a powerful means for finding ways to initiate a more meaningful interaction with the self as producer, reproducer, and product of practice.

References

Alvesson, M., & Skoldberg, K. (2009). *Reflexive methodology: New vistas for qualitative methodology* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.

Barker, C., & Galasinski, D. (2001). *Cultural studies and discourse analysis: A dialogue on language and identity*. London: Sage.

Bore, A., & Wright, N. (2009). The wicked and complex in education: Developing a transdisciplinary perspective for policy formulation, implementation and professional practice. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 35*(3), 241–256.

Borko, H., Liston, D., & Whitcomb, J. A. (2007). Genres of empirical research in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 58*(1), 3–11.

Bullough, R. V., Jr., & Pinnegar, S. (2001). Guidelines for quality in autobiographical forms of self-study research. *Educational Researcher, 30*(3), 13–21.

Cole, A. L., & Knowles, J. G. (1998). The self-study of teacher education practices and the reform of teacher education. In M. L. Hamilton (Ed.), *Reconceptualizing teaching practice: Self-study in teacher education* (pp. 224–234). London: Falmer.

Craig, C. J. (2009). Trustworthiness in self-study research. In C. A. Lassonde, S. Galman, & C. Kosnik (Eds.), *Self-study research methodologies for teacher educators* (pp. 21–34). Rotterdam: Sense.

Dadds, M. (1993). The feeling of thinking in professional self-study. *Educational Action Research, 1*(2), 287–303.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2005). Introduction: The discipline and practice of qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 1–32). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Evans, J., Davies, B., & Rich, E. (2009). The body made flesh: Embodied learning and the corporeal device. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 30*(4), 391–406.

Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings 1972–1977.* London: Harvester.

Green, K. (2002). Physical education teachers in their figurations: A sociological analysis of everyday 'philosophies'. *Sport, Education and Society, 7*(1), 65–83.

Ham, V., & Kane, R. (2004). Finding a way through the swamp: A case for self-study as research. In J. J. Loughran, M. L. Hamilton, V. K. LaBoskey, & T. Russell (Eds.), *International handbook of self-study of teaching and teacher education practices* (pp. 103–150). Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Hamilton, M. L., & Pinnegar, S. (1998). The value and the promise of self-study. In M. L. Hamilton (Ed.), *Reconceptualizing the education of teachers: Self-study in teacher education* (pp. 235–246). London: Falmer.

Kelchtermans, G., & Hamilton, M. L. (2004). The dialectics of passion and theory: Exploring the relation between self-study and emotion. In J. J. Loughran, M. L. Hamilton, V. K. LaBoskey, & T. Russell (Eds.), *International handbook of self-study of teaching and teacher education practices* (pp. 785–810). Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Kirk, D. (2009). *Physical education futures*. London: Routledge.

Kitchen, J., Ciuffetelli Parker, D., & Gallagher, T. (2008). Authentic conversation as faculty development: Establishing a self-study group in a faculty of education. *Studying Teacher Education, 4*(2), 157–171. doi:10.1080/17425960802433637.

LaBoskey, V. K. (2004). The methodology of self-study and its theoretical underpinnings. In J. J. Loughran, M. L. Hamilton, V. K. LaBoskey, & T. Russell (Eds.), *International handbook of self-study of teaching and teacher education practices* (pp. 817–869). Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Loughran, J. J. (2004). A history and context of self-study of teaching and teacher education practices. In J. J. Loughran, M. L. Hamilton, V. K. LaBoskey, & T. Russell (Eds.), *International handbook of self-study of teaching and teacher education practices* (pp. 7–39). Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Loughran, J. J. (2007). Researching teacher education practices: Responding to the challenges, demands and expectations of self-study. *Journal of Teacher Education, 58*(1), 12–20.

Loughran, J. (2010). Seeking knowledge for teaching teaching: Moving beyond stories. *Studying Teacher Education, 6*(3), 221–226.

Loughran, J. J., Hamilton, M. L., LaBoskey, V. K., & Russell, T. (Eds.). (2004). *International handbook of self-study of teaching and teacher education practices*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Macintyre Latta, M., & Buck, G. (2008). Enfleshing embodiment: 'Falling into trust' with the body's role in teaching and learning. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 20*(2), 315–329.

Mitchell, C., & Webber, S. (2005). Just who do we think we are… and how do we know this?: Re-visioning pedagogical spaces for studying our teaching selves. In C. Mitchell, S. Weber, &

K. O'Reilly-Scanlon (Eds.), *Just who do we think we are? Methodologies for autobiography and self-study in teaching* (pp. 1–10). New York: Routledge-Falmer.

Osberg, D., Biesta, G., & Cilliers, P. (2008). From representation to emergence: Complexity's challenge to the epistemology of schooling. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 40*(1), 213–227.

Ovens, A., Hopper, T., & Butler, J. (2013). Reframing curriculum, pedagogy and research. In A. Ovens, T. Hopper, & J. Butler (Eds.), *Complexity thinking in physical education: Reframing curriculum, pedagogy and research* (pp. 1–13). Oxon: Routledge.

Pinnegar, S., & Hamilton, M. L. (2009). *Self-study of practice as a genre of qualitative research: Theory, methodology, and practice*. Dordrecht: Springer.

Pithouse, K., Mitchell, C., & Weber, S. (2009). Self-study in teaching and teacher development: A call to action. *Educational Action Research, 17*(1), 43–62.

Reckwitz, A. (2002). Toward a theory of social practices. A development in culturalist theorizing. *European Journal of Social Theory, 5*, 243–263.

Rossi, T., & Cassidy, T. (1999). Knowledgeable teachers in physical education: A view of teachers' knowledge. In C. Hardy & M. Mawer (Eds.), *Learning and teaching in physical education* (pp. 188–202). London: Falmer.

Rouse, J. (2007). Practice philosophy. In S. Turner & M. Risjord (Eds.), *Handbook of the philosophy of science: Vol. 15. Philosophy of anthropology and sociology* (pp. 639–681). London: Elsevier.

Samaras, A. P. (2011). *Self-study teacher research: Improving your practice through collaborative inquiry*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Samaras, A. P., & Freese, A. R. (2006). *Self-study of teaching practices primer*. New York: Peter Lang.

Samaras, A. P., & Freese, A. R. (2009). Looking back and looking forward: An historical overview of the self-study school. In C. A. Lassonde, S. Galman, & C. Kosnik (Eds.), *Self-study research methodologies for teacher educators* (pp. 3–19). Rotterdam: Sense.

Schatzki, T. (2001). Introduction: Practice theory. In T. Schatzki, K. Knorr Cetina, & E. von Savigny (Eds.), *The practice turn in contemporary theory* (pp. 1–14). London: Routledge.

Schulte, A. K. (2009). *Seeking integrity in teacher education: Transforming student teachers, transforming my self*. Dordrecht: Springer.

Shilling, C. (2004). Educating bodies: Schooling and the constitution of society. In J. Evans, B. Davies, & J. Wright (Eds.), *Body knowledge and control: Studies in the sociology of physical education and health* (pp. xv–xxii). London: Routledge.

Tinning, R. (2010). *Pedagogy and human movement: Theory, practice, research*. Oxon: Routledge.

Trumball, D. (2004). Factors important for the scholarship of self-study of teaching and teacher education practices. In J. J. Loughran, M. L. Hamilton, V. K. LaBoskey, & T. Russell (Eds.), *International handbook of self-study of teaching and teacher education practices* (pp. 1211–1230). Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Wood, L., & Kroger, R. (2000). *Doing discourse analysis: Methods for studying action in talk and text*. London: Sage.

Young, J. R., Erickson, L. B., & Pinnegar, S. (Eds.). (2012). Proceedings from: *The ninth international conference on self-study of teacher education practices*. Provo: Brigham Young University Press.

Zeichner, K. M. (1999). The new scholarship in teacher education. *Educational Researcher, 28*(9), 4–15.

Zeichner, K. M., & Noffke, S. E. (2001). Practitioner research. In V. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (4th ed., pp. 298–330). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Zembylas, M. (2007). Risks and pleasures: A Deleuzo-Guattarian pedagogy of desire in education. *British Educational Research Journal, 33*(3), 331–347.

Bringing the Physical into Self-Study Research

Rachel Forgasz

Introduction

With the passing of time, self-study has continued to gather momentum and to garner acceptance within the academic community as a legitimate form of research. But it continues to be dominated by explorations of personal professional practice undertaken through largely logical-rational, discursive research approaches. In daily life, embodied forms of self-reflexive activity such as meditation and yoga now flourish alongside more discursive ones. So what about the spheres of higher education and self-study of teacher education practices (S-STEP) research? Is the time ripe for non-discursive, embodied approaches to self-reflexivity to enter the methodological landscape? What contribution might sensitivity to embodiment offer to the field of S-STEP research? Which aspects of our practice, our self-understanding, and our identities as teacher educators might be revealed through embodied reflective processes? And what might such processes look like in the context of conducting and disseminating rigorous research? This chapter provides a consideration of what embodiment and physical culture might bring to S-STEP as a field already rich with teacher education conversations.

Context

I am a drama teacher educator so a PETE audience is just about the last I ever expected to be writing for. My sense of disconnection from physical education stems back to my school days when my refusal to participate in team sports was almost a thing of legend, with 'kinaesthetic illiteracy' my favoured excuse. As a secondary

R. Forgasz (✉)
Monash University, Melbourne, Australia
e-mail: Rachel.Forgasz@monash.edu

school drama teacher, I felt the battle lines were strongly drawn between us too. Just as kids were often forced to choose between their jock and diva tendencies for after-school nurturance, so too was there a constant tussle over the physical spaces in which we might 'practice and compete' or 'rehearse and perform' depending on the rhetoric of our respective disciplines. Somehow, throughout my career as a student and then as a teacher, I remained blind to the common denominator shared by drama and physical education. And this essence that binds us is a thing that is missing in large part from the scholarship of teacher education, a thing that can offer new insight, and a new focus for S-STEP inquiry: the body.

Disembodied

Despite the focus on 'the self' in S-STEP, the physical body and the wisdom that it holds have not really been given much attention. And I suppose this isn't surprising given the banishment of the body from much intellectual enterprise. Perhaps none are more attuned to its absence than those of us who work in the kinaesthetic disciplines: physical education, dance, and drama; those of us whose work values the body and therefore sits on the margins of what are accepted as valid forms of knowing and learning. The dismissal of the body in academia is perhaps captured best by Ken Robinson's wry throw away that most academics today 'look upon their body as a form of transport for their heads. It's a way of getting their head to meetings' (2006).

Body/mind dualism can be traced through the history of Western philosophical thought at least as far back as Plato's separation of the body and soul. It was an idea enthusiastically taken up by Rene Descartes among others. Cartesian dualism is particularly noteworthy since Descartes not only proclaimed that mind and body were separate entities, but that our very agency as modern, knowing subjects was dependent on this separation of our thoughts from our passions, desires, and proclivities which were all housed in the physical body (Michelson 1998). And this contempt for the body as that which problematically anchors the otherwise objective knower in the subjectivity of a particular physical context has continued on through centuries of Western thought. The objective and universal truths of positivism rely in many ways on overcoming context – physical, historical, cultural – and our physical bodies are obstacles to such metaphysical transcendence.

Jordi (2010) reminds us that: 'human consciousness and the mind are processes that are contingent on the existence and functioning of the human brain. And the brain is firmly embodied' (p. 191). Nevertheless, emotion and bodily feeling have tended to be dismissed as obstacles to reason and logic, which are privileged as the most reliable, if not the only, legitimate forms of knowledge. And this dismissal of the body as a legitimate form and way of knowing is not limited to positivist scientific inquiry. Even in the humanities and social sciences, in reflective practice, and in a range of approaches to the exploration of self, rationality and verbal language are habitually valued over feeling and bodily held sensation as legitimate ways and

forms of self-knowledge. Pagis (2009) observed that this bias extends even to studies in 'self-reflexivity'. According to Pagis, the privileging of a verbal-linguistic approach is evident in the common framing of self-reflexivity as a kind of 'internal dialogue' in which 'language is assumed to be the main channel through which individuals can relate to themselves' (p. 265).

Pondering the lack of embodied practices amongst adult educators, Lawrence (2010) wondered whether it is because 'they are fearful of the body, or perhaps they just have not been exposed to other ways of knowing' (p. 2). But among physical education teacher educators, I doubt that a lack of exposure or fear is an issue. Much more likely, I suspect, is that just as you observed the gradual 'academicisation and scientisation of senior physical education' (Brown and Penney 2013, p. 42), so too did you take to heart the need to be dismembered and disembodied in order to find a place and a voice within academic discourse. If that is so, then this is an invitation to re-member (Michelson 1998), to rediscover the possibility of the body as epistemology and to pioneer a movement towards embodied reflection as an avenue to S-STEP research.

The Body as Epistemology

Despite my fighting words, I confess I commonly experience intense discomfort when I first tell people about my research interest in knowing with and through the body. So pervasive is the hierarchical privileging of logical-verbal forms of knowledge and knowledge production that I admit it is often with a self-deprecating timidity that I propose the body as an alternate form and way of knowing. I remember the first time I shared my budding research interest with my mother (a mathematics education scholar) and how she cringed at the phrase The Wisdom of the Body.

> '*Wisdom of the body?*' she scoffed, all haughty and dismissive. '*There is no wisdom of the body. The body just reacts, has physiological responses to sensation. There is no wisdom or knowledge there; it's a response without consciousness*'.
> '*But the body's response to particular situations can be a clue, an indication to our understanding of what is going on in a given moment*', I explained. '*And if we pay attention to those clues, we can choose our next action from a place of greater intent and awareness*'. I reminded her of our earlier conversation about how she had sweated and how her heart had raced in the moments before she was interviewed for a promotion. '*That was your body telling you something, wasn't it?*'
> '*It was my body reacting to something. That's just the body's primal reaction to fear*', she retorted.
> '*But you had nothing to fear in a survival sense; you weren't in any physical danger in that moment. That physiological response was your body's way of telling you something about how you were feeling in that moment*'.
> '*But if I learn anything from that, then that's my wisdom in interpreting my body's reactions, not the wisdom of the body itself*'.

Getting to this point was enough for me. I experienced it as a big win; at least I got her to acknowledge that the body's responses might be connected to our feelings and experiential understanding of what is happening in a given moment.

Whether the 'wisdom' is attributed to the bodily response itself or to our intellectual capacity to interpret that response could wait.

Without knowing it, my mother and I were discussing the differences between what neuroscientist Antonio Damasio (1999) describes as the body's first and second order sensations. First order sensations are the body's intake of sensory information from the world; second order sensations are the body's reactions to that information. As Pagis (2009) explains, the body 'reacts to the world by producing sensations – pain, heat, itchiness, change of heart rate, electricity, muscle tension – of the second order, outcomes of the first-order sensory information that the individual receives from the world' (p. 267). These second order sensations are meaningful indicators, signs of how we are feeling in relation to what we are experiencing, even if we are not aware of those feeling responses in a fully languaged, reasoned or logical way.

Part of the problem with a response like my mother's to the idea of embodied knowing is captured by her claim that: '*If I learn anything from that, then that's my wisdom in interpreting my body's reactions, not the wisdom of the body itself*'. In her singular association of her selfhood with her cognitive-interpretive capacity (*my* wisdom) is the simultaneous disassociation of her sense of self from her physical being (*the* body). In this construction of her selfhood, she denies the undeniable fact of the embodied nature of her existence in, and her experience of the world.

But in an embodied view, the body is understood to be a knowing and knowledgeable entity with its own lived experience of a given situation. In this sense it 'knows' or 'understands' in ways as potent as any thinking process. And just as our logical-rational thought processes are communicated to us in symbols and words, so too does the body communicate its experience to us through the second-order sensations that are its own language. Sometimes embodied knowledge forms complement our logical-rational-interpretative knowledges; sometimes they contradict each other. Either way, the point is that our bodily knowing is just as viable and valid as other forms and ways of knowing.

Listening to what the body is saying of what it knows and taking that wisdom into account in deciding our next action is the basis of my conception of drawing on the body as epistemology. It's not such a foreign concept really, is it? After all, despite our obsession with logically reasoned explanations, we are still given to feeling things in our bones, and to knowing them in our gut. This, I propose, is knowing with our bodies, the body as epistemology.

It is a kind of knowing connected to Polanyi's (1958) tacit knowing, the concept upon which Donald Schön (1983) drew in his conception of knowing-in-action. Both these notions account for the prelanguage, intuitive dimensions of our experiential knowing and understanding. But I am proposing the reframing of what they designate as tacit – implied, silent, unspoken – as knowledge that is merely speaking in a different language: body language. If we accept this proposition, then the notion of making the tacit explicit is disrupted too because our tacit knowledge is

already speaking explicitly, and sometimes very loudly. We just need to tune in to our bodies and hear what they are saying.

Drawing on the work of psychotherapist, Eugene Gendlin Jordi (2010) refers to this bodily knowing as the 'felt sense'. Neither a sensory perception of something external nor an emotion, the felt-sense is 'an implicitly intricate bodily felt interaction with a specific situation that invokes a constellation of associations, past and present, self and others' (p. 193). According to Jordi (2010), this bodily expression contains elements of 'feeling, memory, tacit knowledge, thought, emotion, [and] opinion – all of which cross, govern, and give relevance to one another' (p. 193). While we initially experience the felt-sense as an:

> … unclear bodily felt sensation that often occurs in the throat, chest, stomach, or abdomen, and hovers just on the edge of our thinking…what emerges as the felt-sense is made explicit, is a unique "crossing" of particular elements so that the thought, word, or action has a meaning that is specific to that situation. (pp. 192–193)

To achieve this, Jordi suggests Gendlin's psychotherapeutic process of 'focusing' to achieve the 'felt-shift' that makes explicit and conscious the bodily held knowing that is contained in the felt-sense.

If the body is epistemology, is part of *how* we know-in-action, then Jordi's (2010) notion of reflecting *on* the body offers a methodological approach by which we might research the nature of what it is that our bodies know. Reflection on the body may well be an approach to enable access to our knowing-in-action that we cannot achieve through cognitive reflection alone. A rare example of a self-study that includes this kind of focused reflection on the body can be found in the work of Canadian sport psychologist, Chantale Lussier-Ley (2010). A former dancer, Lussier-Ley embarked on a self-study of the role of the body (her own body and those of others) in her consulting practice, using autobiographical narrative analysis to explore her problematic relationship with her body which, she claims, 'was desperately trying to speak to me, but it took some time for me to be ready to truly listen' (p. 199).

Reflecting on the Body

I teach a reflective practice unit within an adult learning and development course. In it, students explore a range of approaches to reflection, including embodied reflection. For their final assignment, they are invited to apply a range of reflective processes to the case of a workplace dilemma.

Here I present the cases of Gareth and Jodie who both applied Jordi's (2010) embodied reflection by recalling and considering their experience of a felt-sense within their nominated workplace dilemma. As illustrated by these cases, focused attention on the felt-sense as a dimension of reflective inquiry offers great promise as part of an embodied methodology for S-STEP research.

Gareth

Gareth wanted to explore a class about which he remembered feeling uneasy right from the start. He hadn't prepared very well so he was feeling anxious and defensive about teaching it before the class had even begun. He asked his apprentices to form their own groups and get on with a set task. Gareth experienced a heightened sense of frustration when they needed guidance forming groups since he had deliberately given them the freedom to choose as a way of acknowledging the autonomy that adult learners supposedly expect and desire. Later, when the groups began to adapt the task he had set for them, Gareth grew intensely angry with them. In the end, he could not reconcile this anger since, in other (small) ways, he was encouraging of the students' autonomy and initiative. He ended the class feeling frustrated, angry, and confused.

Gareth began his reflection in earnest by focusing on the bodily held feeling he recalled having at the start of the class. He described a nauseous, unsettled feeling in his stomach. As he focused on this felt-sense, it took him back to his days as a student when he was often not prepared for class. When he focused on the specific details of his childhood experience of this same felt sense, what stood out for Gareth was his fear of being 'found out,' humiliated, and shown up by the teacher.

Armed with a clearer understanding of his felt-sense, Gareth returned to his exploration of his teaching that day. He had already ascertained that he was predisposed to feeling frustrated as a defensive response to his lack of preparation. But by focusing on the particular memories evoked by the felt-sense that had remained with him throughout the class, Gareth came to a new kind of self-understanding. It wasn't so much lack of preparedness that had been worrying him that day, as it was his fear of being found out by his students. It was this same lack of confidence in his own expertise that led him to panic when his students deviated from the set task. In his fear of being found out he was unable to really allow the students to take genuine initiative and ownership of their learning; he could only pay it lip-service by allowing them to form their own groups.

Jodie

Jodie remembered a planning meeting during which she and her team had determined the unmet needs of their clients (long term unemployed jobseekers). Based on those needs, and drawing on her understanding of adult education principles and processes, she and her team planned a new job skills training program, including details of the human resources needed to successfully deliver the training. As the section manager, Jodie knew that the required resources were simply unavailable. She worked with her team to revise the delivery schedule so that it would be financially viable. At this point, Jodie remembered experiencing a felt-sense, which she described as '*sickness within the stomach and feelings of anxiety within the chest*'.

As a consequence of focusing her reflection on the bodily held sensation she experienced at the time, Jodie remembered having experienced the same sensation on another – seemingly unrelated – occasion. Jodie remembered attending a government forum during which the outcomes for a new training package were being described. In her assignment, she explained: '*as the presentation continued, and the speaker began to talk about the funding that would be attached to the new package, I experienced that same sick and anxious feeling within my stomach*'.

Reflecting on the similarities between the two scenarios, Jodie came to the realisation that:

> *… when the opposing values between what it means to be a manager and what it means to be an adult educator come into conflict, I experience a felt-sense expressed as a feeling of sickness within the stomach and feelings of anxiety within the chest…[In both scenarios] the cognitive dissonance between the two competing sets of values elicited the felt-sense within me, as I instinctively knew that I would not be able to successfully meet the requirements of both sets of values, and that ultimately one would have to be selected over the other.*

Recognising a pattern in her experience of a particular felt-sense, Jodie developed a heightened awareness of the tendency for two dimensions of her job to come into conflict: the manager (concerned with the bottom line) versus the adult educator (concerned with the educational outcomes for clients). Jodie did not seek to resolve the dilemma; this was not the purpose for her reflection. But now she was primed to pay attention to the times when she faced this conflict, to note through her own felt-sense the tensions she faced when working as a manager in the field of adult education.

Reflecting Through the Body

Whereas Jordi (2010) focuses on the value of reflecting *on* the body as a site of wisdom and insight, Pagis (2009) recommends reflecting *through* the body to achieve greater self-awareness and self-understanding. She refers to 'embodied self-reflexivity', a process 'based predominantly on feeling the body, in which the relation with oneself unfolds through a corporeal medium' (p. 266). She draws specifically on the example of Vippassana meditation in which meditators remain silent for prolonged periods, focusing only on their bodily experiences. Pagis (2009) explains that unlike discursive forms of self-reflexivity (such as journal writing, reflective conversations, and story telling) 'in meditation, in order to know oneself, one does not speak either with another or with oneself. Instead, self-knowledge is anchored in bodily sensations' (p. 265).

Other forms of embodied self-reflexivity are akin to what Pirkko Markula (2004) calls 'mindful exercise', those fitness modalities that are characterised by a focus on proprioceptive awareness, breathing, body alignment, and the generation and use of intrinsic energy. Including Eastern modalities such as Yoga and Tai Chi, Western Pilates, and a host of hybrid forms such as yogalates and yogaerobics, mindful

exercise is a means by which 'an integrated self is discovered in a physical activity' (Markula 2004, p. 72).

Another form of embodied self-reflexivity is found in *The walk of the drum,* a form of moving meditation developed by Melbourne DJ and producer, Simon Slieker. Drawing on notions of trance dance found in both ancient indigenous cultural practices and the contemporary electronic music scene, Slieker (2011) proposes that 'when you allow your body to respond to rhythm and sound over time, you are liberating your mind and giving your body a voice'. In *The walk of the drum,* participants are invited to respond in bodily ways (such as movement and dance) to an integrated sound journey of music and guided meditation. Slieker's conception of the role of music in enabling embodied self-reflexivity is eloquently expressed in the introductory meditation of *The walk of the drum:*

> Embrace the structure of the rhythm.
> It is not about confining your creativity,
> it is providing a rhythmic boundary
> to anchor your physical body
> so you can journey deeply internally.
> External anchoring enables inner venturing,
> inner visioning.
> The rhythm can take you there,
> the beats can bring you back.
> The repetition is a roadmap.

Knowing Through the Performing Body

As in the various physical education disciplines, the body is also central to the process of inquiry within the performing arts disciplines of dance, drama, and music. Liora Bresler (2004) explains that this makes the performing arts an ideal area for exploring the potential of embodiment for educational research. In the case of drama, embodied and discursive forms often come together; for example, in the live performance of scripted theatrical work. This positions dramatic performance as a powerful reflective practice approach with the potential to engage participants simultaneously in discursive and embodied reflexive activity.

In the aesthetic space of the theatrical stage, we can enact (or re-enact) particular performances, reflecting ourselves to ourselves through the imaginary mirror of theatre. In doing so, we can become the audience in the present moment to our own actions past, present, or future. In doing so, we experience metaxis; that is, 'the state of belonging completely and simultaneously to two different autonomous worlds' (Boal 1995, p. 43). In this sense we take on simultaneously the roles of actor and spectator, a collapsing of roles which brings about the subsequent emergence of what Boal (1995) calls the 'spect-actor':

> [The spect-actor] is not only an object; he is a subject because he can also act on the actor – the spect-actor is the actor, he can guide him, change him. A spect-actor acting on the actor who acts. (p. 13)

Within this description of the spect-actor is the very image of the reflective practitioner, engaged in the constant reflexive flow of acting, observing action and, through that observation, learning, and determining new action for observation, and so on and on.

In Boal's image of the spect-actor, the mode of reflexive communication is embodied performance. In both *Games for actors and non-actors* (2002) and *The rainbow of desire* (1995), Boal outlines a range of drama-based exercises that engage participants in what are essentially forms of embodied reflection. Each one offers the intriguing possibility of unearthing through an embodied perspective alternative understanding of our actions, practices, and values.

Colombian Hypnosis

On a recent trip to the United States, I worked with a group of undergraduate students taking a course on urban schooling. They had only met one time previous and for many of them, that one session was their first introduction to the intellectual ideas around equity and social justice thrown up by the nature and state of contemporary urban schooling. For my session, I decided to engage the group in the embodied experience of Boal's 'Colombian Hypnosis' (described in his *Games for actors and non-actors,* 2002).

In the first phase, students paired up with A as the leader and B following. B imagined a 10 cm string connecting their nose to A's open palm. In this way A led B around the space, experimenting with height, pace, and movement forwards and back. At the end of a few minutes, A and B swapped roles so that B had a turn to lead. The group reconvened to discuss their experience. They were asked who liked to lead and who liked to follow. Some nominated their preference to lead, citing their enjoyment of the power, the creative possibilities, the idea of pushing their partner to their limits. Others did not enjoy leading; they could not think of imaginative things to do, some did not like the responsibility, and preferred to follow. Others preferred to follow because they enjoyed the challenge set by their partner.

In the second phase, students made groups of three. In the first instance, A led with B and C attached by an imaginary string to each of A's open palms. In this way, A led with two followers. The trios swapped roles until each had a turn to lead. Again, the group reconvened and experiences were shared. Some continued to enjoy leading; they felt as though they were choreographing a dance, but others found the responsibility too much this time since there was the added danger of the pair of followers colliding. Likewise, some who enjoyed following the first time liked it even less since they were now competing for the attention of the leader. Others enjoyed following with a fellow follower in tow since they felt part of a collective and less exposed.

In the final phase, a single volunteer took centre stage and held out two open palms. Volunteers positioned themselves attached to each palm by an imaginary string. Then each of these volunteers held out two palms and a further two volunteers attached themselves before holding up their palms and leading two more volunteers.

The configuration continued to grow until there were only followers on the very ends with no one to lead. Once the whole group was part of the configuration, the leader began to move, with most of the group acting simultaneously as both leaders and followers. It did not take long for the group to descend into chaos, with the outlying followers on the ends flung this way and that with the slightest movement from the centre. Unable to see anything other than the few followers immediately around him, the central leader very quickly got the group stuck in a corner with nowhere to go. The configuration folded in on itself before coming to a complete standstill.

We reconvened to discuss the experience, beginning by sharing the experiences of those who were both leaders and followers. Most said they found it difficult to focus equally on leading and following and admitted that when forced to choose, they privileged following over leading with care. For the most part, the outliers on the ends said they did not feel that anyone was really looking out for them and they could feel their leader's focus on following those in front rather than investing in leading. One outlier said they quite enjoyed this since it meant they felt no responsibility for anyone else. But most felt unsafe and uncared about. The central leader began by focusing on the two followers at his palms. He did not realise the ripple effect of his movements on the whole until it was too late to untangle the group. After some time, he got bored and could not think of new movements but feeling the pressure to continue to lead, he went on moving without really thinking about what he was doing.

After some time sharing purely at the level of their personal, bodily experience, one student offered that it reminded her of her job at Walmart. I asked her to explain what she meant. '*Well*', she said, '*there are so many managers and deputy managers and assistant managers telling each other what to do and then the sales staff just obeying without really understanding what's going on*', Another student added '*it's a bit like a dysfunctional government*' and a third said, '*it's kind of like the school system*'.

We continued to discuss this idea: that they had just created an embodied metaphor for the school system. They shared their various understandings of that metaphor, taking as a starting point their bodily positions within it. The outliers had a felt experience of being neglected by the system that is purportedly designed to support them, experiencing the bodily equivalent of being a student in an education system so focused on rules and regulations that it fails to take account of the negative impacts on the students themselves. The bodily experience of trying to simultaneously lead and follow enabled some students a more empathetic appreciation of the difficulties faced by teachers in urban schools who are charged simultaneously with the responsibility to cater to the needs of their students and to ensure that they achieve at acceptable levels on high stakes tests. They empathised with the double bind that many teachers face in having to follow bureaucratic demands in order to keep their jobs despite feeling that such a focus is not in the best interests of their students.

These students had already begun an intellectual exploration of ideas around the systemic oppression of the school system. This session enabled them to have a *felt* experience of systemic oppression, enabling them to know the experience with their

bodies, through the embodied metaphor of Colombian Hypnosis. As one student wrote to me after the class, '*today I will walk away knowing how it feels to be oppressed while oppressing others, and how much of an impact I will have on my students as a future teacher*'.

According to Brookfield (1995), one of the greatest challenges of reflective practice is overcoming the limitations of our own perspective. We view the world within the frame of our assumptions, which we tend to misrecognise as truths. Reflection depends on our ability to expose our assumptions (Brookfield 1995) and to 'reframe' our experiences (Schön 1983). For these students, embodiment enabled just such a reframing of the concept of systemic oppression so that they came to understand it from an embodied, emotional perspective. Their experience points to the methodological potential for 'framing and reframing' that embodied processes might offer within S-STEP research.

Communicating Bodily Knowing

The irony in encouraging bodily knowing as a starting point for research is that if it is to be shared with others via traditional dissemination formats, ultimately that bodily knowing must somehow be translated into a more conventional, linguistic form. This is what Pagis (2009) refers to as the 'methodological obstacle' (p. 268) of communicating embodied self-reflexivity to others. According to Pagis, as Vippassana meditators develop their expertise in the modality, they become less reliant on talk and social integration and more autonomous in their reflective capacities, thereby reducing the need or desire to share their findings with others. But I remain unconvinced by this notion and am more inclined to see embodiment as another vehicle for reflexive inquiry, which is at its most powerful, dynamic, and revealing when shared. Certainly, in the context of S-STEP research, the act of 'going public' is a fundamental methodological concern (Samaras 2011, p. 81).

Nevertheless, it has certainly been my experience that there is something ephemeral in bodily knowing, something that cannot quite be expressed in words and so some of the experience and the understanding of it is lost when shared in verbal-linguistic forms. This is pertinent not only to the dissemination of embodied research findings, but even in research participants' attempts to make sense of their embodied experiences. I discovered this dilemma when first reporting the findings of a research project for which data collection was conducted through embodied reflection workshops. While at the time I felt confident that powerful learning had happened and the group's experience seemed to be one of profound transformation, later when I went back to write up the experience, I found no verbal evidence of it. Despite having audio and video recordings of the session, I had not captured tangible data as evidence of all that had taken place. The workshop transcripts were characterised by half sentences finished with gestures, grunts of affirmation, exclamations of appreciation, surprise, and agreement.

Weber and Mitchell (2002) addressed the problem of conveying their embodied, performance-based S-STEP research by presenting the theatrical performance of a

play script, as well as disseminating their research in the form of a scholarly article. As they explained, 'it's one thing to write about yourself, but quite another to publicly embody what you've written' (p. 122). Lussier-Ley sought to overcome the 'methodological obstacle' of embodied self-reflexive research in her self-study writing through the creative solution of anthropomorphizing her body. Her self-study work is punctuated by dialogical exchanges between her 'self' and her 'body', which speaks back to her throughout.

Recently, I too looked to an arts-based approach to disseminate research and experimented with dissemination of embodied research findings via an interactive exhibition (Patrizio and Forgasz 2013). In the exhibition, free standing, life-size photographic images of physical poses adopted as part of an embodied reflection workshop were exhibited. A mirror accompanied each one. An invitation was extended to exhibition participants:

> Near each image is a mirror. Use its reflection to guide you as you physically adopt the image. Pause. Breathe into it. What emotion does your body's positioning evoke in you? Do you recognise this emotion? When (and why) have you felt it?

After having their own bodily experience of an embodied emotion, participants were invited to reveal a hidden text panel containing an explanation from the original workshop participant about the emotion they were trying to convey through the image. In this way, I attempted to present the data speaking in the language of the body before being translated into the spoken/written word. Just as significant in this approach was the opportunity it created for audiences to have a bodily experience (engaging with the data through an embodied process) as well as engaging with a logical-rational interpretation of the data and subsequent findings.

All these examples draw on arts-based research forms of dissemination. Theatre-based inquiry approaches such as performance ethnography and verbatim theatre also hold particular promise as embodied approaches to data collection and dissemination of research. But I suspect that arts-based approaches alone will not suffice and that even as they are adopted, they will also be adapted to shift the emphasis away from *artful* ways of knowing and being (Finley 2008), instead shining a light on knowing through the experience and language of the body.

At any rate, if embodied reflection is to enter the vernacular of S-STEP research methods, then it will be incumbent upon those who work with it to continue to develop convincing and authentically representative modes for capturing and presenting data from such research. In doing so, we will very likely have to challenge the boundaries of what are considered valid forms of research dissemination.

Conclusion

The decision to engage in S-STEP research requires a willingness to look vulnerably at oneself; to unravel the complex network of thoughts, emotions, assumptions, histories, and aspirations that motivate pedagogic action and reaction. This self to be

cracked open for exploration is housed in a physical body so it follows that the body should 'count' in S-STEP research.

In this chapter, I have proposed that the body is more than just a physical anchoring of our context and our subjectivity. The body is, but the body also does, it speaks, and it knows. We can know *with* the body and *through* the body; both provide exciting avenues for bodily S-STEP research. Self-study of what we know *with* our bodies means paying heed to our bodily held responses and including them as a legitimate focus for self-reflexive activity. Self-study of what we know *through* the body, means engaging in bodily processes to arrive at self-understanding, just as we might come to know something through an intellectual process of thinking about it.

Given our pre-existing relationships with our bodies, and the central role of the body within our kinaesthetic disciplines, we teacher educators of physical education, drama, and dance are perhaps best placed to develop bodily approaches to S-STEP research. The development of such approaches would not only benefit our own research but could also open an invitation to the wider S-STEP community into awareness and experience of the body as a site of wisdom, of knowing, and of reflection.

References

Boal, A. (1995). *The rainbow of desire: The Boal method of theatre and therapy* (A. Jackson, Trans.). London: Routledge.

Boal, A. (2002). *Games for actors and non-actors* (A. Jackson, Trans., 2nd ed.). London: Routledge.

Bresler, L. (Ed.). (2004). *Knowing bodies, moving minds: Embodied knowledge in education*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Brookfield, S. D. (1995). *Becoming a critically reflective teacher*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Brown, T. D., & Penney, D. (2013). Learning 'in', 'through' and 'about' movement: The new Victorian Certificate of Education Physical Education. *European Physical Education Review, 19*(1), 39–61.

Damasio, A. (1999). *The feeling of what happens: Body and emotion in the making of consciousness*. London: W. Heinemann.

Finley, S. (2008). Arts-based research. In J. G. Knowles & A. L. Cole (Eds.), *Handbook of the arts in qualitative research: Perspectives, methodologies, examples and issues* (pp. 71–82). London: Sage.

Jordi, R. (2010). Reframing the concept of reflection: Consciousness, experiential learning, and reflective learning practices. *Adult Education Quarterly, 61*(2), 181–197.

Lawrence, R. L. (2010). Editorial. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, 134*(Summer), 1–3.

Lussier-Ley, C. (2010). Dialoguing with the body: A self-study in relational pedagogy through embodiment and the therapeutic relationship. *The Qualitative Report, 15*(1), 197–214.

Markula, P. (2004). Embodied movement knowledge in fitness and exercise education. In L. Bresler (Ed.), *Knowing bodies, moving minds: Embodied knowledge in education*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Michelson, E. (1998). Re-membering: The return of the body to experiential learning. *Studies in Continuing Education, 20*(2), 217–233.

Pagis, M. (2009). Embodied self reflexivity. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 72*(3), 265–283.

Patrizio, K., & Forgasz, R. (2013). *Visual imagery, emotion and reflection* [Exhibition]. Blacksburg: Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.

Polyani, M. (1958). *Personal knowledge. Towards a post critical philosophy*. London: Routledge.

Robinson, K. (2006). *Why schools kill creativity: The case for an education system that nurtures creativity.* Presented at the TED Conference, Monterey.

Samaras, A. P. (2011). *Self-study teacher research: Improving your practice through collaborative inquiry*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Schön, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. London: Maurice Temple Smith.

Slieker, S. (2011). *The walk of the drum: Opening meditation*. Retrieved from http://monotremes.com/walk-of-the-drum.html.

Weber, S., & MItchell, C. (2002). Academic literary performance, embodiment, and self-study: When the shoe doesn't fit: Death of a salesman. In C. Kosnik, A. Freese, & A. Samaras (Eds.), *Making a difference in teacher education through self-study* (Vol. 2, pp. 117–120). Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto.

Self-Study as Professional Development: Some Reflections from Experience

Karl Attard

Introduction

There I was: a newly qualified teacher teaching in what many defined a very difficult school. At the end of every single day during my first year of teaching, I returned home without much energy left for planning future lessons, let alone analysing my own practice with the aim of developing professionally. I felt as if I was thrown into an unknown planet where everything was rather new to me. In such a situation my main aim was to survive, a common feeling for newly qualified teachers (Brouwer and Korthagen 2005). Moreover, I wanted to survive by copying what seemed to work for other teachers, which I have since learned is another common survival strategy among new teachers (Griffin 2003; Weiss and Weiss 2001). I was just another mortal being entering the teaching profession.

With time, I managed to adapt to my new role as teacher as I increasingly felt more comfortable with what I was doing. Without knowing it, I had created a comfort zone comprising habitual routines where I did not have to think much about my practice. Because of this comfort zone, I seldom questioned whether my practice could be improved in order to facilitate student learning. Tacit learning from experience helped here, because, as Schön (1983) and Mason (2002) contend, a lot can be learned from practice. But soon the learning is replaced by habits gained from such unquestioned practice. In reality, we sometimes find ourselves doing things without even realising that we have learned to do them. Such habitual practice therefore has the capacity to form professional assumptions that the practitioner is unaware of and subsequently finds hard to articulate.

K. Attard (✉)
University of Malta, Msida, Malta
e-mail: karl.attard@um.edu.mt

Self-Study as a Corrective Measure to Experiential Over-Learning

Taken-for-granted assumptions and habitual practice were thus formed very early in my teaching career. After some time, if unanalysed and unchallenged, these become taken-for-granted to the point that the beginning teacher gets stuck in his/her own habits, unable to articulate the assumptions that led to such routine practice. In Dewey's (1938) words, 'experience may increase a person's automatic skill in a particular direction and yet tend to land him in a groove or rut; the effect again is to narrow the field of further experience' (p. 13). This happens because habitual practice blocks us from seeing possible alternatives as we constantly repeat our practice; thus closing down, rather than opening up new experiences (Day 1999, 2004; Loughran 2006; Mason 2002).

The introduction of a completely new syllabus and a reform in the examination of physical education shook me out of my comfort zone in my second year of teaching. By doing so, these changes acted as critical incidents where I had to change habitual practice in order to manage new challenges (Kelchtermans and Vandenberghe 1994; Schuck 2002). But there is a prerequisite to changing habitual practice, for one cannot simply change a habit without analysing that same habit. Take smoking for example. One can decide to quit smoking but it is impossible to do so unless the smoker analyses his or her habit prior to seriously attempting a change. The same argument holds for habitual professional practice and in my case the best tool at my disposal to analyse my practice is what I (and others) have termed reflective self-study. It is through such a tool that I started questioning what was previously taken-for-granted; i.e. habitual practice and the assumptions that make up that practice. Such questioning of accepted routines and the consequent change to habitual practice are seen as the hallmark of reflective self-study.

> Becoming involved in 'improvement' is not only about becoming 'better' but also to do with becoming 'different' through questioning the taken-for-grantedness, the habits, the comfort blankets that we wrap around ourselves from time to time and by adopting a more problem-posing teaching posture … It is about questioning practice with confidence so as to open up new possibilities and new directions for action (Ghaye and Ghaye 1998, p. 67).

As I argued in my personal journal, *'intentional learning and the need for change progressed in parallel because if we are to change we need to learn, and learning facilitates change'*. Clarke and Hollingsworth (2002) similarly argue that informed change is a complex process that inevitably involves learning. Additionally, deeper understanding and learning are indispensable if the practitioner is to embrace the notion of ongoing development and improvement of practice and see these as desirable. It is for this reason, coupled with my commencement of PhD research, that I engaged in self-study. Such research was optimally suited to my needs since I concur with Zeichner (2007) whose position 'rejects the dualism of research either contributing to greater theoretical understanding or to the improvement of practice and argues that self-study research should attempt to work on both goals simultaneously' (p. 36).

This chapter thus allows me to share with readers what I have learned about self-study research through my engagement with reflective self-study. In trying to do so, I was allowed what Berry and Kosnik (2010) term the rare luxury of going back and re-analysing available data coming from a number of self-studies I was engaged in. I use extracts from personal journals of studies that took place over the past 10 years to strengthen the arguments made.

Taken-for-Granted Professional Assumptions

Through experiencing self-study, I have come to believe that the most important aspect of teacher learning is the examination of one's own tacit understandings and taken-for-granted assumptions (Loughran 2006). This is even more accentuated when considering that these understandings shape the way we interpret experiences and construct knowledge (Nissilä 2005; Orland-Barak 2006). Therefore, erroneous assumptions can distort our view, consequently leading to misinterpretation of what is happening in our classrooms.

Through personal experience I contend that as I go deeply into critically analysing my own assumptions, I realise that deficiencies exist and I try to reframe them. This is indeed the basis of transformative learning (Kraft 2002; Ward and McCotter 2004) because as I altered my beliefs, I increasingly realised that my practice must also change. This provides further support for the work of Sparks (2002) and Coburn (2003), who argue that there is a correlation between changes in assumptions and changes to professional practice. In reality, '*if learning stops, change stops too and we will keep on doing a hundred years from now, what we are doing now*' (Personal Journal). This is exactly how I felt before engaging in reflective self-study, and my experience resonates with Lockford's (2002) statement that:

> With time, the actors become accustomed enough, habituated enough, to live within their roles and to play that script on demand, playing it even when that drama has no catharsis, where the only comfort is the familiarity of habit (p. 78).

I do not mean to argue that experiential learning is not possible if experiences are not analysed. However, such learning would be mostly tacit, and it is difficult for the practitioner to be fully in control of tacit knowledge. Even worse, tacit understandings control the way a person views his/her future experiences. Reflective self-study is fundamental to consciously learn from professional experience and to investigate our own tacit learning. For the practitioner-researcher, experience and reflective self-study form a symbiotic relationship. In truth, self-study has made me an informed decision-maker and afforded me better control and understanding of my actions and the contexts in which I operate. Similarly, I do not make the claim that the creation of habitual practice is always an evil. What is harmful to professional practice is that if such habitual routines and professional assumptions are never analysed and modified where necessary, our practice never changes, whether or not

these practices are achieving the results they are set to achieve. According to Schön (1983), 'when this happens, the practitioner has over-learned what he knows … [and] reflection can serve as a corrective to over-learning' (p. 61).

The Relevance of Learning That Emerges from Self-Study

Professional development opportunities need to be directly relevant to teachers' needs. If they are, teacher learning and improved practice are more likely (Hunzicker 2011). If new learning seems relevant to my needs—for example, if it is linked to a problem I perceive—I already feel the need to change. However, when learning does not appear to be immediately relevant, is highly abstract, or is perceived as being far away from the realities I face as a teacher educator, it is either ignored or just accommodated within my comfort zone and it rarely challenges habitual routines. Thus, such new learning will rarely result in change of practice.

Unfortunately, many teachers complain that traditional professional development opportunities usually lack relevance but in contrast, self-study, especially when conducted in a community of professionals engaging in self-study, can promote learning that is directly relevant (Armour and Yelling 2007; Attard 2012; Duncombe and Armour 2004; Gallagher et al. 2011). In fact, I experienced the learning emerging from reflective self-study as immediately relevant and applicable to my needs. In such a way, it was difficult for me to become a prisoner in my own cage (WestEd 2000). Relevance of learning through self-study is boosted by not having a pre-set agenda where *aspects to develop* would have been previously decided upon. Instead, professional aspects need to be chosen by practitioners themselves according to what they deem relevant; i.e. issues that emerge from, and are having a direct impact upon their practice. As I argued in my personal journal, just like students, '*teachers feel the need to talk about something that is either troubling them…or something that they're really enthusiastic about*'. According to Loughran (2010), self-study offers an opportunity to practitioners to delve deeper into such issues. As Campbell (2002) suggests, 'teachers researching their own classrooms have the potential to locate development where it arguably should be, in the hearts and minds of the teachers, in their everyday lives and work' (p. 31).

Such claims were supported in one of my recent studies where reflective self-study was promoted in a collaborative environment. One of the participants came up to me and enthusiastically stated: 'This is the best form of professional development I have encountered throughout my teaching career' (Attard 2012, p. 210). This was later echoed by all of the other participants of the study and they specifically stated that it is the relevance of learning that mostly helped them appreciate such a professional development opportunity. Participants also reported working harder on their own development when compared to traditional in-service courses. As one participant stated, 'having the freedom to reflect upon and discuss topics we deem as relevant has indeed made this a positive experience, as my enthusiasm to dive into the world of professional learning has increased' (Attard 2012, p. 208).

Conversing and Collaborative Others in Self-Study

Conversing with other professionals offers the possibility of feedback and exposure to different viewpoints. Unfortunately, this is not always possible as professional isolation can be a reality in today's educational institutions, promoted by administrative work and heavy workloads. In similar contexts, collaboration and sharing are limited at best and non-existent at worst. However, as I engaged in my daily reflective writing I felt the need to converse; to make arguments; to obtain multiple viewpoints; to ask questions and give hypothetical answers. In Mills' (1959) words:

> I do not know the full social conditions of the best intellectual workmanship, but certainly surrounding oneself by a circle of people who will listen and talk – and at times they have to be imaginary characters – is one of them (p. 01).

I thus started conversing with my journal. In reality, I was conversing with myself, but the journal was situated as the other: a partner in conversation (Meriläinen and Syrjälä 2001). The unpredictable course of thinking while writing is very similar to when two or more people converse. During informal conversation, one thing leads to another and nobody can precisely predetermine the outcome of such conversations. Writing promoted an internal reflective dialogue – a conversation with oneself – where the same unpredictability found in informal conversation is present (Conle 2001; Glaze 2002). In fact, while writing I unconsciously had multiple selves and I constantly made arguments as if I was debating. I therefore agree with Ellis and Bochner (2000) that the narrative we construct 'displays multiple layers of consciousness' (p. 739). It is interesting to speculate on the role these multiple selves play. When analysing my personal journal, I became conscious that on multiple occasions I imagined myself in various positions. These ranged from the role of parent to that of school administrator, from student to policy maker, from prospective teacher to teacher educator, and from PE teacher to elite athlete. Whatever role I take while engaging in reflective self-study, the aim is that of trying to obtain varying viewpoints regarding the issue in question.

But why is conversing with oneself healthy for the practitioner engaged in self-study? Bohm (1990) suggests that through dialogue we: disclose assumptions, beliefs held, as well as practical theories; reveal our understanding and our knowledge; and our learning through conversation may lead us to action. Yet, do these same arguments hold when conversing with oneself? Through my personal experience with reflective self-study I contend that the aforementioned arguments do hold. The important thing is that 'it values a multiplicity of voices and perspectives' (Brunner 1994, p. 17). It comes as no surprise then that Schön (1983) promotes internal dialogue as essential for reflection. Maybe what various fields term as reflection is simply the ability of the practitioner to converse with himself/herself as regards aspects of professional practice while being able to study issues from various angles.

Although such internal conversation is priceless, not having critical friends can, however, limit one's professional development. At present, I am surrounded with critical friends with whom I can share and discuss various issues related to practice.

What a change this has been! My own professional development seems to have been given a boost by such collaborative practice. New understandings can now be discussed with other professionals who can highlight any short-sightedness from my part. Such newly created knowledge can be useful to them too, in the sense that they might be awakened to new aspects of their practice and research that until then went unnoticed. This is reciprocal, since on many occasions colleagues who shared their new understandings with me prompted me to look further into particular issues, and at times also made me question my held assumptions.

> *As soon as I met [my colleague], he talked to me about some problems he was encountering with his research students. He also argued that changes were needed but was uncertain as to which path to take. When he asked for my opinion, I told him that I had never faced that problem before, but in reality, going unnoticed does not mean that the situation is not problematic. I promised [my colleague] I would ask my students for their opinion and have a think about it before getting back to him* (Personal Journal).

When discussing professional issues with colleagues, questioning from their part with the intention of them better understanding your arguments also has a valuable role. This is because trying to articulate your thoughts while answering colleagues' questions promotes further thought on the issues discussed, and this subsequently promotes further knowledge construction that promotes professional learning and improvement of practice (Orland-Barak 2006; Zellermayer and Tabak 2006).

But why does collaborative self-study augment the benefits of the individual process? Put simply, the answer might be that studying a problem while having the perspectives of various people sheds more light than when done in isolation (Bullough and Pinnegar 2001; Nissilä 2005). Participants in the previously mentioned study where collaboration between self-study practitioner-researchers was being promoted argued that 'being exposed to alternative viewpoints was an immense learning opportunity and a strongpoint of this learning community', and 'through public reflection my professional development has received a big boost as I learned with and from others' (Attard 2012, p. 203). During collaborative self-study, there was scaffolding of ideas where participants constructed knowledge by building on each other's previously constructed knowledge and ideas (Orland-Barak 2006). Clokey-Till et al. (2001) describe the benefits of this process:

> It was this social nature of our learning that pushed us far beyond what was individually possible. It was hard to tell where an idea had originated. Even if one person initiated an idea, it was often developed further in conversation with others (p. 204).

In this way, collaborating practitioners are positioned as co-learners (Le Cornu 2005). Such collaborative practice between self-study participant-researchers is an added boost as it helps the individual practitioner go deeper into personal issues that are directly relevant to his/her practice. Public analysis should therefore not be seen as the end-point. Rather, it is a trampoline where individual reflective self-study recommences. This is because through the collaborative process knowledge construction alternates between personal and public analysis, and promotes the rethinking of professional assumptions (Orland-Barak 2006).

But if the collaborative process is such a powerful tool in teachers' professional development, is there also a need for reflective self-study on an individual basis? In

any type of professional development, individual identity is of utmost importance (Tillema and van der Westhuizen 2006; Calderwood 2000). Therefore, the individual should always be at the centre and knowledge creation needs to start with the individual. Although support in a collaborative environment is desirable, the individual needs to go back to the drawing board where new knowledge is adapted and analysed according to specific contextual circumstances. For instance, decisions regarding actions to take need to be on an individual level. Self-study practitioner-researchers should never feel constrained to *act* and *think* like other critical friends, as such practice would certainly mute the professional development of the individual since relevance of learning might be lost. Any collaborative process should promote professional learning that assists the individual in taking informed-decisions rather than offering packaged solutions for all involved to follow. Therefore, although collaborative self-study practitioner-researchers come together to learn from and with each other, each individual needs to take the decisions deemed best for his/her situation. The main difference is that each individual's learning is not isolated but complemented by that of others.

Unfortunately, the literature is replete with examples where consensus is the target (Collin and Valleala 2005; Stacey et al. 2004). For example, a teacher in Calderwood's (2000) study stated that in the collaborative environment she experienced, practitioners always felt the pressure to reach consensus, and they felt uncomfortable when this did not occur. Regrettably, extreme consensus seeking limits a healthy exploration of alternatives through the uncritical acceptance of solutions (Johnson 2003). This should not happen, as rather than being a boost, collaboration can hinder the development of the reflective self-study practitioner.

The voicing of various beliefs and conflicting views immensely aids public analysis and ultimately learning (Watkins 2005). This is because when facing ideas or arguments that conflict with our held views, the latter are challenged as we start to question and analyse them. This is done in parallel with the analysis of newly-presented arguments and ideas. This is why agreeing to disagree is an important condition, as it promotes the voicing of varying views and understandings; especially when considering that it is inevitable that different professionals experience differences in their practices and assumptions (Orland-Barak and Tillema 2006). Rather than being seen as a problem, varying viewpoints should be seen as manna from heaven because uncertainty and conflicting views are what I called elsewhere *a blessing in disguise* (Attard 2008). Of crucial importance is the necessary understanding that 'relatedness and autonomy are not opposites, as they are sometimes depicted' (Watkins 2005, p. 52). Hence, the questioning of held assumptions receives an added boost when one is exposed to various viewpoints, because with critical friends learning becomes 'a dialectic process in which individuals test their constructed views on others and negotiate their ideas' (Stacey et al. 2004, p. 108). Therefore, being surrounded by other self-study practitioner-researchers is of value, especially when considering that engaging in reflective self-study on an individual level is no insurance against the possibility of blinding oneself (Attard and Armour 2006).

The Pitfalls of Self-Study

Self-study is not all rosy. It is a journey through a bumpy road, whose destination promises to be a better place from our starting point; even though many-a-time the destination is elusive. It is elusive because professional development through reflective self-study is a never-ending journey. This makes sense when we recognise that there is always room for improvement. But let us concentrate on what makes the journey so bumpy. Amongst other things, uncertainty and inconclusiveness are a constant – no wonder the final destination is elusive. Another reason for the road being a bumpy one is the continuous quest of venturing into the unknown, especially regarding professional practice. This is because new learning should lead to changes to professional practice with the intention of improving; for what use is new learning if it is not applied in practice? Finally, reflective self-study does not guarantee that the final destination is actually better, as the possibility of self-deception is always a possibility. After all, 'the aim of self-study research is to provoke, challenge, and illuminate rather than confirm and settle' (Bullough and Pinnegar 2001, p. 20).

The Importance of Tolerating Uncertainty and 'Not Knowing' in Self-Study

New learning and new insights emerging from self-study have made me an informed decision-maker, since my own learning backs my practice and decisions. However, the reader should not get the mistaken idea that the self-study practitioner-researcher is one who knows exactly what is happening and exactly what courses of action to take, since this is far from the reality I have experienced. In fact, Fitzgerald et al. (2002) asserted that 'self-study work did not always solve immediate problems' (p. 77). Without such a realisation, consciously or unconsciously omitting such negative aspects of inquiry can lead beginners in reflective self-study to convince themselves that they are not up to the task when they encounter problems, as 'experts' never seem to encounter such problems. My experience confirms, however, that rough and bumpy roads are more common than smooth highways in a journey towards learning and deeper understanding. On various occasions I wrote that '*confusion reigns in my head. It's like I've got fireworks in my head*' (Personal Journal). I have thus come to see reflective self-study as a tricky, complex and confusing terrain.

The professional practice of both teachers and teacher educators is dynamic, chaotic, indefinite and uncertain (Richert 2001), while for Borko (2004) 'meaningful learning is a slow and uncertain process' (p. 6). Therefore, the major two spheres of reflective self-study (professional practice and professional learning) are both uncertain terrains. No wonder that my life as a professional is full of dilemmas, incompleteness and uncertainties. But most of these went unnoticed before engaging in reflective self-study. It is interesting to note that unlike the creation of habitual routines, reflective self-study does not try to simplify the educative and learning processes. On the

contrary, it made me realise the complexities of a teacher's life, because I started questioning what was previously taken-for-granted. As a result I soon realised that at times '*the more I write, the more confused I feel*' (Personal Journal).

Even today, after more than 10 years of engagement in self-study research, more often than not the answers to my questions are plausible, for now, but hardly definitive. Embarking on a project of ongoing change brings with it risk, because we have to leave the familiarity of habit to explore the unknown. This is why change is difficult, as humans prefer inhabiting the familiarity of the known to venturing into the unknown. Thus, by engaging in reflective self-study 'the old certainties of tradition, custom, [and] technical efficiency … are rejected as rational grounds for practice and replaced with a process of dynamic interrogation' (Parker 1997, p. 122).

Uncertainty and inconclusiveness also affect a person's emotions. Often I felt exasperated when, try as I might, I could get no correct and definite answers to the questions I posed. On such occasions my only possibility was to suspend the need for answers, because 'reaching understanding is not always possible here and now' (Oosterheert and Vermunt 2003, p. 162). Then I would engage in further observations, reflect on my previous and new observations and re-tackle the unanswered questions. This is because, according to Oosterheert and Vermunt (2003), 'new information is often needed … and this information is not always available in the present' (p. 62). Thus in reflective self-study, the practitioner-researcher has to enter *a suspended state of not knowing*, where one has to wait, engage in further observation, and analyse future observations with the intention of shedding light on such dimly lit territory. The realisation is that no simple solutions exist to complex problems faced by teachers and teacher educators, and what seem to be simple solutions are very often inappropriate (Houston and Clift 1990). Thus I agree with Campbell's (2002) statement that on various occasions the practitioner-researcher must have:

> The confidence to admit 'I've looked at the evidence, it has increased my knowledge and understanding, it has affected my practice but I've hit a wall – I don't know what to do next'. And living with uncertainty: 'it feels so messy. You don't think you are going anywhere or doing anything' (p. 30).

I must point out here that although in the initial stages I could not stand having suspended states of not knowing, I later realised that such suspended states promote further analysis of practice. It is doubt and discontent that make me look further and deeper into issues at hand and uncertainty and inconclusiveness powered my need to learn further. This is harmonious with Dewey's (1910) argument that doubt stimulates inquiry. After such a realisation, I constantly took the stance of what Grant (2001) called the uncertain inquirer, where I continuously doubted my own understandings. As such, although at certain stages I commented in my journal that *'uncertainty is a frightening thing'*, on numerous occasions I pointed out that I want to be surrounded by uncertainty throughout my professional career.

> *If I ever wrap enough certainty around myself, then I would be indirectly saying that I have learned enough and that is indeed a paradox. If this was to happen, I would stop reflecting and learning because no uncertain situation would urge me to go deeper into various issues. That would be a shame!!!* (Personal Journal).

As self-study practitioner-researchers we must not be impatient with our own learning. We must not aim for quick change and/or conclusions because learning is accompanied by inconclusiveness and uncertainty, especially when considering that making sense is not a split-second event but a process requiring substantial time (Czarniawska 2004; MacLeod and Cowieson 2001). Hence, my conclusions to specific issues are temporary, as I always leave room for possible error that can be highlighted by the acquisition of new understandings and learning. As Bullough and Pinnegar (2001) contend, 'in self-studies, conclusions are hard won, elusive, and generally more tentative than not' (p. 20). This is exactly what puts uncertainty, inconclusiveness, conflict and dilemmas into one basket, i.e. they all emphasise the lack of one clear way of doing things. If there was one unmistakable way of operating then reflective self-study would be useless and technical rationality would be the preferred procedure. However, in reality the self-study practitioner-researcher needs to engage in a never-ending process where the possibility of various solutions are analysed, with the final objective being the need for continuous change with the aim of constant improvement.

What is of utmost importance is the process of inquiry, the search itself. For in searching for plausible answers many possibilities are imagined and taken into consideration, analysed and tried out in practice. This is what makes reflective self-study an ongoing and never-ending process. On the other hand, as maintained by Schön (1983), many practitioners who do not systematically analyse their practice:

> …become too skilful at techniques of selective inattention, junk categories, and situational control, techniques which they use to preserve the constancy of their knowledge-in-practice. For them, uncertainty is a threat; its admission is a sign of weakness (p. 69).

Therefore, while uncertainty is seen as a sign of weakness for the technical expert, uncertainty is a sign of constant growth, development and learning for the self-study practitioner-researcher.

Translating New Learning into Improved Practice

Better understanding is a precursor to changing habitual practice, but simply '*understanding something does not imply change*' (Personal Journal). As Clark (1995) argues, 'it is one thing to point out a danger or an opportunity, and quite another to do something about it' (p. 27). Therefore, the self-study practitioner-researcher requires determination to continuously improve practice. This is not easy though, as changing habitual practice continues to intensify the feelings of uncertainty as in order to change and develop professionally, we take risks as we deviate from the comfort of familiarity while embracing the unfamiliar (Lockford 2002; WestEd 2000). Henceforth, '*if keeping the status quo is much easier than embarking on a project of change, courage and determination are needed on the part of the practitioner*' (Personal Journal).

Although changing professional practice requires effort and determination, it is a precursor to further professional learning. This is because such changes can offer the self-study practitioner-researcher rich new data about professional aspects that are of interest to him/her. If previous learning is not translated into practice, then s/he will experience saturation of data as nothing new can be observed. This can abruptly terminate the reflective self-study process, going against the notion of reflective self-study being a never-ending process.

Self-Study Is Not Fool-Proof

Throughout my engagement with reflective self-study, I have grown in my conviction that the learning that emerges from such ongoing research is not fool-proof. Therefore, the possibility of fooling oneself is still present for the practitioner-researcher (Fendler 2003), and because of this, not only did I start to question taken-for-granted assumptions about my practice, but I also started questioning insights that emerged from reflective self-study itself. Thus, I do not make the assumption that 'teachers' actions are necessarily better just because they are more deliberate or intentional. Re-analysing my previous learning happened mostly when insights and new understandings were made problematic as a result of further observation and analysis of practice. Hence, I regularly asked myself: '*Is this true, or is it what I want to believe?*' (Personal Journal) This is why I have previously argued in favour of having critical friends who are also experiencing self-study, as their viewpoints can be priceless, especially when they awake the inquirer inside of you. These viewpoints have the potential to challenge or substantiate my views that emerge from the self-study process, the result being a thorough re-analysis of my own views. As Mills (1959) contends, I 'try to think in terms of a variety of viewpoints and in this way… let [my] mind become a moving prism catching light from as many angles as possible' (p. 214). This is surely the way forward if one believes in the power of lifelong learning for teachers and teacher educators.

Conclusion

This chapter presents various aspects that the self-study researcher can encounter when engaging in self-study; where knowledge production is intended both for greater theoretical understanding and the improvement of practice (Gallagher et al. 2011; Ziechner 2007). The initial part of this chapter presented readers with how self-study research can be of value for teachers and teacher-educators in combating the possibility of being stuck in the comfort zone, where professional practice becomes habitual and professional decisions are based on unquestioned professional assumptions. The relevance of learning that emerges from practice is the catalyst for applying changes to professional practice with the aim of continuous

improvement. Such learning can also be augmented with the help of other collaborative self-study researchers, since being exposed to others' viewpoints enriches our own thinking processes. The second part of this chapter then highlighted that effort and perseverance are needed from the self-study researcher's part, if both professional development and research agendas are to progress. For example, the ability to tolerate uncertainty and 'not knowing' are important for the researcher, as these aspects make him/her look deeper while gathering further data. This is true for all research and is especially true for self-study researchers. Additionally, it is important for the self-study researcher to re-question previous learning, since our understanding of a phenomenon or situation is always partial. New observations of practice or the exposure to different viewpoints might shed doubt on previous learning; and such previous learning should thus be revisited.

My final point is that previous research into PE teachers' professional development (*cf.* Armour and Yelling 2007; Craft 1996; Duncombe and Armour 2004) has reported that PE teachers consider professional development opportunities as effective when they: provide useable ideas that are practical, relevant and applicable; provide challenging and thought-provoking issues; offer opportunities for individual and collaborative reflection; and construct learning that emerges from the real-world of teaching. All of these elements were present throughout my journey, especially when surrounded by other reflective self-study practitioner-researchers. It is unsurprising therefore that participants in the aforementioned study where reflective self-study was promoted in a collaborative environment agreed with the participant who stated that this was the best type of professional development he had ever experienced while saying: 'I have come to see it as a learning incubation centre' (Attard 2012, p. 210).

I have briefly attempted to share some aspects of reflective self-study. Although not exhaustive, I believe that these are the salient points that highlight my never-ending journey, a journey where practitioner research is used as a tool for continuous professional development. As a final word of caution to the reader, I would like to emphasise that the outcomes of reflective self-study are as unique as our DNA. The outcomes are unique because everyone experiences professional learning differently, and with such a realisation I do not attempt to put forward the above arguments as a blueprint. Nonetheless, the aspects described are meant to guide the reader in understanding various aspects of reflective self-study that the practitioner-researcher might face on his or her own unique journey.

References

Armour, K., & Yelling, M. (2007). Effective professional development for physical education teachers: The role of informal, collaborative learning. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 26*, 177–200.

Attard, K. (2008). Uncertainty for the reflective practitioner: A blessing in disguise. *Reflective Practice, 9*(3), 307–317.

Attard, K. (2012). Public reflection within learning communities: An incessant type of professional development. *European Journal of Teacher Education, 35*(2), 199–211.

Attard, K., & Armour, K. (2006). Reflecting on reflection: A case study of one teacher's early-career professional learning. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy, 11*(3), 209–229.

Berry, A., & Kosnik, C. (2010). A study is not just a story: Many ways to go beyond the story in self-study research. *Studying Teacher Education, 6*(3), 217–220.

Bohm, D. (1990). *Meaning, purpose and exploration in dialogue.* Available online at http://www.muc.de/~heuvel/dialogue/dialogue_exploration.html. Accessed 26 Feb 2002.

Borko, H. (2004). Professional development and teacher learning: Mapping the terrain. *Educational Researcher, 33*(8), 3–15.

Brouwer, N., & Korthagen, F. (2005). Can teacher education make a difference? *American Educational Research Journal, 42*(1), 153–224.

Brunner, D. D. (1994). *Inquiry and reflection: Framing narrative practice in education*. New York: SUNY Press.

Bullough, R. V., Jr., & Pinnegar, S. (2001). Guidelines for quality in autobiographical forms of self-study research. *Educational Researcher, 30*(3), 13–21.

Calderwood, P. (2000). *Learning community: Finding common ground in difference*. London: Teachers' College Press.

Campbell, A. (2002). Research and the professional self. In O. McNamara (Ed.), *Becoming an evidence-based practitioner* (pp. 27–36). London: Routledge-Falmer.

Clark, C. M. (1995). *Thoughtful teaching*. London: Cassell.

Clarke, D., & Hollingsworth, H. (2002). Elaborating a model of teacher professional growth. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 18*, 947–967.

Clokey-Till, M., Cryns, T., & Johnston, M. (2001). Teachers learning together in forming a learning community. In B. Rogoff, C. Goodman Turkanis, & L. Bartlett (Eds.), *Learning together: Children and adults in school community* (pp. 199–208). New York: Oxford University Press.

Coburn, C. E. (2003). Rethinking scale: Moving beyond numbers to deep and lasting change. *Educational Researcher, 32*(6), 3–12.

Collin, K., & Valleala, U. (2005). Interaction among employees: How does learning take place in the social communities of the workplace and how might such learning be supervised? *Journal of Education and Work, 18*(4), 401–420.

Conle, C. (2001). The rationality of narrative inquiry in research and professional development. *European Journal of Teacher Education, 24*(1), 21–33.

Craft, A. (1996). *Continuing professional development*. London: Routledge.

Czarniawska, B. (2004). The uses of narrative in social science research. In M. Hardy & A. Bryman (Eds.), *Handbook of data analysis* (pp. 649–666). London: Sage.

Day, C. (1999). *Developing teachers: The challenges of lifelong learning*. London: Falmer.

Day, C. (2004). *A passion for teaching*. London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Dewey, J. (1910). *How we think*. New York: D.C. Heath & Co., Publishers.

Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education*. New York: Macmillan.

Duncombe, R., & Armour, K. (2004). Collaborative professional learning: From theory to practice. *Journal of In-Service Education, 30*(1), 141–166.

Ellis, C., & Bochner, A. (2000). Autoethnography, personal narrative, reflexivity: Researcher as subject. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 733–768). London: Sage.

Fendler, L. (2003). Teacher reflection in a hall of mirrors: Historical influences and political reverberations. *Educational Researcher, 32*(3), 16–25.

Fitzgerald, L., East, K., Heston, M., & Miller, C. (2002). *Professional intimacy: Transforming communities of practice.* Available online at http://educ.queensu.ca/~russellt/sstep4/volume1.pdf. Accessed 2 June 2003.

Gallagher, T., Griffin, S., Ciuffetelli Parker, D., Kitchen, J., & Figg, C. (2011). Establishing and sustaining teacher educator professional development in a self-study community of practice: Pre-tenure teacher educators developing professionally. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 27*, 880–890.

Ghaye, A., & Ghaye, K. (1998). *Teaching and learning through critical reflective practice*. London: David Fulton Publishers.

Glaze, J. (2002). Ph.D. study and the use of a reflective diary: A dialogue with self. *Reflective Practice, 3*(2), 153–166.

Grant, P. A. (2001). The power of uncertainty: Reflections of pre-service literacy tutors. *Reflective Practice, 2*(2), 237–248.

Griffin, M. L. (2003). Using critical incidents to promote and assess reflective thinking in preservice teachers. *Reflective Practice, 4*(2), 207–220.

Houston, W. R., & Clift, R. T. (1990). The potential for research contributions to reflective practice. In R. T. Clift, W. R. Houston, & M. C. Pugach (Eds.), *Encouraging reflective practice in education: An analysis of issues and programs* (pp. 208–222). New York: Teachers' College Press.

Hunzicker, J. (2011). Effective professional development for teachers: A checklist. *Professional Development in Education, 37*(2), 177–179.

Johnson, K. A. (2003). 'Every experience is a moving force': Identity and growth through mentoring. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 19*, 787–800.

Kelchtermans, G., & Vandenberghe, R. (1994). Teachers' professional development: A biographical perspective. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 26*(1), 45–62.

Kraft, N. P. (2002). Teacher research as a way to engage in critical reflection: A case study. *Reflective Practice, 3*(2), 175–189.

Le Cornu, R. (2005). Peer mentoring: Engaging pre-service teachers in mentoring one another. *Mentoring and Tutoring, 13*(3), 355–366.

Lockford, L. (2002). Breaking habits and cultivating home. In A. Bochner & C. Ellis (Eds.), *Ethnographically speaking: Autoethnography, literature, and aesthetics* (pp. 76–86). Walnut Creek: Rowman & Littlefield.

Loughran, J. (2006). *Developing a pedagogy of teacher education: Understanding teaching and learning about teaching*. New York: Routledge.

Loughran, J. (2010). Seeking knowledge for teaching teaching: Moving beyond stories. *Studying Teacher Education, 6*(3), 221–226.

MacLeod, D. M., & Cowieson, A. R. (2001). Discovering credit where credit is due: Using autobiographical writing as a tool for voicing growth. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 7*(3), 239–256.

Mason, J. (2002). *Researching your own practice: The discipline of noticing*. London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Meriläinen, H., & Syrjälä, L. (2001). *Autobiographical writing as a self-construction.* Available online at http://wwwedu.oulu.fi/homepage/life/heliisat.htm. Accessed 2 June 2003.

Mills, C. W. (1959). *The sociological imagination*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Nissilä, S. (2005). Individual and collective reflection: How to meet the needs of development in teaching. *European Journal of Teacher Education, 28*(2), 209–219.

Oosterheert, I. E., & Vermunt, J. D. (2003). Knowledge construction in learning to teach: The role of dynamic sources. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 9*(2), 157–173.

Orland-Barak, L. (2006). Convergent, divergent and parallel dialogues: Knowledge construction in professional conversations. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 12*(1), 13–31.

Orland-Barak, L., & Tillema, H. (2006). The 'dark side of the moon': A critical look at teacher knowledge construction in collaborative settings. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 12*(1), 1–12.

Parker, S. (1997). *Reflective teaching in the postmodern world: A manifesto for education in postmodernity*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Richert, A. (2001). The narrative as an experience text: Writing themselves back in. In A. Lieberman & L. Miller (Eds.), *Teachers caught in the action: Professional development that matters* (pp. 159–173). New York: Teachers' College Press.

Schön, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. London: Temple Smith.

Schuck, S. (2002). Using self-study to challenge my teaching practice in mathematics education. *Reflective Practice, 3*(3), 327–337.

Sparks, D. (2002). *Taking personal responsibility for professional development that improves student learning.* Available online at http://www.nsdc.org/educatorindex.htm. Accessed 12 Dec 2002.

Stacey, E., Smith, P., & Barty, K. (2004). Adult learners in the workplace: Online learning and communities of practice. *Distance Education, 25*(1), 107–123.

Tillema, H., & van der Westhuizen, G. (2006). Knowledge construction in collaborative enquiry among teachers. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 12*(1), 51–67.

Ward, J. R., & McCotter, S. S. (2004). Reflection as a visible outcome for preservice teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 20*, 243–257.

Watkins, C. (2005). Classrooms as learning communities: A review of research. *London Review of Education, 3*(1), 47–64.

Weiss, E. M., & Weiss, S. (2001). Doing reflective supervision with student teachers in a professional development school culture. *Reflective Practice, 2*(2), 125–154.

WestEd. (2000). *Teachers who learn – Kids who achieve: A look at schools with model professional development*. San Francisco: WestEd.

Zeichner, K. (2007). Accumulating knowledge across self-studies in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 58*(1), 36–46.

Zellermayer, M., & Tabak, E. (2006). Knowledge construction in a teachers' community of enquiry: A possible road map. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 12*(1), 33–49.

Part II
Exploring the Interplay of Physical Education Practice and Scholarship

> Exploring the edges of the self means shifting the inner place from which one operates. It means opening the mind, the heart, and the will. It means suspending old habits of judgments. It means empathizing. And it means letting go of what wants to die in oneself and letting come what is waiting to be born.[1]

Part II collates a series of nine self-studies by physical education scholars. Each chapter demonstrates that self-study is a personal endeavor involving considered reflexive actions to improve teaching and learning situations. It is important to state at the outset that these studies are not intended to be exemplary self-studies. Rather, they illustrate the methodology in action and the practical issues related what it means to 'do' self-study, and what it means to 'be' a self-studier. Given the diversity represented in these chapters, some may even argue that they contribute more to muddying the waters of the methodology rather than clarifying them. To reconcile such possible concerns we reiterate the notion that in self-study research the aim is to provoke, challenge, and illuminate how we enact ourselves in practice rather than apply, confirm and settle preconceived ideas about practice. In this sense, we hope the chapters in this section act to demonstrate scholars engaging in forms of reflexive inquiry that allows them to question how their professional knowledge is enacted and their teaching selves are performed. Just as important, we hope the chapters provide support for others who are passionate about improving physical education practices and want to follow suit.

---

[1] Scharmer, O., & Kaufer, K. (2013). Leading from the emerging future: From ego-system to eco-system economies. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.

Becoming a Teacher Educator: Legitimate Participation and the Reflexivity of Being Situated

Ann MacPhail

Context of the Study

It is only recently that a number of research agendas within teacher education literature have begun to focus attention on teacher educators (as a distinct professional group) as key players in the endeavour to improve the quality of teacher education and, by association, examine the role of teacher educators' professional learning and development (Bates et al. 2010; Loughran 2006; Silova et al. 2010). Agendas include determining an effective structured preparatory route to a career in teacher education, best practice for teacher educators' pedagogies, professional identity (individual and shared) of teacher educators, curriculum reform and professional development opportunities for teacher educators, and building a professional development community among teacher educators. Related to the latter agenda, such communities have included the development of a group of new tenure-track professors engaged in a self-study of their teacher education practices (Kitchen et al. 2008), self-study groups encouraging new education professors/pre-tenure teacher educators to identify with teacher education (Gallagher et al. 2011), the establishment of a 'Becoming Teacher Educators' initiative for a group of doctoral students who wanted to become teacher educators (Kosnik et al. 2011), beginning teacher educators making the transition from classroom teacher to university-based teacher educator (Murray and Male 2005) and a professional development project modeled on a professional development community in which teacher educators become a community of learners focused on thinking education (Brody and Hadar 2011; Hadar and Brody 2010).

A number of studies have examined the development and maintenance of communities of practice among physical education teachers (Parker et al. 2010, 2012; Ward and O'Sullivan 2006). There is evidence that groups of physical education

A. MacPhail (✉)
University of Limerick, Limerick, Ireland
e-mail: Ann.MacPhail@ul.ie

teacher educators share a passion for something that they know how to do and who interact regularly to learn how to do it better – this has been shown in studies that described the model based instruction initiative from Georgia State University (Gurvitch and Metzler 2008) and the professional development schools initiative from The Ohio State University (Stroot et al. 2000). However, it appears that only one study has explicitly explored and presented physical education teacher educators' professional learning through communities of practice (MacPhail et al. 2014). I acknowledge that authors have shared their concern that conceptual issues related to situated learning theory remain underdeveloped in the literature (Handley et al. 2006), that communities of practice can vary enormously (Hodkinson and Hodkinson 2004) and that Etienne Wenger (1998) abandoned the concept of legitimate peripheral participation (LPP) and used the idea of the inherent tension in a duality instead. Regardless, I believe that Lave and Wenger's (1991) LPP concept provides a worthwhile framework to explore how my learning trajectory enhanced or inhibited the move towards full participation in a PETE community of practice (CoP) within a university department. Self-study aided this exploration by encouraging an awareness and understanding of the shifts in my learning. Self-study is an appropriate method as it is driven by my needs and focuses on improvements in my teacher education practices and scholarship, appreciating that connections between my learning and teaching are the essence of self-study (LaBoskey 2004).

I have been a physical education teacher educator for the past 10 years. On first entering the position I had completed a 4-year undergraduate physical education programme, undertaken supply physical education teaching in schools and completed a research PhD investigating the social construction of knowledge within a particular physical education curriculum development initiative. The research PhD was not completed in a PETE department and consequently I had no opportunity to be involved with contributing to a (physical education) teacher education programme. Following graduation from the PhD programme and prior to entering the PETE profession, I had spent the previous 3 years as a Research Associate, a privileged position that provided me a solid grounding in conducting research and writing for publication, both of which I strive to maintain as I become more embroiled with PETE. That is, acknowledging the challenge of maintaining the roles of research, teaching and service as an academic in a higher education institution. As reported elsewhere (Casey and Fletcher 2012), there was no formalised professional preparation or induction for beginning teacher educators as I transitioned from a Research Associate to teacher educator. Indeed, the comment has been made that those entering teacher education become teacher educators as soon as they accept teaching and supervisory positions in teacher education programmes (Dinkelman et al. 2006a). Over the past 10 years I have sought and been provided with the opportunity to live the experience of being a physical education teacher educator and, as a result, believe I have some understanding and appreciation of what being a physical education teacher educator entails. This ranges from my own practical learning experiences to distinguishing the most effective ways to design and deliver a meaningful and worthwhile PETE programme.

Aims/Objectives of the Chapter

It is the aim of this chapter to explore my learning trajectories as a physical education teacher educator. Examining teacher educators' experiences as legitimate peripheral participants and studying their interactions with university colleagues (and also pre-service teachers and teachers but not a focus here) can help inform what support structures and 'up-skilling' is necessary to become effective, confident and competent members of a PETE community. This is an issue of relevance to PETE due to the continued support for constructivist learning in physical education (Kirk and Macdonald 1998; Light 2008; Rovegno and Dolly 2006). From a constructivist perspective, learning is both cultural and social involving social interaction and collaboration with learning peers, as well as interaction with more knowledgeable individuals within society (Biggs 1996; Lave and Wenger 1991). This is not to suggest that it is necessary to be a member of a PETE community in order to be an effective teacher educator but rather that genuine and authentic learning is more likely to be accomplished through a framework for learning within a CoP.

Throughout this chapter my learning trajectory in PETE to date is mapped to Lave and Wenger's (1991) concept of LPP, and it is my intent to convey the extent to which my learning trajectory enhanced or inhibited the move towards full participation in a PETE CoP. After each main concept that contributes to our understanding of LPP, I map my learning trajectory under two headings that are contained in 'grey areas'. The first, 'Entry into PETE' denotes my initial years as a physical education teacher educator when I joined a physical education university department that, in my mind, did not embody a group of physical education teacher educators sharing common interest in PETE or working towards a common goal. The second heading 'Becoming a physical education teacher educator' denotes the period that began 3 years after my initial entry to PETE. The period denotes the arrival of new PETE faculty and subsequently development of a PETE CoP that encouraged a safe environment in which I could contribute to talking about pre-service teacher learning, how to improve my own teaching abilities, and avail of professional learning and development opportunities. I remain cognizant of Dinkelman et al.'s (2006a) statement that,

> Even if one becomes a teacher educator at the moment one begins working as a teacher educator, one's professional identity as a teacher educator is constructed over time. Developing an identity and a set of successful practices in teacher education is best understood as a process of becoming (p. 6).

Self-study is not a collection of particular methods but instead a methodology for studying professional practice settings (Hamilton and Pinnegar 1998; Pinnegar 1998). In discussing Weber and Mitchell's (2002) thoughts on 'memory work', LaBoskey (2004) explains that the object of critical memory work is to make the past usable,

> The assumption is that the accuracy of our memories does not matter; whatever shape they take, they influence the construction of our identities, our current thinking, and our future behavior. Therefore, if we begin to access and interrogate those memories, we can have more control over them and their impact on our teaching (p. 843).

What is presented in this chapter is personal and professional recollections/ 'memories' that I share as critical incidents that represent important realities in my evolution as a teacher educator. Kosnik (2001) described critical incidents as 'events… considered to raise, broad, sustained issues' (p. 69). The incidents described in this chapter are chosen as they are still powerful to me in mapping my learning trajectory 10 years after transitioning to teacher education. All research is necessarily constrained and influenced by the subjectivity of the investigator and I acknowledge the biases and limited perspectives of the researcher self (LaBoskey 2004).

Communities of Practice and Legitimate Peripheral Participation

Communities of Practice

Communities of practice provide an avenue to rethink our learning in a teacher education setting, acknowledging that for a teacher educator learning means engaging in and contributing to a CoP (Cochran-Smith and Lytle 1999; Lave and Wenger 1991; Wenger 1998). Communities of practice are groups of people who share a concern or a passion for something they do and learn how to do it better as they mutually engage regularly. Communities of practice provide an infrastructure that supports change, a setting where teacher educators come together to learn from each other and identify professional development needs and opportunities, acknowledging that working together as a learning community enhances a sharing of expertise.

Entry into PETE

The level of disparity across physical education teacher educators' philosophies and practices was more prominent than the drive to present a group of practitioners sharing common interests in PETE and working towards a common goal. This led to my experience of LPP being limited with no intentionally initiated CoP through which my learning could take place. Isolation from 'colleagues' was a restrictive feature in my learning, resulting in an over-reliance of learning *about* teacher education with little consideration of learning *in* teacher education, and how to most effectively become a teacher educator through related publications such as peer-reviewed articles and (physical education) teacher education text books. Such isolation is not unique with numerous self-studies reporting the differing extent and types of isolation experienced by those entering the teacher education profession (Bullock 2007; Dinkelman et al. 2006a, b).

(continued)

Becoming a physical education teacher educator

Personal and professional isolation was no longer an issue and participation in a PETE community afforded an opportunity to share, explore, learn and incorporate changes into my own teaching practices as well as those of other members of the community. This led to reinforcement that how we practice and enact teacher education is a worthy topic for interrogation and discussion. This subsequently resulted in encouraging me to work with colleagues in pursuing a research agenda around the symbiotic ideas of practice-referenced research and research-informed practice.

Legitimate Peripheral Participation

Legitimate peripheral participation is proposed as a way of understanding learning and characterises the *shifts in learning engagement* in CoP, providing:

> … a way to speak about the relations between newcomers and old-timers, and about activities, identities, artifacts, and communities of knowledge and practice. It concerns the process by which newcomers become part of a community of practice. A person's intentions to learn are engaged and the meaning of learning is configured through the process of becoming a full participant in a sociocultural practice. This social process includes, indeed it subsumes, the learning of knowledgeable skills (Lave and Wenger 1991, p. 29).

Acknowledging that each of the aspects of LPP cannot be considered in isolation and that 'learners must be legitimate peripheral participants in ongoing practice in order for learning identities to be engaged and develop into full participation' (Lave and Wenger 1991, p. 64), it is useful to define the concept of each aspect with respect to the position of the physical education teacher educator.

Learning is 'legitimate' (authentic and meaningful) in that there is an acceptance that physical education teacher educators' involvement matters to the physical education teaching community's successful performance of its work, if that work is to prepare and support teachers who are able to deliver meaningful, relevant and worthwhile student. For learning to be legitimate, physical education teacher educators must therefore understand their roles and responsibilities.

Entry into PETE

In entering a university department as someone whose teaching was to solely reside in a PETE programme, I was granted some form of legitimacy regardless of my (in)abilities to be an effective teacher educator (at the time of interview I had no formalised experience in teacher education). Legitimacy may have been deemed to reside in having completed an undergraduate degree in physical education, having a PhD that examined curriculum development

(continued)

within physical education and/or more recently in having completed three years involved in research that examined physical education practices and resulted in the beginning of a research profile in the area of sport pedagogy. Despite having a previous successful career in another occupation, there is an acknowledgement that it takes a number of years to establish a new professional identity as a teacher educator (Murray and Male 2005).

To experience legitimacy, physical education teacher educators need to be supported and valued, in the first instance, by fellow physical education teacher education colleagues. At that point in my career there was no formalised apprenticeship model for learning 'how to do PETE' or discussion on what were to be my roles and responsibilities. Subsequently, legitimacy was not deliberately facilitated. Rather, learning to teach teachers was often experienced as a private struggle, with a culture of isolation prevalent reinforcing the message that sharing questions or concerns about teaching is not something that teacher educators do (Berry and Loughran 2005).

Legitimate participation can be hindered by the presence of hierarchies. While one may have expected a hierarchy/certain level of power to be devolved to me undertaking the role of Course Director for the PETE programme at the start of my second year, this was less evident than the extent to which knowledge was constructed as power. At the time, there appeared to be no concession that it is the engagement in practice/social participation that is the condition for the effectiveness of learning rather than knowledge as a commodity (Wilson and Berne 1999). Hierarchical relationships were nurtured on access to knowledge, which was detrimental to the potential development of relationships and subsequently to the evolution of any potential community.

Becoming a physical education teacher educator

The arrival of additional physical education teacher educators allowed me to experience, belatedly, the role of an apprentice, involved in open discussions and shadowing of practices that explored how best 'to do PETE'. I was encouraged by the belief that in 'doing' PETE it was essential to agree and work to a set of principles that guided not only the delivery of the PETE programme but also pre-service teachers' learning. I appreciated the level of self-accountability that such principles provided to my work as a teacher educator. I also learned constructs in which to situate my teaching, such as 'instructional alignment' and 'backward design'. The shared vision to develop caring, reflective and effective physical educators who strive to develop young people with a passion to be physically active encouraged us to determine the most effective roles and responsibilities for each of us to contribute to the PETE community. Such roles and responsibilities revolved

(continued)

around teaching, research and programme vision. I felt comfortable, and somewhat relieved, knowing that while we had a shared vision, we could all play a part in enacting that vision through different roles and associated responsibilities. This carried over into our research interests and writing where it became evident that we each had particular strengths, (e.g., theoretical frameworks, methodology, application of theory to practice) that collectively contributed to the writing of peer-reviewed papers.

There is support for the belief that members must initially be engaged on the periphery of a community to effectively learn the practices of a community (Lave and Wenger 1991). Learning is 'peripheral' to the (evolving) community of physical education teacher educators early in the learning process, with the physical education teacher educator being introduced to the support they can provide to pre-service teachers. The learning trajectory intensifies with more entrusted activities, expecting to result in the physical education teacher educator's eventual full participation in the community of physical education teacher educators.

Entry into PETE

While it is expected that a learning trajectory may begin by being on the periphery, I initially found myself in a situation where I was observing random practices (that I did not wish to emulate) of a group of colleagues. The group each had responsibility for aspects of PETE yet there appeared to be no effort to work to collectively determine common goals, collaborate or share expertise. Subsequently, I felt such exposure disempowering. However, I was somewhat forced to begin to participate in and even lead the PETE group due to a substantial increase in responsibility that arose from me undertaking the leadership of the undergraduate PETE programme one year into my appointment. The lack of opportunity to experience a gradual trajectory from the periphery to the core practice negatively impacted my learning (Warhurst 2006). This resulted in me reverting back to what my gut reaction to PETE was rather than being part of a formalised supportive structure that nurtured and challenged my development as a physical education teacher educator.

Becoming a physical education teacher educator

It may have been somewhat fortuitous that the newly appointed physical education teacher educators brought with them a set of teacher education philosophies and practices that I identified with and wished to emulate. I

(continued)

(continued)

found myself happy to be on the periphery as I began to be exposed to such philosophies and practices, and was empowered and excited for the possibilities that lay ahead. My learning trajectory from the periphery to the core practice of what I believed to be effective PETE enhanced my learning (and perhaps that of others) through our discussion, delivery, reflection, writing and publication of our practices. This has included topics such as preparing physical education pre-service teachers to design instructionally aligned lessons through constructivist pedagogical practices, examining what teaching metaphors tells us about pre-service teachers' developing beliefs about teaching and learning, and helping pre-service and beginning teachers examine and reframe assumptions about themselves as teachers and change agents.

Learning involves 'participation' in experiencing practices within the community. The extent of participation is determined by the type and intensity of exposure to the three dimensions of a CoP, i.e., mutual engagement, the negotiation of a joint enterprise and a shared repertoire (Wenger 1998). Evolving forms of 'mutual engagement' include the possibility for a group of physical education teacher educators to be involved in the practice of a community while appreciating that there will be different levels of mutual engagement across individual members. 'Joint enterprise' is a collective process of negotiation that is enacted when differing identities and philosophies of physical education teacher educators lead to conflicting interpretations of what the enterprise is about. A 'shared repertoire' includes routines, ways of doing things, actions or concepts adopted that become part of the practice of a community.

Entry into PETE

My absorption into the role of a physical education teacher educator was compromised by a style of teacher education to which I was not positively disposed. Mutual engagement was limited. I availed of any opportunities to observe experienced colleagues (although I continued to be at odds with the philosophies and delivery styles) and received no constructive feedback on my own performance as a physical education teacher educator. Rather, interactions with colleagues revolved around philosophical and theoretical preferences for the delivery of teacher education that would become a topic of discussion at meetings concerned with considering changes to the PETE programme. There appeared to be no appreciation from either side, or indeed consideration that members of the group embodying differing identities and philosophies, while somewhat limiting mutual engagement, still could contribute to the practice of a PETE community. There was no shared concern on

(continued)

(continued)

identifying what constituted the practice of the PETE community. The conflicting interpretations of what the enterprise should look like (differing according to individual's identities and philosophies of how best 'to do' PETE) appeared too powerful to allow members to agree on working towards a joint enterprise. Subsequently, I developed my own way of 'becoming' an effective teacher educator in the absence of a community. Acknowledging that learning does not occur in isolation but rather is a social and active process, this was a concern. The breakdown in communication and lack of interaction between members of the group resulted in teacher education being dysfunctional, although at the time I was not aware to what extent this was subverting the quality of my learning. Subsequently, there was a limited shared repertoire as regards expectations for participation in classes, relationships between faculty and pre-service teachers, and assessment practices.

Becoming a physical education teacher educator

There was a genuine interest and desire for a PETE community of practice. It did not transpire that there were significantly different levels of mutual engagement across individual members but rather that the level of engagement was intense for all who chose to be involved. As other faculty members arrived to teach in the programme, different levels of mutual engagement were evident. It quickly became clear that the shared aim of preparing caring, committed, innovative and reflective practitioners led to the establishment of a PETE CoP. That is not to say that individuals supported differing identities and philosophies of physical education teacher educators but rather that any differences were seen to complement the shared aim, and subsequently strengthen the pre-service teacher learning experience. The PETE CoP enhanced a shared repertoire of routines and practices, and this included focused discussions on practice (assessment, teaching, learning curriculum, etc.), the professional development of one another, collaborative research and writing, and working as a collective toward common goals.

Newcomers and Old-Timers

The emphasis on the changing relations between newcomers and old-timers in the context of a changing shared practice (Lave and Wenger 1991) is pertinent to analysing:

> …changing forms of participation and identity of persons who engage in sustained participation in a community of practice: from entrance as a newcomer, to a point when those newcomers themselves become old-timers. Rather than a teacher/learner dyad, this points to a richly diverse field of essential actors and, with it, other forms of relationships of participation (p. 56).

In line with the expectations that physical education teacher educators develop from a newcomer to an experienced member of a community of physical education teacher educators through LPP, it is imperative that physical education teacher educators participate initially in tasks that are clear and straightforward yet productive and necessary to contribute to the goal of the community. Peripheral tasks (such as observation, discussion, clarification, posing queries, exploring how to link theory to practice) allow the physical education teacher educator (as a newcomer) to become acquainted with the tasks, values and practices associated with the PETE community. Observing, and having access to, the practices of experts, enhances a physical education teacher educator's understanding of the expectations as an experienced member of the PETE community.

Within Lave and Wenger's (1991) context of apprenticeship, the problem of transfer of learning diminishes as what is to be learned (LPP) is embedded in the setting in which learning is to be applied (CoP). That is not to deny that whilst becoming a legitimate peripheral participant can be an empowering experience, it may also be disempowering, with newcomers potentially posing a threat to old-timers who have acted as 'gate keepers' for a significant length of time. Newcomers who wish to challenge the gate keeping can therefore create tension between newcomers and old-timers.

Entry into PETE

The fundamentally different identities and personalities we embodied compromised any intentions of me being established as a novice and a legitimate member of the group. This perhaps resulted in all physical education teacher educators in the department struggling to validate their positions as physical education teacher educators. I was subsequently forced to engage in autonomous work to experience the essential components of PETE, which may have affected my learning trajectory towards full participation. LPP is motivated in part by newcomers' desires to become full participants but at this point in time there was no community for me to contribute to as a full participant. I found myself at times engaged in 'doing' and yet withdrawing from an identification with the practice, what Hodges (1998) describes as 'participation as dis-identification'.

Nias (1989) distinguishes between the 'situational self' and 'substantial self' in describing the occupational transition a person undertakes between leaving previous employment to take on a role that differs from the post that they were originally trained and in which they have gained expertise. Situational selves are developed from interaction with others whilst the substantial self is a core of self-defining beliefs unlikely to change. In entering teacher education it was evident that my substantial and situational selves were out of alignment, causing feelings of professional unease and discomfort. The lack of interaction did nothing to enhance my situational self while I was left unchallenged on my core beliefs on how to most effectively become a teacher educator. The career

---

(continued)

transition to a different occupation is not considered to be complete until the two aspects of self are closely aligned, even if that entails changes to substantial self (Murray and Male 2005). It was not until new faculty arrived that I began to feel confident and competent in 'becoming' a teacher educator.

Becoming a physical education teacher educator

The new faculty were indeed newcomers to the department but were 'old-timers' as regards the level of expertise they possessed as physical education teacher educators. Their arrival resulted in me reverting to the role of a 'newcomer'/novice who welcomed the opportunity to be a legitimate member of the evolving PETE CoP. I may have been as instrumental in the development of the community as the new faculty but due to their previous experiences in PETE communities I deferred to the position of 'newcomer'. As I had not had the opportunity to contribute to a sustained PETE CoP previously, their arrival was empowering as it allowed me to learn within a PETE CoP, and contribute to the learning of others.

Legitimate Peripherality and Peripheral Participants

The notion of 'legitimate peripherality' is evident when physical education teacher educators are afforded an opportunity to become more involved, resulting in peripherality as an empowering position. In instances where physical education teacher educators are kept (legitimately) from participating more fully, peripherality is a disempowering position. Lave and Wenger (1991) emphasise that legitimate peripherality crucially involves participation as a way of learning the 'culture of practice', acknowledging that '[a]n extended period of legitimate peripherality provides learners with opportunities to make the culture of practice theirs' (p. 95). Teacher educators as 'peripheral participants' is about physical education teacher educators being located in the social world, suggesting that there are 'multiple, varied, more-or-less-engaged and inclusive ways of being located in the fields of participation defined by a community' (Lave and Wenger 1991, p. 36).

Entry into PETE

Legitimate peripherality was somewhat limited with any opportunity to become more involved my own decision and not something that was informed or encouraged by the PETE faculty group. Peripherality resulted in a feeling of disempowerment as there was no PETE community to which I could contribute more fully.

(continued)

(continued)

Becoming a physical education teacher educator

I was afforded the opportunity of experiencing an extended period of legitimate peripherality where I learned a significant amount about the culture of a PETE CoP. This subsequently resulted in experiencing, and continuing to experience to this day, a strong level of ownership and identity as a member of a PETE community. It became evident that legitimate peripherality was experienced at some time or another by everyone in the PETE CoP. That is, there were times when some members were positioned as learners in some respects and experts in others. The PETE CoP spanned research, teaching, and service and each of us had strengths in different areas and so learned with and from one another as both learners and mentors.

A PETE CoP also afforded me the opportunity to establish and re-establish identity via practice. That is, my strong dispositions to what I believed PETE should look like was considered and refined through my involvement with a PETE CoP.

Reflexivity of Being Situated

In writing this chapter I considered whether to begin my reflexivity as a legitimate peripheral participant from the time when new PETE faculty arrived and encouraged a PETE CoP, denoted under the heading 'Becoming a physical education teacher educator'. I believe LPP extends reflection (i.e., my examination of what I think happened, how others perceived the event and opening my practice to scrutiny) to reflexivity by encouraging me to find strategies to question my own attitudes, thought processes, values and assumptions in order to understand my role in relation to others (Bolton 2005). I chose not to narrow my reflexivity to 'Becoming a physical education teacher educator' as the preceding period of professional isolation, denoted under the heading 'Entry into PETE' also contributes to my current and future understanding of myself, my pedagogical beliefs, approaches, and practices. What I experienced was not a unique sense of isolation, with numerous self-studies reporting the differing extent and types of isolation experienced by those entering teacher education from various starting points, whether that be as a school teacher (Bullock 2007; Dinkelman et al. 2006a, b; Murray and Male 2005; Nicol 1997) or a doctoral candidate (Kosnik et al. 2011). The very nature of being a physical education teacher educator lends itself to the notion of teacher educators being students of teaching. I make space to study my own practice and learning and the knowledge generated through such exploration encourages me to understand and improve self and practice within a PETE learning context.

My initial entry into PETE left me 'suspended' between the role of a novice and expert. Having no PETE community with which to align my practices resulted in little personal interrogation of how the skills and dispositions I possessed could contribute

to encouraging effective pre-service teacher learning. Any newly acquired skills were sourced from reading (physical education) teacher education literature and interacting at professional meetings. The lack of (perceived) community forced me to rely on my own interpretations of the value of newly acquired skills. Initially, social interaction and subsequent learning through negotiating meaning and communication with other teacher educators was not encouraged. While the role of Course Director provided some opportunity to experience my professional identity as an expert, I believed I had no community in which I could undertake roles and responsibilities that would allow me to be an expert in one domain and a novice in another.

The personal and professional isolation that I had experienced on entering the PETE profession was eradicated by the arrival of new PETE faculty who encouraged a safe environment in which I could contribute. There were opportunities to talk about pre-service teacher learning, how to improve my own teaching ability, and professional learning and development opportunities that I needed to heighten my effectiveness as a physical education teacher educator. The PETE community was characterised by a vibrancy and confidence that resulted in changes to the undergraduate PETE programme where joint enterprise was enhanced by mutual engagement and a shared repertoire of concepts, routines, and practices. It was not until I experienced being a member of a PETE community that I understood the contribution of effective group process on the professional development for all members of that community. While the community simultaneously housed 'newcomers' and 'oldtimers', all members contributed to a 'community of learners' (Rogoff et al. 1998) where everyone participated in extending their knowledge of teaching and learning through working together. Such social interaction, missing from my initial entry into PETE, contributed to innovation and improvement of pedagogic practices shared through the delivery of the PETE programme and, by association, stimulated and supported professional development amongst the members. I truly associate with Hadar and Brody's (2010) statement that '[d]evelopment of personal expertise results from deep learning through interaction' (p. 1642). There is no denying that community involvement has significantly influenced my identity as a physical education teacher educator, encouraging a learning trajectory that enhanced my move towards full participation in a PETE CoP within a university department.

Significance

A key concept of a CoP is a 'person's identity in relation to other members in the community, and the emotional investments individuals make in relation to their sense of who they are and where they fit in as a member of a group' (Lave and Wenger 1991, p. 98). It is crucial that physical education teacher educators examine the ways in which they can strengthen their role in a CoP and consequently heighten the learning experience for all members. That is, it is imperative that, through self-study, further research acknowledges the importance of teacher educators' personal pathways in their own growth and development as competent professionals (Ham and Kane 2004).

A collection of self-studies of teacher education practices carried out by each member of the PETE community would allow all members of the community to highlight the emerging conflicts, dilemmas, and incongruities arising within a PETE community. Such a collection of self-studies would encourage physical education teacher educators to explore and appreciate the interaction between group and individual development processes, bringing to the fore the particular contexts of this population and their needs to grow and develop professionally (Hadar and Brody 2010). Lave and Wenger's (1991) intention was that LPP convey a sense of authentic and genuine participation and provide a framework for learning within a CoP. The learning is legitimate as it is not only important to the individual physical education teacher educator but also to the development of the community of physical education teacher educators. Self-study enables me to take my place with some confidence and authority in a scholarly community, allowing me to explore the interplay of practice and scholarship in the PETE community. In my current role as a Head of Department, I aim to provide mentoring and professional development support to allow teacher educators to become committed to both practice and scholarship by interrogating learning trajectories through group self-study. I continue to be directed by considering 'Entry into PETE' and 'Becoming a physical education teacher educator'.

Entry into PETE

While there is an opportunity for mentoring in the university it is somewhat removed from what a self-study community can offer. It is important for me as a Head of Department (and as a member of the teacher education self-study group) to understand how each teacher educator negotiates the challenges of entering PETE and preparing pre-service teachers while contributing to the scholarship of teacher education. While some teacher educators will rely on support from others in the community to navigate teacher education, I need to be cognizant of individual teacher educators who, on entry into PETE, may not invest in contributing to a teacher educator self-study community of practice committed to working together to study their educational practices and educational contexts.

Becoming a physical education teacher educator

Sustaining a self-study CoP is one route to improving practice and engaging in inquiry for teacher educators, allowing teacher educators to attend to their own professional development independently, collaboratively and/or collectively (Gallagher et al. 2011). In instances where this is not feasible, it is anticipated that further professional development needs would require my assistance. I am keen to develop/reconfigure current university (predominantly teacher education) discussion groups towards teacher education self-study groups as a form of faculty development that can strengthen commitment to teacher education across departments, programmes, and the university.

References

Bates, T., Swennen, A., & Jones, K. (Eds.). (2010). *The professional development of teacher educators*. London: Routledge.

Berry, A. K., & Loughran, J. J. (2005). Teaching about teaching: The role of self-study. In C. Mitchell, S. Weber, & K. O'Reilly-Scanlon (Eds.), *Just who do we think we are? Methodologies for autobiography and self-study in teaching* (pp. 168–180). London: Routledge Falmer.

Biggs, J. (1996). Enhancing teaching through constructive alignment. *Higher Education, 32*(3), 347–364.

Bolton, G. (2005). *Reflective practice: Writing and professional development* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.

Brody, D., & Hadar, L. (2011). "I speak prose and I now know it". Personal development trajectories among teacher educators in a professional development community. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 27*, 1223–1234.

Bullock, S. M. (2007). Finding my way from teacher to teacher educator: Valuing innovative pedagogy and inquiry into practice. In T. Russell & J. Loughran (Eds.), *Enacting a pedagogy of teacher education: Values, relationships and practice* (pp. 77–94). Oxon: Routledge.

Casey, A., & Fletcher, T. (2012). Trading places: From physical education teachers to teacher education. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 31*, 362–380.

Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. L. (1999). Relationships of knowledge and practice: Teacher learning in communities. *Review of Research in Education, 24*, 249–306.

Dinkelman, T., Margolis, J., & Sikkenga, K. (2006a). From teacher to teacher educator: Reframing knowledge in practice. *Studying Teacher Education, 2*(2), 119–136.

Dinkelman, T., Margolis, J., & Sikkenga, K. (2006b). From teacher to teacher educator: Experiences, expectations, and expatriation. *Studying Teacher Education, 2*(1), 5–23.

Gallagher, T., Griffin, S., Ciuffetelli Parker, D., Kitchen, J., & Figg, C. (2011). Establishing and sustaining teacher educator professional development in a self-study community of practice: Pre-tenure teacher educators developing professionally. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 27*, 880–890.

Gurvitch, R., & Metzler, M. W. (Eds.). (2008). Model based Instruction in physical education: The adoption of an innovation. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, *27*(4), 449–589.

Hadar, L., & Brody, D. (2010). From isolation to symphonic harmony: Building a professional development community among teacher educators. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 26*, 1641–1651.

Ham, V., & Kane, R. (2004). Finding a way through the swamp: A case for self-study as research. In J. J. Loughran, M. L. Hamilton, V. K. LaBroskey, & T. Rusell (Eds.), *International handbook of self-study of teaching and teacher education practices* (pp. 103–149). Dordrecht: Springer.

Hamilton, M. L., & Pinnegar, S. (1998). Conclusion: The value and the promise of self-study. In M. L. Hamilton (Ed.), *Reconceptualizing teaching practice: Self-study in teacher education* (pp. 235–246). London: Falmer Press.

Handley, K., Sturdy, A., Fincham, R., & Clark, T. (2006). Within and beyond communities of practice: Making sense of learning through participation, identity and practice. *Journal of Management Studies, 43*(3), 641–653.

Hodges, D. C. (1998). Participation as dis-identification with/in a community of practice. *Mind, Culture, and Activity, 5*(4), 272–290.

Hodkinson, P., & Hodkinson, H. (2004). Rethinking communities of practice: A case study of schoolteachers' workplace learning. *International Journal of Training and Development, 8*, 21–31.

Kirk, D., & Macdonald, D. (1998). Situated learning in physical education. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 17*(3), 376–387.

Kitchen, J., D, C. P., Parker, D., & Gallagher, T. (2008). Authentic conversation as faculty development: Establishing a self-study group in a faculty of education. *Studying Teacher Education, 4*(2), 157–171.

Kosnik, C. (2001). The effects of an inquiry-oriented teacher education program on a faculty member: Some critical incidents and my journey. *Reflective Practice, 2*(1), 65–80.

Kosnik, C., Cleovoulou, Y., Fletcher, T., Harris, T., McGlynn-Stewart, M., & Beck, C. (2011). Becoming teacher educators: An innovative approach to teacher educator preparation. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 37*(3), 351–363.

LaBoskey, V. K. (2004). The methodology of self-study and its theoretical underpinnings. In J. Loughran, M. L. Hamilton, V. K. LaBoskey, & T. Russell (Eds.), *International handbook of self-study of teaching and teacher education practices* (pp. 817–869). Dordrecht: Springer.

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Light, R. (2008). Complex learning theory – its epistemology and its assumptions about learning: Implications for physical education. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 27*(1), 21–37.

Loughran, J. (2006). *Developing a pedagogy of teacher education. Understanding teaching and learning about teaching*. London: Routledge.

MacPhail, A., Patton, K., Parker, M., & Tannehill, D. (2014). Leading by example: Teacher educators' professional learning through communities of practice. *Quest, 66*(1), 39–56.

Murray, J., & Male, T. (2005). Becoming a teacher educator: Evidence from the field. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 21*, 125–142.

Nias, J. (1989). Teaching and self. In M. Holly & C. McLoughlin (Eds.), *Perspectives on teacher professional development* (pp. 155–172). London: Falmer Press.

Nicol, C. (1997). Learning to teach prospective teachers to teach mathematics: The struggles of a beginning teacher educator. In J. Loughran & T. Russell (Eds.), *Teaching about teaching: Purpose, passion and pedagogy in teacher education* (pp. 95–116). London: Falmer Press.

Parker, M., Patton, K., Madden, M., & Sinclair, C. (2010). From committee to community: The development and maintenance of a community of practice. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 29*(4), 337–357.

Parker, M., Patton, K., & Tannehill, D. (2012). Mapping the landscape of communities of practice as professional development in Irish physical education. *Irish Educational Studies, 31*(3), 311–327.

Pinnegar, S. (1998). Introduction to part II: Methodological perspectives. In M. L. Hamilton (Ed.), *Reconceptualizing teaching practice: Self-study in teacher education* (pp. 31–33). London: Falmer Press.

Rogoff, B., Matusov, E., & White, C. (1998). Models of teaching and learning: Participation in a community of learners. In D. R. Olson & N. Torrance (Eds.), *Handbook of education and human development* (pp. 388–414). Oxford: Blackwell.

Rovegno, I., & Dolly, P. (2006). Constructivist perspectives on learning. In D. Kirk, D. Macdonald, & M. O'Sullivan (Eds.), *The handbook of physical education* (pp. 226–241). London: Sage.

Silova, I., Moyer, A., Webster, C., & McAllister, S. (2010). Re-conceptualizing professional development of teacher educators in post-Soviet Latvia. *Professional Development in Education, 36*, 357–371.

Stroot, S., O'Sullivan, M., & Tannehill, D. (2000). Weaving a web of relationships. In M. Johnston, P. Brosnan, D. Cramer, & T. Dove (Eds.), *The challenges of professional development schools* (pp. 233–246). New York: SUNY Press.

Ward, P., & O'Sullivan, M. (Eds.) (2006). Professional development in urban schools. *Journal of Teaching Physical Education*, 25(4), 348–466.

Warhurst, R. P. (2006). "We really felt part of something": Participatory learning among peers within a university-development community of practice. *International Journal for Academic Development, 11*, 111–122.

Weber, S., & Mitchell, C. (2002). Academic literary performance, embodiment, and self-study: When the shoe doesn't fit: Death of a salesman. In C. Kosnik, A. Freese, & A. P. Samaras (Eds.), *Making a difference in teacher education through self-study*. Proceedings of the fourth international conference on self-study of teacher education practices, Herstmonceux, East Sussex (Vol. 2, pp. 121–124). Toronto: OISE, University of Toronto.

Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning and identity*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Wilson, S. M., & Berne, J. (1999). Teacher learning and the acquisition of professional knowledge: An examination of research on contemporary professional development. *Review of Research in Education, 24*, 173–209.

Lessons on the Hoof: Learning About Teacher Education Through Horse-Riding

Dawn Garbett

Introduction

A risk of being an experienced teacher educator is that your practice becomes so ingrained and well rehearsed that it is difficult to change without some significant and meaningful experience to give you a new perspective. This is in large part due to the difficulty of seeing our own practices and beliefs outside of the accepted ways of doing things. The ideas and practices of hegemony – the conventional wisdoms, the pragmatic and routinised behaviours, and unquestioned assumptions – are difficult to see beyond when you are in the thick of teaching (Brookfield 2005).

In this chapter I reflect on new perspectives that learning to ride a horse meant for me as a teacher educator. By choosing something that was so out-of-my comfort zone, the process was, as Brookfield (1995) suggested, 'a visceral rather than an intellectual route into critical reflection' (p. 50). It was a way of building my understanding of learning through being conscious of my body's feelings, reactions, and responses to the experience. Learning to horse ride gave me an embodied sense of what it is to be a learner and teacher of student teachers.

This study started serendipitously, as it so often does in self-studies, when a particular exchange with students piqued my interest. I am a science teacher educator and I work with student teachers in a graduate teacher education programme. As part of this programme students participate in several practicum experiences during the 1-year they are enrolled in the university. This approach of interspersing school-based experiences with campus-based studies is meant to provide a means for contextualising students' developing professional knowledge and skills. As a seasoned teacher educator, I know that students value gaining first-hand experience in classrooms but I also recognise that learning is deepened through reflecting on an

D. Garbett (✉)
University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand
e-mail: d.garbett@auckland.ac.nz

experience rather than just repeating it (Korthagen et al. 2006). I also know that many associate teachers believe that our students learn most about teaching when they are in their classrooms (Kane 2007).

The trigger for this study occurred when my students returned from a short practicum experience after 1 month of being in the programme. There was a real buzz in the first session back as they discussed their experiences. Several claimed that they had 'taught' classes. In fact, they stated that they had found teaching easier than their lecturers (myself included) had said it would be. I was highly skeptical of their naiveté, but, at the same time, I was also baffled. How could their perception of such an inherently complex craft as teaching be so different from mine? Why couldn't they see that there was still so much to learn? I flippantly said that if teaching was so easy then perhaps I could learn to ride a horse? As luck (good or bad) would have it, I felt obliged to follow through with my suggestion when most of my students thought it sounded like a good idea. Little did I know at the time, but this enabled me to pursue a line of inquiry that was fundamentally transformative for my teaching and significantly reframed my understanding of being a teacher educator.

In this chapter I have selected four horse riding episodes that resonated most strongly with my students and peers. I have expanded on several themes that I first discussed in Garbett (2011a) and included others that proved valuable with the benefit of hindsight and that emerged following my initial account. Using these episodes to better understand the embodied nature of my own professional learning continues to nudge me in new ways and is discussed more fully in my concluding thoughts.

Professional Learning

From my perspective, a key problem for teacher educators is attending to our own professional learning. This problem becomes particularly pronounced the longer we have been in the role. I had been a successful secondary school science teacher before moving to the university to work in teacher education. Initially, I drew on my classroom experience and passion for teaching to shape how I worked as a teacher educator. My expertise in the classroom translated into an easy confidence with student teachers. I segued from teaching about science to teaching about teaching. However, my practice was based on the assumption that teaching how to teach boiled down to modeling exemplary practice. My students and I enjoyed sessions where I modeled innovative approaches or engaging activities. They participated enthusiastically, keen to learn 'how to…' or 'about' XY and Z. My doctoral studies (Garbett 2007) first opened my eyes to self-study as a way to inquire into my practice and to develop my professional expertise.

Learning to ride a horse did not immediately strike me as being something that could contribute to my professional learning. For starters, it contravened the principle of alignment that the knowledge acquired in the learning context should be applicable in the practice context. Learning the skills of riding a horse certainly seemed to have very little to do with teaching teachers. It also contravened the

principle that new learning should build on prior knowledge and experience. Once again, learning to ride a horse was not contingent on any of my prior knowledge, experience, or abilities of teaching. In fact, it took me so far out of my comfort zone that, to be completely honest, it terrified me. So how could this provide any professional learning value?

There were two answers. Firstly, I eschewed a logical, cognitively-oriented approach based on distilling forms of knowledge to apply in practice, in favour of one in which the highly reflexive, embodied, and subjective ways of knowing-in-practice became informative. To put it another way, I had forgotten what it felt like to be a learner. Horse riding reminded me of the angst, self-doubt, bravado, satisfaction, thrill, and despair that can accompany learning by the bucket-full. Secondly, Brookfield (1995) suggests that one way to crack the insulation provided by the everyday mundane routines of institutional culture is by becoming a learner in a totally new and challenging activity. Learning to ride enabled me to explore the dynamic, relational, and temporal interplay each context provided for agency. On the one hand, I appreciated the instructors' teaching abilities in a horse riding session as a novice learner. At the same time I recognised the fears and frustrations of being a student of teaching as an experienced teacher educator. Self-study provided a means to attend to the complex interrelations and the layering of experiences, events, intentions, and narratives that worked together to produce emergent effects across the embedded and mutually implicated systems (Ovens, Hopper, and Butler 2013).

Framing the Study

Learning to ride a horse provided the perfect means to unsettle my taken for granted views of teaching and learning. My body was the primary source for making sense of, and connections with, being a learner. In this way, I experienced everything that Loughran (2006) states are so enmeshed in the experiences of learning and teaching about teaching – the emotions, feelings, sensations and reactions – but which are often dominated by the cognitive domain. 'Falling into trust with [my] body's role in teaching and learning' (Macintyre Latta and Buck 2008, p. 324) has enabled me to become a better teacher educator.

I initially enrolled for a term's tuition in a riding academy but the study eventually spanned 3 years of weekly riding lessons with experienced instructors and other learners. In the first year, following each weekly riding lesson I journalled key aspects of the experience, including my perceptions of self-efficacy, my emotions and feelings, and the verbal interactions I had with my horse riding instructors and fellow riding students. The process of writing enabled me to reconstruct what had taken place in each lesson and to explore how my experiences related to teaching. I also stored photos and videos of my lessons. My journal became a space to reflect on learning situations and contexts.

I shared my journey as a neophyte rider with my student teachers and critical friends. Being able to feed key ideas, observations, and experiences into discussions

with them was central to my initial analysis. My students' responses to the images in PowerPoint presentations and stories about my weekly riding lessons provided an alternative lens through which to view experiences. These responses were gathered in the form of critical incident questionnaires (Brookfield 1995), end of course evaluations, and informally through conversations and emails. I reflected on their comments and evaluations in my journal. My critical friends' comments, insights, and responses also added to my examination of teacher education practices.

All written data and images were stored electronically and linked by the date they were created. Discernable themes coalesced from the mass of undifferentiated ideas through the method of pattern analysis. Pattern analysis differs from open coding or categorical analysis in that it works from the general to the particular (Lankshear and Knobel 2004). Revisiting the data numerous times to re-read, compare, contrast, and sort meant that themes that appeared most significant and meaningful were identified and communicated to my students. My sense of their relevance to teacher education practice was measured against my students' responses and reassessed accordingly.

Re-reading my journal entries enabled me to draw on them as an archival reference and re-examine further significant themes. As Ham and Kane (2004) suggest:

> It is the researcher – me, now, investigating the archives and artefacts left by the informant – me, then, with the bonus miles available that the archive can still stimulate the remembering of much more about the situation as I initially experienced it than can be read in the archive itself. When it is self-generated, the archive is thus an ongoing stimulus to even more data, at least about 'my' part in the practice. But it is still data in the way in which it is treated in the analytical, synthetic and presentation stages of the research. (p. 114)

Now, I can dip into this archival source and re-examine episodes at will. Particularly powerful are the photographs and videos that evoke strong memories. I reminisce and draw on my embodied understanding of being a learner to embellish my teaching every day. The following episodes are some that most powerfully illustrate my embodied learning.

Findings

Episode 1: Opening the Reins

One theme I explored in Garbett (2011a) was how novices can be blind to an expert's skill. When experts appear to perform a task so effortlessly, it is very difficult for beginners to emulate them. As Russell, (2007, p. 190) wrote: 'teaching looks easy, and good teaching looks very easy.' I recognised that in my classroom setting I was uncomfortable letting my students see a flummoxed me; a teacher who didn't handle every situation with aplomb and dexterity; someone who made mistakes and regretted missed opportunities. In short, I didn't want them to see behind the façade I presented of being an expert and making teaching look easy. However, I was more than happy to compare my bumbling efforts on horseback with world-class dressage

riders and show jumpers. It was a far less threatening route for me to instigate authentic discussions about the skillful, complex nature of teaching. It was a way to open my students' eyes so that they could see the expert's nuanced performance with more clarity. As one student commented: '*People who are experienced can make it look easy when it isn't always*.'

I exposed my vulnerability through horse riding because I didn't need to be the unflappable, confident expert in that arena. It was only later on, when I felt more confident with my students that I drew parallels to my teaching performance. Rather than maintaining the façade of being the expert teacher, I acknowledged times in front of my students when a question had sidetracked me, or when I felt that a strategy had fallen flat. This was courting disapproval. I am well aware that with 13,000 hour of schooling under their respective belts student teachers 'have well-developed ideas about what should occur in classrooms, what counts as learning and as evidence of learning, what teachers should do, and so on' (Trumbull 2004, p. 1216). There are always some students who have expectations that I am unable to meet. They want definitive answers; expect me to model for them exactly what they should do in their classes; want me to provide them with clear learning outcomes and detailed resources for every session; and to adhere to preordained lesson plans. I let them know how I feel about not meeting their expectations – the sinking feeling I get when I think I don't measure up to their ideals. I resist the urge to give them what they want in order to foster in them a sense that being a teacher is never easy. It is complex and demanding, even when we are experienced. To pretend otherwise is misleading and counterproductive.

Episode 2: Pushed to the Limit

One of my most negative horse riding experiences made me aware of the serious consequences that putting learners into situations that are too demanding can have on self-efficacy. I was trying to make a horse transition from a trot to a canter but as the lesson wore on I became more and more distressed. As I commented in my journal:

> *I was feeling fatigued mentally and uncomfortable physically. I was bruised and chafed. The instructor kept repeating instructions which I could not coordinate while the horse was jogging along in a trot, 'Sit down, squeeze, scoop… Nearly. Try again.' I finally managed to canter down one side of the arena but then we had to change reins and canter down the other side. I was frightened and close to tears. I had a feeling of complete helplessness. I couldn't physically do what was being asked of me.* (Journal entry, 16 June)

That particular riding lesson is etched indelibly on my mind. I had wanted to give up and never, ever go back to horse riding. A few weeks later, a fellow horse-riding student very nearly came off his horse in this cursed arena.

> *He was quite shaken and finished his lesson earlier than the rest of us. I think he had enough! You don't always get the opportunity to call it quits in front of a class.* (Journal entry, August 4)

I remembered reading how overwhelmed Scherff (Scherff and Kaplan 2006) felt when she returned to a full-time school position even though she was an experienced

teacher and teacher educator. Scherff lasted 6 months: no mean feat given the lack of support, school culture, and unmotivated students she encountered. She got to the point where she dreaded going to school. Scherff went back to her teacher education position 'acutely aware of [her] responsibility to prepare preservice teachers for the realities of the job' (p. 165).

That same abject sense of hopelessness compelled me to rethink my course so that my student teachers might be better prepared for the realities of teaching. Now, my students practice teaching a small group of their peers one skill or idea before they go on practicum. I want them to at least have experienced finding their feet in the teaching role in a relatively structured and safe environment, before they meet a full class of students (see Garbett 2011b; Garbett and Ovens 2012 for more on peer teaching and the effect peer teaching has had on our practice).

Furthermore, when I visit them on their placements I am gentler and more caring when critiquing their teaching. I hold on to the sense that this memory evokes. What damage do I do to my students' sense of self-efficacy when I insist that they take full control of a class of students and then learn from their mistakes? They need to be stretched but not to breaking point!

Episode 3: Connecting the Dots

Many of the archived moments pivot around what it felt like to be a learner in different situations. In Episode 2 I floundered out of my depth. In the following snapshots, my mastery of big and small goals motivated me to persevere and push myself further. The role that the instructor had in enabling my learning is foregrounded in these snapshots when I re-read them now.

Snapshot 1:
Karren seemed to know exactly what each student was capable of doing at any point in the lesson. Her advice and instructions were always precise and tailored to the individual. 'Just trot for five steps and do it well…Keep your legs on, Dawn, reins in a bit tighter, shoulders back, legs on, keep your legs on!…It's better that you do a little bit well than you go all the way around the arena out of control. There is no point in doing that. That isn't riding. That's just being taken for a ride. You want to learn to ride, just do a little bit well.' (Journal entry, 10 May)

Reflecting on my take-back-to-teaching message from this snapshot I recognised the importance of breaking down a complex task into more manageable components and of being given the opportunity to successfully master them. Bandura (1997) reckoned that this was the most influential source of efficacy and other teacher education researchers concur (e.g. Long and Stuart 2004). My feeling as a learner was that mastery of small steps enhanced my sense of satisfaction and accomplishment.

Snapshot 2:
Karren said that we had to get into the position for jumping with shorter stirrups. We had to have our balance forward and we had to keep our backs straight and look up, between the horse's ears. She told us that we had to lean forward and put one hand on our knee with

our elbow in the crease of our hip and thigh. In this position, bums slightly off the saddle we had to trot, then canter, around the arena. It seemed impossible but in actual fact, once you had your balance settled and your arm locked in, it was surprisingly easy. As she was talking to us, she was building a jump. She said to me: 'Don't worry – it is only this high, stay in the position and you will be fine'. Then she said: 'OK, trot over the jump, keep your legs on, stay in position, look up, look up!' And that was it – me and Brew did a jump. It was neat. I did it again and again and again. Brew was totally nonplussed, I felt totally relaxed and it was effortless. I was on top of the world. What a buzz! (Journal entry, August 25)

With regard to this snapshot I thought about the importance of preparation and being molded in the 'right position'. I wrote in my journal:

I thought again about how we put our students in the right position so that they can fly and clear the little jumps with relative ease so that they can go on and attempt new hurdles. I would put something like the artificiality of lesson planning to the nth degree into this category. We ask them to do it – they don't really see the reason and complain about it; but we know that it is a small step to make sure that their balance is in the right place. They should be able to maintain the position later without the detail but at the start it might be very important for them to at least have a sense of security and a feel for what it is like to be in the right position. (Journal entry, August 25)

Snapshot 3:
We were instructed to knot the reins, come into the jumps nice and slowly, shut our eyes and put our arms out to the sides like flying angels. I rued the thought that I had precipitated this ridiculous exercise because I had said to the instructor that I still couldn't imagine what jumping was supposed to feel like. It always came as a surprise to me when the horse took off. So here we were, supposedly counting the strides between the little cavalettis, with no hands and in the dark! (Journal entry, May 29)

This final snapshot highlights the importance of explaining clearly that some of the tasks I design and insist the students' complete are only intermediary steps to help them appreciate thinking and acting like a teacher. Equally, I am sure not all of my tasks make sense to students out of context.

Episode 4: Modeling in a Different Sense

The inadequacy of modeling exemplary practice and pretending that teaching was little more than telling, showing, and guided practice (Myers 2002) had become increasingly clear to me as my self-study research had enhanced my professional learning. Modeling how to be a teacher has been an important thread for self-study researchers like Clare Kosnik. She espouses learning 'to teach as a life-long process' (Kosnik 2003, p. 8). Berry and Loughran (2002) modeled being prepared to 'honestly, openly and publicly critique their own teaching' (p. 23). Loughran (1997) has explained that modeling in teacher education practices is not a matter of providing student teachers with a recipe of how to teach. He states that it is:

modeling the processes, thoughts, and knowledge of an experienced teacher in a way that demonstrates the 'why' or the purpose of teaching; it is not creating a template of teaching for unending duplication. (p. 62)

This distinction reminded me of one of the most valuable and effective lessons I had when riding. The instructor was modeling exemplary riding alongside us on her own horse.

Watching Karren imitate one of us, then correct herself and pull herself up into a more balanced position with a stronger central core made me aware of what each of us were doing wrong. To transition back to a walk from a trot, we had to use our biceps and sit stiller, and deeper 'into the saddle' by contracting our inner cores. You had to tense your stomach muscles as though someone was about to punch you to create the appropriate effect. This was tricky to comprehend and it didn't make much sense. (Journal entry, February 20)

I remember this being a case of me practicing the movements but not getting any relevant feedback from the horse. I was trying to replicate what Karren was doing and what she looked like as she exaggerated her movements but I had no idea of why I would ever need to perform this particular skill. I found out a few minutes later.

Our last task of the lesson was to go for a short canter. I walked around the short end of the arena, trotted a few steps and then asked Fizz to canter. She took two enormous galloping strides, bucked and then cantered flat out down the long side of the arena. I was so surprised – mainly by her amazing acceleration. The one buck lurched me forward but I was pretty square on her back so I just went forward, perhaps a little bit to the right-hand side. Certainly if she had bucked again that was the shoulder I felt I would have gone over. But, in the stride after the buck, I sat back down into the saddle and clenched my stomach muscles so tight, pulled her head with my biceps and gripped with my legs. I was furious! I made her come to a stop. … Karren urged me to make Fizz go back to the same spot to see if she would do it again. She did, but I anticipated it and controlled her. I walked her back to the others feeling like I should be getting a round of applause. (Journal entry, February 20)

This was an episode when I realised that developing expertise requires practicing effective, deliberate strategies skillfully while at the same time, generating ways through which you can monitor your actions accurately (Zimmerman 2006). What was missing in the first part of the lesson was receiving any feedback from the horse as to whether my actions were effective. I had an open-ended feedback loop. It was only when I received feedback from the horse that I felt that I knew what I was doing in an embodied way.

This was an important lesson for me to learn because it firmly shifted my focus from what I was doing to how the horse was responding. In my classes I realised that I am constantly gathering information from my students to monitor the effectiveness of my teaching. Apart from the official end of course evaluations and critical incident questionnaires, I also seek other evidence which can be as fleeting as reading the look on a student's face; unobtrusively monitoring group discussions as I circulate around the room; a Get out of Class ticket; or a thumbs up, thumbs down show of hands. I am simultaneously 'being' a teacher and 'doing' teaching.

Concluding Thoughts

Each of the above episodes taught me something about being a teacher. In each of them I have highlighted an aspect of the embodied nature of my professional learning. At first I used my experiences of learning to ride to share my feelings of anxiety,

frustration, hopelessness, and satisfaction, novice-to-novice. 'Opening the reins' in horse riding parlance means to guide the horse to turn in that direction. It is a subtle shift in position, which might be barely discernible but I know that I am opening the reins and giving myself and my students license to discuss feelings in relation to teaching. Being a teacher is challenging, demanding, and an emotional rollercoaster but that is how it should be.

I included the episode (Pushed to the Limit) where my confidence and enthusiasm for learning to ride hit rock bottom to highlight how important it is to me to support my students' initial efforts. The instructor in that particular session was less experienced than Karren and misread my capabilities. It took me a long time to recover from the physical bruising but the despair I felt lingered even longer. I never trusted the judgment of that particular instructor again and dreaded lessons with her but, through this episode, I became aware of the importance of fostering my students' self-efficacy and resilience to cope with the realities of teaching.

Learning to ride a horse included knowing numerous skills and being able to perform these adroitly. I practiced some of the techniques, such as balancing, without a horse. Other techniques, such as lengthening my legs, I practiced without stirrups. I jumped with my eyes closed and both arms outstretched. Even when I managed to accomplish the 'flying angel' task I still didn't feel as though I was a rider. Instead, I felt like someone perched on top of a horse. It was a surreal, disembodied experience. This exercise was supposed to give me a better feeling for jumping but in this instance, the dots never joined up. I learnt through the various snapshots in this episode the importance of students mastering discrete, sequenced skills but I also recognize that these skills often need to be contextualized in classroom practice.

In the final episode on modeling I highlighted one moment when it came together for me and I felt like a rider. Up until this point I was competent at *doing* riding tasks – I could saddle my own mount; rise to the trot and stay on when cantering; I could jump small fences and a myriad of other things, but I didn't feel as though I was a horse rider. I was focused on myself doing these things well and improving my technique – never on the horse or its experience of being ridden. It was only when Fizz caught my attention by bucking that I responded directly to her and felt that I was a rider. I am sure that this sea-change in my approach could have resulted in huge improvements in horsemanship but, ironically, it was one of the last horse riding lessons I took.

The lessons I learnt in the arena have transformed my practice. I was too comfortable as an experienced teacher educator *doing* teaching tasks rather than *being* a teacher. In this self-study research contextualised by horse riding, my body has been the medium for making sense of, and connections to, being a teacher educator (Ovens and Powell 2011). It has been a powerful reminder that there are multiple ways to learn. I am honestly looking forward to the next time student teachers return from practicum saying they can do teaching. This self-study has given me renewed enthusiasm to engage in conversations about the vast difference between going through the motions and being embodied in the role.

References

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: Freeman.

Berry, A., & Loughran, J. J. (2002). Developing an understanding of learning to teach in teacher education. In J. J. Loughran & T. Russell (Eds.), *Improving teacher education practices through self-study* (pp. 13–29). London/New York: Routledge Falmer.

Brookfield, S. D. (1995). *Becoming a critically reflective teacher*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Brookfield, S. D. (2005). *The power of critical theory for adult learning and teaching*. Berkshire: Open University Press, McGraw-Hill Education.

Garbett, D. (2007). *Science teacher education: Foster confidence and competence.* Unpublished doctoral thesis, Monash University, Australia.

Garbett, D. (2011a). Horse riding 101: The role of experience in reframing teacher education practices. *Studying Teacher Education, 7*(1), 65–75.

Garbett, D. (2011b). Developing pedagogical practices to enhance confidence and competence in science teacher education. *Journal of Science Teacher Education, 22*(8), 729–743.

Garbett, D., & Ovens, A. (2012). Being a teacher educator: Exploring issues of authenticity and safety through self-study. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 37*(3), 43–56.

Ham, V., & Kane, R. (2004). Finding a way through the swamp: A case for self-study as research. In J. J. Loughran, M. L. Hamilton, V. K. LaBoskey, & T. Russell (Eds.), *International handbook of self-study of teaching and teacher education practices* (pp. 103–150). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Kane, R. (2007). From naïve practitioner to teacher educator and researcher. In T. Russell & J. Loughran (Eds.), *Enacting a pedagogy of teacher education: Values, relationships and practices* (pp. 60–76). London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Korthagen, F., Loughran, J., & Russell, T. (2006). Developing fundamental principles for teacher education programs and practices. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 22*, 1020–1041.

Kosnik, C. (2003). *Reflection in teacher education: It starts with me!* Retrieved from the World Wide Web: www.oise.utoronto.ca/~ctd/networks/journal

Lankshear, C., & Knobel, M. (2004). *A handbook for teacher research from design to implementation*. Berkshire: Open University Press.

Long, D. T., & Stuart, C. (2004). Supporting higher levels of reflection among teacher candidates: A pedagogical framework. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 10*(3), 275–290.

Loughran, J. J. (1997). Teaching about teaching: Principles and practice. In J. J. Loughran & T. Russell (Eds.), *Teaching about teaching: Purpose, passion and pedagogy in teacher education* (pp. 57–69). London: Falmer.

Loughran, J. (2006). *Developing a pedagogy of teacher education: Understanding teaching and learning about teaching*. Oxon: Routledge.

Macintyre Latta, M., & Buck, G. (2008). Enfleshing embodiment: 'Falling into trust' with the body's role in teaching and learning. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 40*(2), 315–329.

Myers, C. B. (2002). Can self-study challenge the belief that telling, showing, and guided practice constitute adequate teacher education? In J. J. Loughran & T. Russell (Eds.), *Improving teacher education practices through self-study* (pp. 130–142). London/New York: Routledge Falmer.

Ovens, A., & Powell, D. (2011). Minding the body in physical education. In S. Brown (Ed.), *Issues and controversies in physical education: Policy, power and pedagogy* (pp. 150–159). Auckland: Pearson.

Ovens, A., Hopper, T., & Butler, J. (2013). Reframing curriculum, pedagogy and research. In A. Ovens, T. Hopper, & J. Butler (Eds.), *Complexity thinking in physical education* (pp. 1–13). Oxon: Routledge.

Russell, T. (2007). How experience changed my values. In T. Russell & J. Loughran (Eds.), *Enacting a pedagogy of teacher education: Values, relationships and practices* (pp. 182–191). London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Scherff, L., & Kaplan, J. (2006). Reality check: A teacher educator returns home. *Studying Teacher Education, 2*(2), 155–167.

Trumbull, D. (2004). Factors important for the scholarship of self-study of teaching and teacher education practices. In J. J. Loughran, M. L. Hamilton, V. K. LaBoskey, & T. Russell (Eds.), *International handbook of self-study of teaching and teacher education practices* (Vol. 2, pp. 1211–1230). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Zimmerman, B. J. (2006). Development and adaptation of expertise: The role of self-regulatory processes and beliefs. In K. A. Ericsson, N. Charness, P. J. Feltovich, & R. R. Hoffman (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of expertise and expert performance* (pp. 705–722). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Through the Looking Glass: Distortions of Self and Context in Teacher Education

Ashley Casey

Context of the Study

Nearly 40 years ago Whitehead and Hendry (1976) suggested that the physical education teacher had been socially constructed as a none-too bright individual, a companionable man (sic) of action but not someone with whom to engage in critical conversation. When this remark is taken along side the commonly held 'observation' that those who can *do*, those who can't *teach,* and those who can't do that *teach teachers*, then exactly how none-too bright, companionable, and uncritical are those of us who teach teachers considered to be? This chapter sets out to explore that question from my personal perspective as a teacher-as-researcher (Stenhouse 1975) turned teacher educator, one who maintains the aspiration to be critical of both the practices I brought from school teaching and those I encountered along the way. That is not to say that 'companionable' and 'bright' weren't also two aspirations of mine; but you will forgive me if I don't comment on those two in this chapter.

Before this chapter can properly begin I need to offer a context for the study. I worked as a secondary school (11–18 year olds) physical education teacher for 15 years, and for the last 7 of these I engaged in a reflective journey as a teacher-as-researcher. Stenhouse (1975) envisioned this 'person' to be a creative and autonomous teacher-scholar who, through thoughtful experimentation, strives for continual development in a classroom they have repositioned as a 'living laboratory'. This theory of praxeology[1] was one that Elliott (1983) believed would help teachers take the steps needed to translate educational aims into teaching reality. Drawing on Elliott (1983) and Stenhouse (1975) it could be understood that I engaged in research-informed teaching. I read research in my spare time (between lessons

---

[1] '*Praxis*, action, and *logos*, talk, speech' (Roth, Lawless and Tobin 2000, p. 2., original emphasis).

A. Casey (✉)
Loughborough University, Leicestershire, UK
e-mail: A.J.B.Casey@lboro.ac.uk

even), engaged with academics through a course-based masters and then a research doctorate, and taught up to 35 lessons a week of secondary school physical education. I specialised in the use of three pedagogical models[2] (Cooperative Learning, Sport Education, and what I now come to see as games-centred approaches but at the time would have called Teaching Games for Understanding) and adopted a models-based approach[3] (Kirk 2013) to teaching physical education. For 7 years I challenged my teaching and the orientations I had prior to the start of my *reflective odyssey* (Attard and Armour 2005). A reflective odyssey is a process through which the author explores an ongoing, often long-term, and problematic journey to self-realisation and meaningful insight into their teaching and learning. For me this meant that I recorded my journey by writing daily reflective diaries, field notes, post-lesson reflections, memos, and research papers, and generally tried to change my pedagogical practice. Such was the degree to which I sought to change, that recently I suggested:

> I joined the teaching profession in 1996 and then again in 2002. That is not say that I had a career break but rather that I discovered autobiographical inquiry, alternative pedagogies of physical education and perhaps, most importantly, action research.

(Casey 2013, p. 147)

However, having completed 7 years of this *odyssey* I promptly *turned game-keeper*[4] and left secondary school to work in higher education. My aim was to take both my models-based practice and my reflective practice with me, and challenge what some colleagues described as the hyper-traditional practices of universities. To this end I continue to write the daily diaries that I started as a physical education teacher, '*follow[ing] my move into higher education and [recording] the changes and developments that might occur in my pedagogy*' (Reflective Diary, 5th September 2009). Since working in higher education I have written over 300,000 words across 1,500 entries. These reflections as they were written at the time, as well as my reconsideration of them 'today', form the basis of this study and how I explore my past practice to inform the present and future. They show how I inherited lectures, seminars, and practical sessions (and their associated materials) from colleagues, how I was expected to apply my secondary school practice to teacher education without formal training, and how I made mistakes and enjoyed success in discovering what it means to be a teacher of teachers. Ultimately, they serve to contextualise my memories and allow you, as the reader, to generalise beyond my personal experiences.

---

[2] Empirically researched and theoretically informed teaching strategies. One that would be familiar to readers outside of physical education would be Cooperative Learning.

[3] 'A models-based approach seeks to retain [a] range of legitimate learning outcomes for physical education but [also] to align relevant subject matter and teaching strategies with a set of learning outcomes to create a package or a model for programme design' Kirk (2013, p. 225).

[4] *Poacher turned gamekeeper* is a British phrase used to exemplify someone whose new job is seen as being the opposite of what it once was i.e. teacher to teacher educator.

Aim/Objectives of the Study

It could be argued that we get the physical education teachers that: (a) we want and (b) we deserve. But why? I would not be alone or even perhaps in the first 100 people to suggest that the majority of physical education teachers are the product of a system that rewards students who thrive in the traditional, gender-based team games that have dominated physical education in schools (Hardman 2008). This system is the primary reason why 'certain ideas regarding physical education are propagated and why we have certain conceptions of physical education that, at particular points in time, become dominant or wither and fade from use' (Tinning 2012, p. 116). In this way, Tinning (2012) holds that physical education is an idea, a set of cultural practices that are spread through transmission. The purpose of this chapter is to explore how a so-called innovative secondary school teacher faced up to the new challenge of teaching teachers. It tries to show how I used a models-based approach – the mainstay of my secondary practice – in teaching student teachers of physical education.

Methodology and Methods

Loughran (2002) concluded that there has been a long history of research in teaching generally and teacher education specifically; however, in either case there has been little impact on practice. The biggest reason for this has been the reported irrelevance of this research to those who work 'at the coalface' of education and teacher education. In contrast – and in an effort to improve this lamentable situation – self-study of teacher education practice (SSTEP) research focuses on the questions teacher educators themselves have about practice and reports on their findings. It then asks others to generalise beyond these reported experiences for their own benefit. As a new teacher educator I have used SSTEP to challenge what Louie, Stackman, Drevdahl and Purdy (2002) called teacher educators' past assumptions on current practices. In other words, I have sought to identify the assumptions and expectations that I had about teaching teachers – and that others had of teacher educators (students, colleagues, and managers alike) – in an effort to improve my teaching, and the learning that occurred as a consequence of my efforts. As this chapter develops it is important to note, that, in describing the methods I used (and in keeping with the editors' ideas for this book), I have borrowed shamelessly from my work with Tim Fletcher to inform this section (see Casey and Fletcher 2012).

Data Gathering

Data were gathered from two sources. My ongoing reflective diaries, written daily since 5th September 2009 (my first day in teacher education and 4 weeks before the submission of my doctoral thesis), serve the purpose of a written narrative of my contextual experiences within higher education and act as the first data source. It is

important to note that these diaries have been written as personal reflections (in the tradition of St. Augustine) and as a means to understand the institutional impact on my teaching of moving from a secondary school to a university. When re-read, these reflections also served as artefacts of my experiences of making the transition from teacher to teacher educator as they were written during my initial years of teaching pre-service teachers (Ham and Kane 2004; Williams and Ritter 2010). The use of these artefacts as a second data source allowed me to situate myself 'back' at the time of my respective written experiences, allowing for the:

> Re-establishing [of] contact with place [which] must therefore be part of the self-study project. The means for doing so are to be found in such textual artefacts as church bells, personal memories, and most importantly the *literature of place*.
>
> (Kelly 2005, p. 112, my emphasis)

Therefore, when reflections are used as 'literature of place', they can be considered as *sui generis* artefacts, serving to remind me of each incident as I contextualised them at the time of writing. Consequently, they act as reminders of those times and represent my reflections in and on the actions I took as a beginning teacher educator (Schön 1983).

Outcomes

I have chosen to explore this section under two themes: (1) Everything's got a moral, if only you can find it, and (2) Curiouser and curiouser. These themes draw directly from the work of Lewis Carroll so as to better represent my decision to borrow part of my title from his work 'Alice through the looking glass'. They are somewhat arbitrary categories that serve the purposes of this chapter. However, they could have been interpreted in many different ways depending on the context in which they were written and indeed the author who had engaged with them. They serve, I hope, the ideas behind this chapter, as they represent: (a) the distortions I now see that occurred in my pedagogical practices when I moved into a new and unfamiliar context, and (b) the importance of SSTEP in my journey to becoming a better teacher educator. They are anchored through my exploration of the artefacts and the literature of place that my diaries have now come to be conceived. The first theme is written to show the need to heed the warnings we see as teacher educators and find ways of addressing them sooner rather than later. The second theme explores the idea that the more I reflected and engaged in self-study the more I found to interest me and challenge me in my teaching of pre-service teachers.

Everything's Got a Moral, If Only You Can Find It

After more than a decade in one institution you get to understand both *the* place and *your* place. Indeed, after more than a decade in one place everyone seems to know your place as well. You fit in. Your idiosyncrasies are known and accepted, and you

are left to get on with things. This was the case with me, even after I started my own *reflective odyssey* (Attard and Armour 2005) in 2002 and flipped my practice on its head. It wasn't a smooth journey and I made some mistakes (large and small) but I was big enough and ugly enough at that stage to make those changes and survive – some would say thrive. When I left and joined higher education I fully expected to be able to take this security and understanding with me. I naively believed that good practice was good practice and that I could flourish in any environment. What I neglected to understand was that, while there are similarities between secondary and higher education, schools are not as comparable to university as I thought.

One of the first things that becomes obvious was that I didn't quite 'get' university. I didn't know my place, or how to 'be' an academic in this community. Indeed '*I expected to be out on a limb – especially given the familiarity I had with [my previous school] – but this does feel a little isolated. I am out on a limb and am, not deliberately, being kept in the dark*' (Reflective Diary, 7th September 2009). This feeling of isolation continued not because I was ostracised but because people had their own things to do and manage, and because I was expected to find my own way. This was a slow process and I began to uncover '*a little more of the puzzle*' each day and started to learn how to be an academic. However, an unsure neophyte teacher educator was replacing the confident teacher I had been and I started to question who I was and why I was here. I noted, '*I left knowing I could do my job and feeling that I had made an impact on my pupils and their learning. Will the same be said of me at this job?*' (Reflective Diary, 11th September 2009).

One of the cornerstones of my secondary school practice had been my use of a models-based approach (see Casey et al. 2009; Casey and Dyson 2009; Casey 2013). Yet another facet had been my struggles against the expected practices of my school and my subject area (Casey 2012). It had been my hope that I would be able to maintain my use of a models-based approach while avoiding similar struggles in my move to a university. Looking back from this keyboard, those hopes mostly came to fruition but in the early days it wasn't so clear:

> *It also seems that some of the guys are more progressive in their teaching than others. This means that while I will have my battles I am not sure that they will be as bad as the ones at [my old school]. Still, I am sure that my pedagogical beliefs will be challenged and I will have to compromise (initially at least) before I get to do things my way.*

> (Reflective Diary, 9th September 2009)

The prediction that I would have to compromise before I could do things my own way was truer than I thought at the time. I don't know how much of these early reflections were rhetoric but in the end they appeared to be a self-fulfilling prophecy. I lacked the basic knowledge '*about what it takes to succeed in such an organisation*' (Reflective Diary, 14th September 2009) and needed to learn quickly. The familiarity of a school environment, and its associated comfort, was replaced with a '*sink or swim*' feeling where '*little bits of the picture kept being revealed*' at intermittent stages. In some areas I was left to my own devices (i.e. in the way I was trusted to teach my sessions), yet in others I had my hand held (inasmuch as I was provided with pre-planned – and not by me – sessions to teach). It wasn't that I was neglected

but instead it was assumed that my experience as a secondary school teacher and as a near-completed PhD student was the only preparation that I needed. Yet I had no experience as a teacher educator and no experience as a university academic, and I certainly had yet to consider or even begin to understand what my approach to teaching might '*be like*'. I had assumed – as had my employer – that my prior experience and pending qualifications were sufficient enough to allow me to excel as a teacher of teachers (Casey and Fletcher 2012).

While this understanding seems obvious now, at the time it just felt like the norm. A new fish in a big pond with a discernable uncertainty around what it was I was expected to do. Some of this was to do with university acronyms – which were thrown around like sweets and yet for which I needed a phrase book to understand – and others to do with a timetable and a teaching load that didn't reflect the lesson-by-lesson busyness I had experienced at school. In fact, the time that we had available to use was noted as a huge positive but there was also a sense of wanting to get my teeth into some teaching:

> The contrast in the working day is interesting. The number of meetings I have had in the last 3 weeks seems to out-do [my old school] by a mile. The degree of preparation is huge as is the degree of collaboration. There is also a free discussion on everything and while there are mandates coming from on high, the way that these issues are dealt with is a breath of fresh air. How much better would the school have been if the level of dialogue had been the same. People seem to have trust and respect in each other, which seems a much better way forwards. Anyway the talking might continue next week but the doing certainly starts. I am looking forward to my first real go at this.

(Reflective Diary, 24th September 2009)

But it was more than that. It was the growing sense of 'what comes next?' At no time during my first month at the university did I reflect on my own learning about teaching teachers. I just assumed that I could do it and my diary suggests that that was exactly what happened. I felt '*I did a good job*' and after my first teaching day '*I can sit back and reflect on a job well done*'. Yet this didn't reflect some of the issues I would experience further down the line. In hindsight these first experiences were with first year students in their first week of university and they were as close to secondary school students as I could possibly have found. As a result, my teaching might have been seen as 'fitting' their requirements well.

However, while my first experiences of teaching teachers only served to reinforce the idea that I was well suited to work in higher education, only now, with the benefit of hindsight, do I realise that I was losing much of what had made me distinctive as a secondary school teacher. I found that I was teaching subjects that were '*out of my comfort zone but the pedagogy was just not where I wanted it to be. I guess that this is the problem with teaching someone else's lessons. The moral seems to be that I need to make the work that I do my own*' (Reflective Diary, 6th October 2009). This idea of '*teaching someone else's lessons*' became the key facet of my early work and one that distorted my idea of myself as a teacher and certainly of the teacher educator I wanted to be. I lost myself, and while I am grateful to all those colleagues who shared their work and ideas with me, I would have been better placed planning and preparing for myself.

Finding the Moral

The crux came in early November in my first year. However, more worryingly perhaps, I was already aware that I was in danger of forgetting the teacher I had worked through 7 years of practitioner research to become. A month before the tipping point I outline below, I went so far as to warn myself: '*I know I can teach, it is now a case of finding out how best to approach this unit of athletics without falling back on old, worn out practices*' (Reflective Diary, 6th October 2009). And yet that warning (and others like it) went unheeded. It wasn't until I was emailed by a colleague with a 'heads-up' that things were not going well:

> *An interesting e-mail from Chris [pseudonym] yesterday about the athletics unit and the concerns of the students about traditional learning outcomes has led to some soul searching. At first I thought I would give them what they expected. Yet that would be a betrayal of seven years of pedagogical and curricular change. Then I got cross for Chris for making me consider myself inept and in need of such compromise, but I know he took a difficult step in telling me. To take such a step would be a disservice to him and a disservice to my belief in becoming [an idea that emerged from my PhD]. This is a new world and I need to continue to develop. This requires reflection and critical pedagogy. I don't want to revert to a didactic style, but nor do I want to stand still. The primary purpose of this journal was to look at how I faced down this particular problem so to bail at this point would be wrong. It will be interesting to see how the students react to this type of pedagogy.*

> (Reflective Diary, 9th November 2009)

This was a defining moment for me but, in the context of this chapter, it also needs some additional explanation. I was teaching second year students a unit of athletics and I had been following my interpretations of a colleague's sessions throughout this time. In many ways – and with the benefit of hindsight – I now feel that I had fallen between a few styles of teaching and the resulting 'monster' was not what any of us (staff or students) expected or wanted. Yet, I allowed this to happen despite my reflections to the contrary. Furthermore, I was almost taken unawares by this event (despite my own warnings) but it was the impetus that I needed to get myself on a better track. I had been as guilty as my colleagues and my employer in assuming that I was well suited for higher education and yet the reality was a little different. In adopting other people's bodies of work and trying to teach as they taught I resorted to type. Not their type, but the stereotype and approaches that I thought I had moved past as a schoolteacher were reasserting themselves in this unfamiliar environment. In jumping through the looking glass I had lost a sense of myself as a pedagogue and a sense of the context in which I was working. I had assumed that I knew what I was doing and where I was going and had lost my way a little. However, without any explicit and intentional preparation to teach teachers, my early experiences show more similarities than differences with those of other teacher educators (e.g., Ritter 2007; Zeichner 2005). The key element, however, was that I had found my moral and pedagogical compass and could move forwards. I consider now that my approach to teacher education is not defined by my early experiences but by the steps I took to find my own approaches and position myself within my context – as I will now discuss.

Curiouser and Curiouser

Adams (2009) reported that university teachers most frequently cited student course evaluations and informal peer feedback as the catalysts for changing their practices. The email from Chris (in the previous section) was a seminal moment for me in my self-study and served as one of my catalysts for change. Like the novice teacher educators studied by Murray and Male (2005), I felt a sense of de-skilling as I was faced with the reality that I had let slip with some elements of my successful secondary practice when coming into higher education. Not only that but I also found that I had to unlearn some of my ways of teaching – as they were 'designed' to work with much younger children – and had to learn and adopt new pedagogies suitable for adult learners. This started on 9th November 2009 and, while I will explore some of those ideas here, it is still very much an ongoing process and one I hope will never end.

I owe a point of gratitude to one colleague in particular who helped '*me to stay true to myself and my developing pedagogy*' (Reflective Diary, 10th November 2009) – she knows who she is – and in some ways this was a second seminal moment (in almost as many days). It was one that encouraged me to be increasingly curious about my teaching. The consequence was that I used a Cooperative Learning approach to teach athletics but I could easily have gone the other way:

> *It would have been easy to resort to an old, unloved and unmissed pedagogy, but it would have been wrong. Things didn't go perfectly, in fact the saturation of a double session would have been the undoing of many classes: 2½ hours on a cold and dank November day was a tough call for any class. Still, given my apprehension at 1 pm this afternoon and my dilemmas last night and Sunday night, I need to be glad that I took a step in the right direction.*

> (Reflective Diary, 10th November 2009)

It wasn't as simple as taking a lesson from my teaching days and applying it in a university context. As Loughran (2006) suggests, the thoughts of both my students (and the concerns they had expressed to Chris) and me (as a teacher educator) needed to be brought forth in the moment of teaching. Without my written discussions and the subsequent analysis of the thoughts behind my specific practices 'teacher education becomes a series of 'tips and tricks'' (Casey and Fletcher 2012). Therefore I also needed to 'let go' of some of the practices that had worked so well in the past and start to develop a bespoke approach to teacher education. This was not an easy process for as Murray and Male (2005) have illustrated, many new teacher educators struggle with this challenge, especially when required to modify the very practices that got them the job in the first instance.

While the portents of an impending 'disaster' had been there – and as I can see from revisiting the literature of place I have accumulated over the years – it took a brave colleague and some disgruntled students to give me a wake up call. However, I wasn't backwards in coming forwards and the realisation that I was over reliant on borrowed pedagogies and borrowed content acted as a '*wake up call*'. Within a few days I reflected on how '*things switch around*' and how I moved from '*a feeling of*

trepidation to one of satisfaction'. The key ingredient was a move away from Chris's lesson plans and taking the decision to use:

> *something I am much more comfortable with and that keeps me true to my beliefs about teaching, but more importantly about pupils and their learning. This is very much a notion of change and becoming. Yet it is also about teaching (helping) others to unlearn their pre-conceptions about learning, and encouraging them to embrace other ideas and pedagogies*

<div align="right">(Reflective Diary, 12th November 2009).</div>

The realisation that I had started my teacher education career in the wrong way was something that I reflected on again and again. In late January '*I wondered how these pages and my efforts might allow me to develop my own approach to the teaching of a very traditional subject*' (26th January 2010). The idea – in fact the firmly held belief – that physical education has endured a lack of change for 50 years has featured in my academic writing. Yet, here I was teaching teachers of physical education. As I have reported elsewhere (see Casey and Fletcher 2012) I felt the need to fit in and I was as guilty as anyone of allowing my preconceptions to influence my university teaching. My preconceptions were that university teaching was about lecturing, telling, and explaining and I lost (or struggled to gain) a sense of what it takes for teacher educators to support pre-service teachers. Most particularly the 'processes of learning to teach subject matter, in particular, the complexities associated with learning specific subject matter' (Berry and Van Driel 2013, p. 118), which in this case also referred to pedagogical approaches.

Much of what I have suggested above came about as a direct consequence of over-confidence in the ability of new staff and failure to even see the need to support new teacher educators in their unfamiliar roles. That is not to say that I was honest enough with myself to even acknowledge I needed this, and I don't blame my institution for failing to acknowledge a problem that I wasn't prepared to acknowledge myself. Writing from an American context, Cochran-Smith (2003) noted 'disparities between the multiple demands placed on teacher educators and the lack of attention to a curriculum for teacher educators and/or to policies that would support their ongoing learning' (p. 6). To this end I was not alone in being alone but it was only through these diaries and my subsequent writing that I come to see this as a problem or a concern. Worryingly, I can see that I am repeating the mistakes with those aspiring teacher educators that I work with as doctoral students. As I have become *curiouser and curiouser* I must ensure that I don't forget about others in the institution. I have a duty of care to encourage them to examine their transition to becoming a university academic, and to be critical of the ways in which they teach and act. This is the significance in this study that I will discuss in the final section.

Significance

Self-studies take a teacher-as-learner stance (Loughran and Berry 2012) and focus on the processes and practices of teaching and learning, as the participants themselves experience them. Many studies highlight the importance of teacher educators' processes

of identity formation and the role of reflection as a tool to help make the tacit aspects of their practice explicit to pre-service teachers (Berry 2009; Loughran 2006; Williams and Ritter 2010). In my case, while my prior experience and PhD were seen as key facets of my pedagogy of teacher education, neither were undertaken with higher education in mind. Like Zeichner (2005), my initial intent for pursuing doctoral studies was to improve my school teaching practice. Therefore my PhD did not focus on teacher education and too many assumptions were made about my prior learning and the ease of teaching pre-service teachers the 'tips and tricks' that is was assumed they would need to successfully work as teachers themselves.

In their work around science teaching and teacher education, Berry and Van Driel (2013) suggested that there are common issues and challenges for teacher educators when they seek to promote particular approaches to learning. In my case this revolved around the use of models-based practice (see Casey 2012). In some ways I was initially reticent to use these approaches and instead chose to 'borrow' lessons from other colleagues. However, in exampling these approaches – as can be seen from response to Chris's email – I also had to consider how these approaches to physical education (e.g. Cooperative Learning) could (a) be learnt at university and then (b) transferred (or not) into a school setting. Like Berry and Van Driel (2013) I chose to do this 'through an emphasis on promoting opportunities for PSTs to experience self-directed learning and problem solving' (p. 2). However, this is not an easy process with a specific end point. Instead, and in keeping with the work of Cochran-Smith (2003, p. 9), I conceptualise learning to teach teachers 'as an ongoing process of learning and unlearning with inquiry as stance'. However, more than that, I increasingly see my responsibility as a *teacher of teacher educators.* As such, I take on an additional role which supports doctoral students to understand what it means to be a physical education teacher educator and encouraging them to engage in a critical, self-reflective process.

In my first year of teaching teachers I learnt that expectations are a potentially dangerous thing. I started by depending on other people's lessons and trying to teach in the way I thought I should. The context of university served to distort my pedagogy and my perceptions of teaching. In trying to fit in I was in fact losing much of what I was good at. Self-study served as a gauge for my mistakes and certainly allowed me to learn from them. However, it is important that others – new teacher educators especially – are supported so that they don't have to make the same mistakes and try and learn by them. In teaching teachers we mustn't make assumptions about those employed to help them on their journeys. We must support them to develop their own pedagogy of teacher education and stop leaving this to chance.

References

Adams, P. (2009). The role of scholarship of teaching in faculty development: Exploring inquiry-based model. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching & Learning, 3*(1). Retrieved from http://academics.georgiasouthern.edu/ijsotl/v3n1/articles/_Adams/index.htm.

Attard, K., & Armour, K. (2005). Learning to become a learning professional: Reflections on one year of teaching. *European Journal of Teacher Education, 28*(2), 195–207.

Berry, A. K. (2009). Professional self-understanding as expertise in teaching about teaching. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 15*, 305–318.

Berry, A., & Van Driel, J. H. (2013). Teaching about teaching science: Aims, strategies, and backgrounds of science teacher educators. *Journal of Teacher Education, 64*(2), 117–128.

Casey, A. (2012). A self-study using action research: Changing site expectations and practice stereotypes. *Educational Action Research, 20*(2), 219–232.

Casey, A. (2013). 'Seeing the trees not just the wood': Steps and not just journeys in teacher action research. *Educational Action Research, 21*(2), 147–162.

Casey, A., & Dyson, B. (2009). The implementation of models-based practice in physical education through action research. *European Physical Education Review, 15*(2), 175–199.

Casey, A., & Fletcher, T. (2012). Trading places: From physical education teachers to teacher educators. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 31*, 362–380.

Casey, A., Dyson, B., & Campbell, A. (2009). Action research in physical education: Focusing beyond myself through cooperative learning. *Educational Action Research, 17*(3), 407–423.

Cochran-Smith, M. (2003). Learning and unlearning: The education of teacher educators. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 19*, 5–28.

Elliott, J. (1983/2007). A curriculum for the study of human affairs: The contribution of Lawrence Stenhouse. In J. Elliott (Ed.), *Reflecting where the action is: The selected works of John Elliott* (pp. 15–29). London: Routledge.

Ham, V., & Kane, R. (2004). Finding a way through the swamp: A case for self-study as research. In J. J. Loughran, M. L., Hamilton, V. K. Laboskey, & T. Russell (Eds.), *International handbook of self-study of teaching and teacher education practices* (pp. 103–150). Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Hardman, K. (2008). Physical education in schools: A global perspective. *Kinesiology, 40*(1), 5–28.

Kelly, T. (2005). Truth and fiction: Seeing our rural selves. In C. Mitchell, S. Weber, & K. O'Reilly-Scanlon (Eds.), *Just who do we think we are?: Methodologies for autobiography and self-study in teaching* (pp. 111–120). London: Routledge.

Kirk, D. (2013). What is the future for physical education in the 21st century? In S. Capel & M. Whitehead (Eds.), *Debates in physical education* (pp. 220–231). London: Routledge.

Loughran, J. (2002). Understanding self-study of teacher education practices. In J. Loughran & T. Russell (Eds.), *Improving teacher education practices through self-study* (pp. 239–248). London: Routledge-Falmer.

Loughran, J. J. (2006). *Developing a pedagogy of teacher education*. London: Routledge.

Loughran, J. J., & Berry, A. K. (2012). Developing science teacher educators' pedagogy of teacher education. In B. J. Fraser, K. G. Tobin, & C. J. McRobbie (Eds.), *Second international handbook of science education* (pp. 401–415). Dordrecht: Springer.

Louie, B. Y., Stackman, R. W., Drevdahl, D., & Purdy, J. M. (2002). Myths about teaching and the university professor. In J. Loughran & T. Russell (Eds.), *Improving teacher education practices through self-study* (pp. 193–207). London: Routledge-Falmer.

Murray, J., & Male, T. (2005). Becoming a teacher educator: Evidence from the field. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 21*, 125–142.

Ritter, J. K. (2007). Forging a pedagogy of teacher education: The challenges of moving from classroom teacher to teacher educator. *Studying Teacher Education, 3*, 5–22.

Roth, W.-M., Lawless, D., & Tobin, K. (2000). Towards a praxeology of teaching. *Canadian Journal of Education, 25*(1), 1–15.

Schön, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner*. New York: Basic Books.

Stenhouse, L. (1975). *An introduction to curriculum research and development*. London: Heinemann.

Tinning, R. (2012). The idea of physical education: A memetic perspective. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy, 17*(2), 115–126.

Whitehead, N., & Hendry, L. B. (1976). *Teaching physical education in England*. London: Lepus.

Williams, J., & Ritter, J. K. (2010). Constructing new professional identities through self-study: From teacher to teacher educator. *Professional Development in Education, 36*, 77–92.

Zeichner, K. M. (2005). Becoming a teacher educator: A personal perspective. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 21*, 117–124.

Disturbing Practice in Teacher Education Through Peer-Teaching

Alan Ovens

Context

For some time now I have considered myself very fortunate to work in a university setting where I can combine my love for physical education with an opportunity to work with very capable and committed students and be an advocate for criticality in our field. By criticality I mean a form of emancipatory politics that invites students to read and discuss health and physical education as a contested terrain and site of struggle in which the organization, legitimation, and circulation of knowledge are core to issues of power and social justice. Like many of my fellow physical educators I have found that a critical discourse provides an intellectual framework and language for understanding and problematising educational practices in ways that recognise their complexity, humanity, and emancipatory potential (Ovens 2013). In my approach to teaching I aim to enable my students to use critique, inquiry, and reflection as tools to challenge existing knowledge and ways of knowing, and to inform their practice as teachers. It is an approach that I have explored, evolved, and researched over the past 20 years.

At the same time, I have a concern that approaches to promoting criticality in teacher education are dominated by forms of rationalism that work against our ability as teacher educators to enact the concept in a meaningful way. In other words, there is a tendency to overplay the agency of the individual and believe that everyone is capable of challenging the ideological nature of, and transform, educational practices (Segall 2002; Tinning 2002). This is further complicated by pedagogies that are based on a process of transmitting generalised and decontextualised knowledge about teaching which is meant to be memorised and applied in practice. When taught in this way, students of teaching are invited to learn a critical theory of pedagogy

A. Ovens (✉)
University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand
e-mail: a.ovens@auckland.ac.nz

rather than engage with a pedagogy of critical theorizing (Giroux 1996). That is, when students learn about and analyse how power relations in education contexts influence educational outcomes, it tends to be through learning to critically analyse school practice and the work of teachers rather than being an active and ongoing critique of how professional learning is constituted in teacher education settings.

In this chapter I turn the research focus on myself to examine how I enact a form criticality within my pedagogy as a teacher educator. In particular, I explore how studying my use of peer-teaching with students in their fourth year of a physical education teacher education (PETE) programme can improve my future practice. By peer-teaching I mean the practice of organizing the lesson so that students take turns at being in the teaching role, teaching their peers, receiving peer-feedback from their peers, and reflecting on the experience (Garbett and Ovens 2012). In this way, the structure and organisation of the lesson is significantly different from a lecturer-focused, transmission approach to one where students learn from participating in a learning community focused on them and their practice of teaching. Turning the focus on myself provided a means to analyse my practice in the moment of its production and consider the tacit and personal practical knowledge that is central to my knowledge and understanding of teaching (Myers, 2002; Pinnegar and Hamilton 2009).

I enact this approach with final-year students enrolled in a 4-year PETE degree programme. The students in this programme are immersed in the nature and content of physical education from day 1, with pedagogical studies an important aspect running alongside, and sometimes within, the broader course work they undertake as part of the degree. In addition, the students participate in at least one practicum experience each year. This means that by the time they enroll in my year-four course, they have experienced teaching in a range of schools, at various grade levels, and in different content areas. With this set of prior knowledge and experiences in mind, my aim in using peer-teaching is to enable an inquiry-oriented approach to engaging PETE students to think critically about their professional knowledge, the problems they encounter in pedagogical situations, and the means for resolving these problems. I want to structure the course as a locus or space where the role of being a student is not to simply to learn a body of pre-determined knowledge in a passive way from someone positioned as an expert, but rather to unpack, examine, and consider how the knowledge they bring from prior experiences shape their actions and problem-solving as teachers of physical education.

Examining the Self-in-Practice

I chose to undertake a self-study to illuminate, provoke, and challenge my practice as a teacher educator (Bullough and Pinnegar 2001). Opening my teaching to such scrutiny allows consideration of what constitutes meaningful learning experiences (for myself and my students) and models the ongoing critical conversation that should be the core of teacher education. As LaBoskey (2004) comments,

> Our motivation in adopting a self-study stems also from the acknowledgement that we are as limited by our own personal histories and cultural identities as are our students, we cannot expand their horizons if we do not expand our own. Similarly, we cannot help them to detect and interrogate their biases if we do not detect and interrogate ours (p. 840).

Opening one's pedagogy to inquiry is not straightforward since it is configured within multiple and interdependent elements such as biography, personal politics, regulatory standards, institutional culture, teaching space, and resourcing. Trying not to unravel these strands, and therefore losing a sense of the agentic contribution each makes to how pedagogy is performed, meant critically examining my assumptions about how peer-teaching, as a pedagogy, could structure meaningful learning opportunities (Brookfield 1995). A search of my rationale and within the research literature revealed two key assumptions that underpinned my use of peer-teaching.

Assumption 1: By Having Opportunities To Be in the Teaching Role Student Teachers Experience the Relational Complexities and Dilemmas of Teaching

Peer-teaching has the potential to significantly shift the structure of the lesson away from a transmission style of teaching to one where students learn from participating in a learning community focussed on the practice of teaching. It confronts the dualism that teaching knowledge and teaching practice are separate (Britzman 1991). By having opportunities to be in the teaching role student teachers experience the relational complexities and dilemmas of teaching that are central to professional decision making and enacting good judgment. The need for constant discernment and decision making forms the basis for reflection and learning (I'Anson, Rodrigues, & Wilson 2003; Macintyre Latta and Field 2005; Wilson and I'Anson 2006). Knowledge for teaching is not represented as certain or generic, but enacted as a way of solving the specific pedagogical problems embedded in the teaching situation.

Assumption 2: Peer-Teaching Creates a Critical Learning Community

Students perceive peer-teaching as providing a worthwhile learning experience that is both positive and enabling (Fernández and Robinson 2006; Hansen et al. 2007; Rubin and Herbet 1998; Tien et al. 2002). When students are given the opportunity to develop collegial learning relationships there are often associated social, emotional, and cognitive gains (Le Cornu 2005; Topping 2005). Peer-teaching can create a positive learning community that is more inclusive, satisfying, and interactive than large lecture style teaching (Ten Cate and Durning 2007). It also allows peers to explain concepts in language they can understand (Ten Cate and Durning 2007).

Research supports the notion that peer-teaching is an effective way of teaching theoretical knowledge; clinical and psychomotor skills; and leadership and collegial behaviour (Goldschmidt and Goldschmidt 1976; Secomb 2008). Deeper learning of subject matter also happens as students accept the responsibility for reviewing, organising, and presenting subject material in such a way that it can be learnt by their peers (Whitman and Fife 1988).

Implementation

To implement the peer-teaching approach I organised the lessons so that each student was allocated a time within the course to teach a series of 30-min lessons to the rest of the class. The peer-teaching process followed a set procedure based on peer- and self-assessment. Immediately after each lesson, everyone gathered in a circle to debrief. Those in the teaching role began with a brief explanation of their rationale for the lesson. They then reflected on their own performance by firstly stating what they could improve on, and then what they did well. The members of the class then gave a first round of feedback focused on aspects that could be improved and a second round that focused on aspects that were good about the lesson. I also participated and gave feedback. In these rounds there was no right of reply. Those in the teaching role could choose what they took on board and were encouraged to reflect on the comments after the lesson. In this way, learning about teaching was both situated in the teaching role and in response to how knowing-in-action was enacted as a form of professional judgment. Summative assessment was based on an essay in which they reflected on the feedback received in relation to their beliefs about teaching.

Grounding the Study Empirically

In order to situate myself within this study and 'describe, interpret and discover' (Cochran-Smith 2008, p. 275) my pedagogy, I used dialogic self-study conversations (Placier et al. 2005) in which I worked closely with a critical friend in an iterative and collaborative manner. Three forms of empirical material were generated for examination within our conversations. Firstly, through a reflective journal, I wrote regularly about my experiences of implementing peer-teaching. The journal documented my impressions and descriptions of events, circumstances, experiences, discussions, and reflections (Holly 1984). Secondly, my critical friend observed me teaching throughout the semester. Thirdly, eight students volunteered to be part of two focus group interviews. Their comments were audio taped and transcribed.

Throughout the course of the study, which began in 2007 and continued over the following 3 years, my critical friend and I met regularly, often on a daily basis. Our regular meetings provided both support for implementing the approach and

assumption hunting (Brookfield 1995). The conversations were a form of ongoing analysis and the basis for 'checking ideas, developing evidence, and creating an authoritative space from which to make claims for assertions for action or under-standing' (Placier et al. 2005, p. 61). Drawing on one another's perspective, being challenged to read representations of experience differently, and linking this to the wider literature, we were able to make key aspects of my pedagogy explicit and available for critique. Finally we planned future actions as our understanding of this approach co-evolved.

Tales of Experience

The following discussion is oriented around three themes that demonstrate how our dialogic self-study conversations helped to focus, support, and challenge my teaching. Each theme emerged as an issue that I needed to manage in enacting peer-teaching effectively. All names of the student teachers have been changed.

New Roles and New Skills

The most immediate result of implementing peer-teaching was that it changed my role in the class and fundamentally altered my perception and experience of the lesson. Initially, I thought my disorientation was due to the fact that I didn't have the skills to facilitate a more participative and fluid style of learning. I definitely felt more comfortable presenting information in a classroom and realised that my teaching skills had been honed over time to be effective in a transmission style. In this new format I found the temporal and spatial patterning of the lesson disorienting in the sense that the pace, space and movement within the lesson felt strange and foreign.

I knew how to teach in a lecture setting, but found it difficult to know how to support learning activity in this new arrangement. When should I interrupt and say something, and when should I stay quiet and let the process work its way through? This uncertainty was challenged by my critical friend, who commented in her observation notes,

> *Why didn't the students [who were teaching the session] say something to those late-comers? Why didn't you challenge them to ask? Is it acceptable in Physical Education to arrive late? (Observation notes: 26 July 2007)*
>
> *When Alex was so condescending, why didn't you say something? I wanted to ask Daniel how it felt to be talked to like that. (Observation notes: 2 August 2007)*

In the meetings that followed these events, our dialogic conversations began with the struggle to know when to interrupt peer-teaching, and how to facilitate the conversations more effectively and create the critical learning community I was seeking. We noted the difficulties in noticing the key elements that may affect the

lesson, challenge the students so forthrightly, and maintain a positive learning culture. Doing this involved a fine balance between maintaining a positive relationship with the students and giving them honest feedback. Berry (2007) writes of this as a tension between safety and challenge. Berry noted that her style was to be confrontational in debriefing peer-teaching but that such a style could reduce the feelings of safety (and opportunities for growth) for her students. Mine was non-confrontational.

When comments from my journal were also included in our discussions, my critical friend suggested there was a need to also examine how I was feeling in these lessons. For example, early on I wrote, *I get so bored just watching them teach*. (Journal entry: 18 June 2007). By exploring these, I came to realise that while I was feeling lost in how to teach using this approach, I was also not getting much pleasure from my teaching. Since peer-teaching required students to become actively involved in the learning process, this necessitated a shift in my roles during the lesson (Rubin and Herbert 1998). It was uncomfortable to realise that I liked being the expert who provided all the information and that transmitting information was easier than fostering students' knowing in action. Using peer-teaching meant that I needed alternative ways to use my knowledge to help students learning that also lead to feelings of satisfaction, accomplishment, and enjoyment for me.

Importance of Authenticity

The concept of authenticity emerged early in respect to how students engaged with teaching their peers. The difficulties and confusion were apparent through comments such as:

> *Teaching peers is confusing as do we teach them as student teachers or as mock students from school? It is hard to take the task seriously. (Student comment; 19 June 2007)*
>   *The situation in peer-teaching never accurately simulated an adolescent classroom environment. And peers are very nice to each other and don't always give thorough and honest feedback. (Student comment: 19 June 2007)*

The students' comments reflect that peer-teaching could be construed as some form of simulation activity that was meant to model a situation one may find in a school. When performed in this way, the task risked becoming very artificial because it lacked any clear congruence with a school context. Our self-study conversations highlighted the subtle differences between teaching being acted rather than enacted. Acting implies that participants frame the task as a theatrical performance in which they can practice or rehearse a role (Bell 2007). In contrast, enacting implies the performance is enmeshed with, and emerges from, the immediate context (Loughran 2007). When group members were pretending to be students rather than being actual students, the actions within the lesson, from both those in the student and teaching roles, became stereotypical and superficial representations of the teaching process. For example, if group members pretended to be bored in a lesson, as though they were playing the role of disinterested teenagers, they followed some preconceived

script: yawning loudly, calling out inane comments, and the like. The person in the teaching role then resorted to artificially managing the situation (for example, warning students that they would be detained after the session).

Focussing student attention on the distinction between acting and enacting became important to structuring the experience. When the students acted bored, the situation became a parody of a school classroom; the authenticity was low and the opportunity for meaningful learning from the activity was reduced. However, if the students were actually bored during a lesson taught by one of their peers, it became something that could be discussed meaningfully. What acts, ideas, and words promoted the disengagement that led to boredom? How does a teacher cope with a diverse range of students – whose interests were being served? In such discussions the participants were able to share their genuine feelings and thoughts.

Vulnerability

Discussions with students provided an insight into how important it was to ameliorate the feedback and be conscious of the social dynamics in play for the students. For example:

> I think we tried to make them [lessons] meaningful. And every single time we tried to do anything we just got hammered, so we just got so over it by the end of it that we were just trying to make a fun lesson so everyone would just enjoy it. (Alison, focus group interview: 23 November 2007)
>
> I found [being critiqued by my peers] useful but some people in the class, it had a real negative effect on their teaching. They actually couldn't handle it… I witnessed one boy actually just think he was totally useless and pretty much give up because he couldn't cope with getting slammed all the time. (Karen, focus group interview: 23 November 2007)

Feeding comments like these into our dialogic conversations challenged us to consider the nature of the community being created. Of concern was how vulnerable students felt at times. They often used emotive terms like 'slammed', 'hammered' or 'smashed' to label the critique of their teaching. Terms like these indicated that the students did not 'hear' the feedback in the way it was intended, but instead took it personally as criticism. I needed to attend to the emotional response to being critiqued as well as finding ways to include open discussion (and model) that feeling vulnerable, uncomfortable, possibly hurt, and upset are acceptable and normal reactions when your teaching actions are scrutinized.

However, while creating this form of learning community is the goal, another comment from one of the students drew my attention to the need to consider how the social dynamics operating within the class were mediating my intentions of open discussion. Sally was one of the students who often spoke and gave, what she felt, was an honest opinion. She suggested that,

> There is an ongoing consequence of what you say. I wouldn't go to the extreme because when I walk out that door, they're then going to say, 'Oh, she's a bitch,' ra-ra-ra. (Sally, focus group interview: 26 November 2007)

Sally's comment showed that she was conscious of who was being critiqued and the possible social cost. I had essentially ignored the fact that these students had studied together as a cohort for 4 years and now had an established social hierarchy and network that extended beyond the course. This strong set of connections influenced how students related to each other and what they could say in their feedback. This was somewhat ironic given my intention to create a safe environment for critical inquiry.

Reframed Understandings: Reflecting on My Initial Assumptions

Cochran-Smith (2008) suggests that the way forward in teacher education includes a journey of describing, interpreting, and discovering our way into the future. By engaging in dialogic conversations, the purpose was not to explicate and share with others what works for me in practice or provide a confessional story about my attempts to implement a new idea. Rather, through an iterative and collaborative scrutiny of my teaching I aimed to make explicit the hidden nature of teaching itself (Loughran 2004) as a way of moving forward with my own teaching. Through this process, I discovered that my initial assumptions about peer-teaching were reframed and expanded in the following ways:

Assumption 1: By Having Opportunities To Be in the Teaching Role Student Teachers Experience the Relational Complexities and Dilemmas of Teaching

It may initially appear obvious that peer-teaching provides an opportunity to take on authentic aspects of the teaching role and, by implication, provide the opportunity to experience the relational complexities and dilemmas of teaching. Situations are said to be authentic when the use and value of the practices being performed can be explicitly attributed to communities of practice that are not directly in evidence (Barab et al. 2000). In using peer-teaching, I felt I had structured an authentic situation because the students would engage in the sorts of practices that teachers would normally do when in the teaching role and solving the situational problems faced while in the role. It appeared to be a structure that fostered the kinds of thinking and problem-solving skills that students would need to use in schools (Putnam and Borko 2000).

However, as became apparent, being in a teaching role does not mean that the students experience an authentic situation. What I, believed authentic (from the perspective of an experienced educator), may not be perceived by students in the same way. Conversely, what was authentic to the students may not have been authentic to me. A further possibility existed that neither of our perceptions of authenticity

would be considered authentic in the school-based community of practice. As Barab et al. (2000) note, perceptions of authenticity emerge from the relationship between the practices individuals perform and the use-value of these practices. In other words, in order for students to experience the relational complexities and dilemmas of teaching, they needed to perform the immediate situation as 'real' rather than as an imagined school situation. This meant focusing their attention on the need to teach their peers as actual students rather than pretending they were school students. I learnt to encourage those in the teaching role to '*teach the students in front of you*' and to '*drive the lesson not go through the motions*'. This focus greatly enhanced the quality and relevance of the peer-teaching.

Coupled with this, I found that other contextual features affected the perception of authenticity. Unlike school situations, where lessons are sequenced, cumulative, and foreground the learning of curriculum knowledge, the peer-teaching sessions tended to be one-off and disjointed, confined to short time lengths, and involved teaching content that was not necessarily related to the learning outcomes of the course. I have managed this in different ways. Initially, I encouraged those in the teaching role to be creative in designing their session so that the intention for their peers was to experience a myriad of different ideas and approaches to teaching physical education. Later in the project, I modified the approach to so the peer-teaching became more focused on teaching topics related to aspects of the course content.

Assumption 2: Peer-Teaching Creates a Critical Learning Community

In making learning a collective activity, peer-teaching draws on the knowledge, experience and support of everyone in the class. While discussing new concepts in small groups gives students the opportunity to articulate their ideas and provides a diversity of viewpoints that enables deeper understandings, I had been naïve about the extent to which the sense of community for the students existed prior to, and extended beyond, the boundaries of my course. I found that my students were part of a very close cohort within a degree programme, and all the friendships, rivalries, and aspects of being a part of a close social network were all actively influencing how my course operated as a space for learning about teaching.

This is not to suggest that a culture central to being a critical learning community cannot be created in the course. What has emerged from my reflections on students' comments has been how useful it has been for them to experience what it was like to be a learner in a variety of different teachers' classes. As Sarah, one of the students, commented when she reflected on the experience,

That kind of made me realize what my kids would be like, because I misbehaved at different times because of different reasons and now I can look back, when I am teaching, and go well that guy's doing that but I kind of know why now because maybe I'm coming at the lesson in a different, like in the wrong way, or I'm not actually catering for their needs or I'm not treating them the way that I should be and that's why they're misbehaving, not because he's got an issue, you know? (Sarah, focus group interview, 27 November, 2007).

Sarah's comment shows more than a teacher identifying with her students. Coupled with her hesitant delivery, the statement reveals her struggle with the complex nature of teaching. This does indicate students engage and are provoked to think about teaching in a different way.

Concluding Thoughts

Developing a pedagogy of critical theorising implies more than cosmetic reform of programmes to ensure they are 'research informed and led' or about the instructional strategies used to structure individual courses. Rather, it implies attention is given to the curriculum of teacher education in a way that meaningfully ensures that the purpose, nature, culture, and process of learning to teach provides multiple spaces and communities to promote reflexive engagement with ideas in a way that challenges prior experience and assumptions while also creating avenues for alternative thinking, alternative experiences, and alternative ways of knowing (Ovens 2013; Segall 2002). Educational theory is not about the mastery of knowledge that can inform teaching decisions, but about a means for critique for how we come to know and understand the process of education.

However, when enacting this as a form of pedagogy it is necessary to acknowledge that the world of the learner is always in flux and that the connection between learner, teacher, and context is 'not linked by chains of causality, but (by) layers of meaning, recursive dynamics, non-linear effects and chance' (Osberg 2008, p. viii). In other words, those who wish to enact a critical pedagogy need to recognise the limitations of rationality to enable change with any certainty (Tinning 2002). Through this self-study I have a deeper appreciation that to enact a critical pedagogy I need to be sensitive to the interconnections and the intricate interrelations, the layering of experiences, events, histories, intentions, and biographies that work together to produce emergent effects across a range of embedded and mutually implicated settings, networks, and fields. The challenge of enacting a critical pedagogy is not about adopting a new approach, or understanding how to manage the multiple issues that arise from the instructional methods employed, but confronting how our own pedagogies anesthetise the students from challenging their own education. Only in this way can we ensure that theory is connected to everyday practice because it enables it to be lived rather than reduced to be content to be learnt.

References

Barab, S., Squire, K., & Dueber, B. (2000). A co-evolutionary model for supporting the emergence of authenticity. *Educational Technology Research and Development, 48*(2), 37–62.

Bell, B. (2007). Microteaching: What is going on here? *Linguistics and Education, 18*, 24–40.

Berry, A. (2007). *Tensions in teaching about teaching: Understanding practice as a teacher educator*. Dordrecht: Springer.

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

Brookfield, S. (1995). *Becoming a critically reflective teacher*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bullough, R. V., Jr., & Pinnegar, S. (2001). Guidelines for quality in autobiographical forms of self-study research. *Educational Researcher, 30*(3), 13–21.

Cochran-Smith, M. (2008). The new teacher education in the United States: Directions forward. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 14*(4), 271–282.

Fernández, M., & Robinson, M. (2006). Prospective teachers' perspectives on microteaching lesson study. *Education, 127*(2), 203–215.

Garbett, D., & Ovens, A. (2012). Being a teacher educator: Exploring issues of authenticity and safety through self-study. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 37*(3), 44–56.

Giroux, H. (1996). *Counternarratives: Cultural studies and critical pedagogies in postmodern spaces*. New York: Routledge.

Goldschmidt, B., & Goldschmidt, M. (1976). Peer teaching in higher education: A review. *Higher Education, 5*, 9–33.

Hansen, L., McCollum, M., Paulsen, S., Cyr, T., Jarvis, C., & Tate, G. (2007). Evaluation of an evidence based peer teaching assessment program. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education, 71*(3), 1–7.

Holly, M. L. (1984). *Keeping a professional personal journal*. Geelong: Deakin University Press.

I'Anson, J., Rodrigues, S., & Wilson, G. (2003). Mirrors, reflections and refractions: The contribution of microteaching to reflective practice. *European Journal of Teacher Education, 26*(2), 189–199.

LaBoskey, V. K. (2004). The methodology of teaching and its theoretical underpinnings. In J. J. Loughran, M. L. Hamilton, V. K. LaBoskey, & T. Russell (Eds.), *International handbook of self-study of teaching and teacher education practices* (pp. 817–869). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Press.

Le Cornu, R. (2005). Peer mentoring: Engaging pre-service teachers in mentoring one another. *Mentoring and Tutoring, 13*(3), 355–366.

Loughran, J. (2004). A history and context of self-study of teaching and teacher education practices. In J. J. Loughran, M. L. Hamilton, V. K. LaBoskey, & T. Russell (Eds.), *International handbook of self-study of teaching and teacher education practices* (pp. 7–39). Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Loughran, J. (2007). Enacting a pedagogy of teacher education. In T. Russell & J. Loughran (Eds.), *Enacting a pedagogy of teacher education: Values, relationships and practices* (pp. 1–15). New York: Routledge.

Macintyre Latta, M., & Field, J. (2005). The flight from experience to representation: Seeing relational complexity on teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 21*, 649–660.

Myers, C. B. (2002). Can self-study challenge the belief that telling, showing and guided practice constitute adequate teacher education? In J. J. Loughran & T. Russell (Eds.), *Improving teacher education practices through self-study* (pp. 130–142). London: Routledge Falmer.

Osberg, D. (2008). The politics in complexity. *Journal of the Canadian Association for Curriculum Studies, 6*(1), 3–13.

Ovens, A. (2013). Disturbing practice in teacher education. *New Zealand Physical Educator, 46*(2), 20–21.

Pinnegar, S., & Hamilton, M. (2009). *Self-study of practice as a genre of qualitative research*. New York: Springer.

Placier, P., Pinnegar, S., Hamilton, M., & Guilfoyle, K. (2005). Exploring the concept of dialogue in the self-study of teaching practices. In C. Kosnik, C. Beck, A. Freese, & A. Samaras (Eds.), *Making a difference in teacher education through self-study* (pp. 51–64). Dordrecht: Springer.

Putnam, R., & Borko, H. (2000). What do new views of knowledge and thinking have to say about research on teacher learning? *Educational Researcher, 29*(1), 4–15.

Rubin, L., & Herbert, C. (1998). Model for active learning: Collaborative peer teaching. *College Teaching, 46*(1), 26–30.

Secomb, J. (2008). A systematic review of peer teaching and learning in clinical education. *Journal of Clinical Nursing, 17*(6), 703–716.

Segall, A. (2002). *Disturbing practice: Reading teacher education as text*. New York: Peter Lang.

Ten Cate, O., & Durning, S. (2007). Peer teaching in medical education: Twelve reasons to move from theory to practice. *Medical Teacher, 29*(6), 591–599.

Tien, L. T., Roth, V., & Kampmeier, J. A. (2002). Implementation of a peer-led team learning approach in an undergraduate organic chemistry course. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 39*(7), 606–632.

Tinning, R. (2002). Toward a "modest pedagogy": Reflections on the problematics of critical pedagogy. *Quest, 54*(3), 224–240.

Topping, K. (2005). Trends in peer learning. *Educational Psychology, 25*(6), 631–645.

Whitman, N., & Fife, J. (1988). *Peer teaching: To teach is to learn twice. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 4*. Washington, DC: ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Reports, The George Washington University.

Wilson, G., & I'Anson, J. (2006). Reframing the practicum: Constructing performative space initial teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 22*, 353–361.

A Journey of Critical Scholarship in Physical Education Teacher Education

Erin Cameron

Context and Objectives of the Study

I am a beginning teacher educator in a university physical education program in Canada. This emerging identity is informed by my past role as a professional athlete and current roles as a doctoral student and contract lecturer in a physical education teacher education (PETE) program. In this chapter, I illustrate how these roles are not only interrelated but I argue that taking the time to understand their relatedness has been instrumental to understanding my developing 'critical' pedagogy (CP).

Through a year-long critical autoethnographic self-study (CASS), I explore my shifting perspectives during the 2010–2011 university school year as a student in my first year of doctoral studies and as a co-instructor of a course titled 'Curriculum and Instruction in Health and Physical Education'. I draw upon reflective journaling and critical dialogues with internationally renowned scholars in physical education to explore the research questions: *What informs my developing critical pedagogy? How does this influence my teaching practice?* The paper has three objectives: (a) to explain the nature and process of CASS methodology, (b) to highlight key moments when thinking about my CP changed, and (c) to identify some of the ways in which my professional knowledge of teaching practice has benefited from this form of inquiry.

This study is important for three reasons. First, just like students can't help but learn in ways that reflect their past learning experiences, teacher educators cannot help but teach from their subjective experiences (Palmer 1998). As such, understanding and sharing how our past, current, and future experiences impact our attitudes, beliefs, and values as researchers and teacher educators is of utmost importance (Loughran 2006). Second, there is growing recognition of the complex and multifaceted process that contributes to becoming a teacher educator (Williams

E. Cameron (✉)
Assistant Professor, School of Human Kinetics and Recreation,
Memorial University of Newfoundland, St. John's, NL, A1C 5S7, Canada
e-mail: ecameron@mun.ca

et al. 2012). As a result, a growing number of scholars are suggesting that self-study methodology offers a 'promising method for new teacher educators to make meaning of their developing pedagogies' (Bullock and Ritter 2011, p. 173). This is particularly important given that new teacher educators often 'do not think about the issues of teacher education in a general sense or about the programs they work in beyond their individual courses' (Zeichner 2005, p. 120). Yet, few have endeavoured to explore the experiences of beginning physical education teacher educators, and it is my hope to contribute to this body of literature by sharing my own experiences and encouraging other beginning physical education teacher educators to engage in self-study 'not only for what it shows about the self but because of its potential to reveal knowledge of the educational landscape' (Clandinin and Connelly 2004, p. 597). Third, a number of scholars are calling for 'critical consideration and/or revisiting of programs in light of changing societal and student needs for global, socially and culturally responsive PETE' (Melnychuk et al. 2011, p. 148). Critical pedagogy, which derives from the idea of education for social justice, endeavours to transform inequitable, undemocratic, and oppressive institutions and social relations. This study responds to this call for reconsideration and reimagining of PETE programs in Canada and beyond. It builds upon the rich history of CP within physical education, which began in the 1990s and highlights the need for more socially, culturally, and critically oriented PETE programs (*cf.* Fernandez-Balboa 1997; Fitzpatrick 2010; Halas 2011; Kirk 2010; Macdonald and Brooker 2000; Tinning 2002).

Why Self-Study and Critical Autoethnography?

Hamilton and Pinnegar (1998) define self-study as 'the study of one's self, one's actions, one's ideas, as well as the "not self"' (p. 236). Self-study provides a framework for inquiry that enables teacher educators to explore the gap between who we think we are and who we think we would like to be (Pinnegar and Hamilton 2009). As Wilcox et al. (2004) write, self-study helps 'to uncover, critique, and celebrate the less explicit, yet significant, aspects of professional practice' (p. 307). At its core it is a recursive process where teaching philosophies and practices are 'revisited, reinterpreted, reframed, and restoried' (Tidwell et al. 2009, p. xix). As Pithouse et al. (2009) write, self-study 'involves using methods that facilitate a stepping back, a reading of our situated selves as if it were a text to be critically interrogated and interpreted within the broader social, political, and historical contexts that shape our thoughts and actions and constitutes our world' (p. 45).

It is the dual purpose of self-study, to incite reflective practice and transformative education, that makes it uniquely positioned to contribute to a social justice agenda (LaBoskey 2004). However, LaBoskey (2004) argues that 'the connection is not automatic' (p. 81) and it is for this reason that I believe critical autoethnographic self-study (CASS) (Pennington 2006) is particularly suited to self-studies that aim to explicitly bring social justice issues to the forefront. Not only has CASS been used to prompt pre-service teachers to examine their white racial identities in

relation to their practice (Pennington and Brock 2012) but teacher educators have used CASS to examine their complex identities and histories within the classroom and their attitudes towards students (Pennington et al. 2012). As Kincheloe (2005) writes 'teachers and students who gain such a critical ontological awareness understand how dominant cultural perspectives have helped construct their political opinions, religious beliefs, gender roles, racial positions, and sexual orientation' (p. 162). By employing CASS I am intentionally engaging in what Lincoln and Denzin (2005) have called the 'methodologically contested present' (p. 1116), where blurring genres pushes methodological boundaries (Hamilton et al. 2008). While critical autoethnography and self-study are both methodologies that have 'I' at the centre, the blending of the two recognizes that *self* does not exist apart from but rather is part *of* complex social structures.

While CASS was used in this research, the design of the study was consistent with characteristics of self-study research identified by LaBoskey (2004). First, it was self-initiated and focused. Not only did I want to teach but I wanted to engage in reflective practice throughout my first year of teaching in order to better understand my practice. Second, it was improvement aimed. Despite the recognized need for more critical approaches in physical education, there is a recognized need for more effective strategies to address power and privilege within the physical education classroom (Halas et al. 2012). Third, it was interactive. As I was co-teaching the course with my doctoral supervisor, I met with her on numerous occasions to discuss the course and to reflect upon my teaching practice. I also wrote reflective journal entries after most classes and we used these as texts to analyze and critique. Fourth, it included multiple, primarily qualitative, methods. Not only did I engage in narrative inquiry through reflective journaling, but also through dialogues with six prominent scholars around the world about the *process* of becoming a critical scholar in physical education and teaching in a PETE program.

By engaging both an internal reflective tool and an external reflective tool I was able to analyze my developing CP within the broader context of PETE. Through several successive rounds of data analysis, involving coding, categorizing, and identifying concepts (Lichtman 2010), a number of key themes emerged that highlighted my developing CP. Furthermore, ongoing discussions with my co-instructor and supervisor helped to further affirm how my thinking about teaching practice was changing.

In the following sections, I highlight how I came to CASS methodology and what I learned through the process about my teaching practice. It is my hope to promote CASS 'as an approach which creates space for others to engage in critical thought' (Lyle 2009, p. 294) so that together we can reconsider and reimagine PETE pedagogy and practice in the twenty-first century.

Examining My Developing Critical Pedagogy

In the months leading up to the PETE course, my excitement escalated. Not only was I excited to teach adult learners, I was also excited to engage CP as a way to disrupt some of the dominant discourses and ideologies within physical education.

While I hadn't always been critical of physical education, a growing sense of discomfort with the field had encouraged me to pursue doctoral studies where I had been introduced to CP, what I described in one of my dialogues as a '*language of possibility*'. As part of the doctoral program, I conducted numerous literature reviews on the history of physical education, the emergence of CP in physical education, and physical education reform. I quickly realized I was not alone, that in fact there were many arguing for physical education reform, PETE reform, and for the inclusion of more social-cultural perspectives in physical education. I learned how rationalism and the Scientific Revolution gave shape to ideologies of mind/body separation and inspired educators to promote physical education as a vehicle for military training (Phillips and Roper 2006); how ideas in medicine and psychology about sanitary practices and physical activity inspired educators to use physical education to promote health (Van Dalen and Bennett 1953); and, how, in Canada, low fitness levels among men enlisting in WW2 and a desire to stimulate amateur sport inspired educators to emphasize fitness and sport in physical education curricula (Morrow and Wamsley 2005). While this emphasis on fitness and sport has remained dominant over the last 50 years, it has been argued that a new agenda has emerged where schools, particularly physical education programs, are targeting childhood obesity (Azzarito 2007; Evans et al. 2008). Sadly, such acculturation of neoliberal ideology results in the promotion of body regulation and serves to fuel dominant discourses of fat bodies being 'at risk' (Lupton 2013). In response, a growing number of voices are calling for critical reflection on a view of physical education that is dominated by obesity discourse (Gard and Wright 2005; Webb et al. 2008).

With the Best of Intentions

It was in reading the critical physical education scholarship where I felt I had found an academic home. I began to critique all positivistic, reductionistic approaches, and began to identify as a critical pedagogue. Like others, I began to argue that physical education has largely been influenced by master narratives derived from privileged, white, elite, Western worldviews (Fernández-Balboa 1997) that have encouraged or abetted the continual progress of science and technology, industrialization, and medicalization of life, referring to how more and more of everyday life has come under the medical dominion, influence, and supervision (Conrad 1992). I wrote in my journal: *I feel as though we need a whole new language to talk about the concept of being and living.* I increasingly drew from the work of Foucault (1977, 1984) and Bourdieu (1990) to argue that with the increased agenda of high standards and measurement, bodies were being turned into sites of punishment and privilege, and as a result, many youth were suffering from these injustices (Cameron et al. 2014). I drew attention to the need for more physical educators to understand how the subject was (and was not) engaging students in meaning-making practices about their bodies, from the perspective of both a physical and social construction. For instance, I wrote in my journal: *are we teaching youth about bodies in such a*

way that they don't know how to be…that we teach our youth to say NO but that we don't teach them to say YES? While this entry was inspired by the growing controversies within the sex education curriculum in Ontario, I felt these could be extended to other body-related activities such as eating and activity. As has been shown, youth are well-versed in health discourses and the behaviours that can and cannot make them healthy, but few actually choose to engage in such behaviours (Rail 2009). I argued that physical education continues to focus on providing students with information, skills, and confidence, but little attention is given to situating these within broader contexts of society.

When the time finally came to start planning for the PETE course, my co-instructor and I drew heavily from Fernández-Balboa's (1995) work around reclaiming PETE through CP. There were three goals for the course. Our first goal was to connect the course to broader social issues. We wanted students to see health and physical education as broader than just sport techniques. For this reason, we included a diversity of topics related to wellbeing and introduced a variety of pedagogical models (e.g., Sport Education, Teaching Games for Understanding, and Teaching for Personal and Social Responsibility). Our second goal was to challenge conventional relations of power in the classroom. We hoped to create spaces that encouraged emancipative dialogue by positioning power and privilege in all classroom discussions, and by inviting students' experiences and perspectives to be equally as necessary as our own in the creation of classroom knowledge. In doing so we hoped to acknowledge the possibilities and limits of our own knowledge and perspectives and challenge the notion of teacher-as-expert. Following Fernández-Balboa's (1995) suggestion we endeavoured to co-create the syllabus and design the course content, topics, and assignments with the students. So on the first day of class we presented the syllabus as a rough draft and invited students to provide feedback. Other strategies we employed to challenge power relations were: talking circles, interactive classes that prompted dialogue, and community building activities. Our third goal was to bring the personal and the political into the learning experience. We wanted students to question knowledge, particularly around who benefits from it, how it changes over time, how it is used, and who it influences. This approach stemmed from our desire to inspire a group of students to value difference and diversity, be attentive to one another, and to care about and protect the health of each other, the environment, and oneself. We hoped that by employing CP our students would 'acknowledge, accommodate, and adopt more holistic and integrative ways of knowing and living' and 'be better prepared to teach in a society of multiple values and traditions, and I dare say, would be more able to renew the world' (Fernández-Balboa 1995, p. 99).

While there were a few students in the class who embraced and expressed appreciation for our approach, the majority resisted. Even our attempt to engage the students in co-creating the syllabus fell flat as we received no feedback. My journal entry for that day should have been a forewarning of what was to come.

> *I watched the students' expressions intently – some were nodding, while others looked absolutely stunned. Some of their faces seemed to say … 'What kind of PE is this!? Gardening? Spirituality? Death Education? Book Clubs? Journaling?' I had to stop from laughing out*

loud out of nervousness. I can't help but think about the year ahead... How will our critical approach be received?

While there were many moments throughout the course that were suggestive of how our critical approach was being received, it was the second last day that was the most memorable. As outlined in their negotiated final assignment outline, two students had chosen to create a film that examined conventional physical education with more alternative forms. While we had approved the outline, the final product was none-other than a 'mockumentary' of the course. I still remember how sick I felt watching the video. One by one they picked apart and mocked the social justice issues that we had asked them to critically reflect upon, such as racism, sexism, elitism, and healthism. In one scene, a student dressed in a fat suit woke up, got out of bed, reached into his pants (for what appears to be an erection), pulled out a chocolate bar, and proceeded to eat it. I am still not sure why we didn't stop it or how I held back tears of frustration. It wasn't just the film, but also the standing ovation they received by half a dozen males in the class that left a lasting impact.

When I think back to that film on the last day of class, I can still remember sitting there paralyzed by disbelief and being at a loss for words. In fact, neither my co-instructor nor I said anything during or at the conclusion of the video. It wasn't until a few days later that I reflected on the experience in my journal: '*I am calling it a mutiny. A besiege. A form of resistance. Whatever it was – whatever I call it... it was shocking, disturbing, and deeply unsettling*'. For months I relived the experience and went through a range of emotions, from anger to sadness. Mostly I struggled with a sense of helplessness, especially knowing that these students would pass (despite a low grade in physical education) and could go on to become certified as teachers. While I initially blamed the students' unquestioning compliance with the field's determined boundaries, their privileged backgrounds, and their hegemonic intent on preserving masculinity within physical education, later I turned the critical lens on my own teaching practice. I began to ask, what could I learn from their resistance to inform my practice? While I still can't help but think that my students were standing on the shoulders of the status quo in physical education, admittedly the resistance had also been a result of the pedagogical approach and critical practice that we had taken in the class.

Turning a Negative into a Positive

Given that our intention had been to challenge the master narratives and regimes of truth in physical education, I initially felt that we had been ineffective in doing so – I even went so far as to write that we '*failed to teach*'. But did we? While the students responded differently than I had anticipated or perhaps hoped for, the fact that they responded meant that they had engaged in the learning. Through my journal, it is evident that learning had taken place and that we had connected the students to broader issues. In fact, many of them responded enthusiastically to the alternative activities and ideas we included in the course. For example, many of them felt that the gardening lecture, where we had explored issues such as greening school-yards

and school food policies, had been extremely useful. One student even wrote to us after the course was finished to explain how the lecture on death education, where we had examined death as it related to health and wellbeing, had benefited her teaching practice.

When I now reflect back to the course I realize we didn't fail, but rather it was our interpretation and implementation of CP that failed (Muros-Ruiz and Fernandez-Balboa 2005). I can see that despite efforts to engage CP, I unwittingly perpetuated the 'repressive myth' of CP (Ellsworth 1992) by being too idealistic (O'Sullivan et al. 1992) and too fixed on ideas of acceptable moral behavior (Sicilia-Camacho and Fernandez-Balboa 2009). For, as much as I tried to challenge power and de-centre myself as the expert teacher, I maintained a position of authority over the class. In fact, the tension between my desire to give up power and my inexperience to do so is clearly evident in my journal. After the first day of class I wrote:

We presented the syllabus as a draft asking for their input. But what if they come back hating it all – what then? Do we start from scratch? How comfortable am I with reorienting my thoughts, ideas about what I think they should learn?

While my intentions had been to create a more socially, culturally, and critically oriented PETE program, I now realize how naïve, inexperienced, and ill-prepared I was to teach using CP. My hope had been to challenge power, but I failed to recognize the very fact that by employing CP I was enacting my power as the teacher. As Muros-Ruiz and Fernandez-Baloba (2005) argue:

… methods, no matter how they are used, do reflect specific relations of power. That is, using a so-called emancipator method in autocratic ways works against the aims of CP because, rather than encouraging students to be transformative, it forces them to comply (p. 258).

Research has shown that student resistance in teacher education can stem from a lack of preparation towards alternative praxis, being pushed too quickly towards thinking critically, and specific expectations of teacher education (Breunig 2006). While some resistance is arguably healthy as it can demonstrate student agency (Davis 1992), strong resistance can be discouraging and even harmful to some students and teachers. For instance, at the end of our course a few students indicated that while they had enjoyed the course and appreciated our approach, the overt resistance displayed by some students had turned them off of wanting to teach physical education in the future. One student went as far as to suggest that the overt resistance by several students had made her feel unsafe and unwelcome in the class and the field in general. As a beginning teacher educator I had felt similarly disoriented and discouraged by the resistance and for months struggled and questioned whether I should continue.

Fortunately, over time and as a result of this self-study I did not lose hope but rather gained new insights into my developing CP. I began to shift away from a focus on teaching students to *be* critical towards trying to understand the different ways we, students and I, *do* criticalness. This shift in thinking was further precipitated by my dialogues with critical scholars in physical education, who reinforced the ideas that teaching is emplaced, storied, and relational. These themes have not

only helped me to further my CP but also my teaching practice. While none of these themes seem out of the ordinary, their presence has been nothing shy of extraordinary for my practice. I am thankful for what they have taught me about myself and how they have contributed to my developing teacher educator self.

Teaching as Emplaced

I began dialogues with several critical scholars in physical education by sending each a narrative of the key moments, shifts, and transitions that I experienced in my critical journey. By offering my narrative, it was my hope that others would be inspired to reflect on their own journeys and identify the challenges they faced in forging their professional identities. One scholar responded by writing,

> *I don't know whether it is refreshing and hopeful to encounter a graduate student who is questioning the level of critical thought among physical educators, or depressing beyond words to be reminded that a severe lack of critical perspective and a studied avoidance of anything approaching social justice could probably be used as distinguishing characteristics of the field.*

Another suggested: '*The idea of key moments, shifts, and transitions is an interesting way to think about the pathways we take*'. He later went on to write:

> *I've come to view over the course of my career that very little of what I've done has been on the basis of such a 'rational' decision-making process. The issue for me is, how much do we position ourselves and to what extent are we positioned by others, by events, by our biographies?*

The discursive production of selves was a key theme to emerge through my dialogues. Others suggested that through multiple encounters, the books/articles they read, the people they spent time with and/or met, and the television/media they watched, they were constantly negotiating new subjective positions. As Davies and Harre (1990) write 'who one is always an open question with a shifting answer depending upon the positions made available within one's own and others' discursive practices' (p. 46). This diverges from role theory, where personhood can be seen as separate from various roles. So, while I began this study with the intention of understanding how my various roles have informed my critical journey (i.e., athlete, student, teacher), I have come to see that what I am really trying to understand is how my 'experiencesasathletestudentteacherinWesternculture' have informed my critical journey. This distinction not only captures the interconnected nature of my emerging professional identity, situated in time and place, but also the contextual nature of teaching, where social conventions within sport and education impact my teacher educator identity. This distinction is important in that it recognizes both the freedom and constraint in our positionality. This was well articulated by one scholar who wrote,

> *I think part of the answer to your question about our responsibility to address/interfere/ disempower, etc, harmful ideologies is to become aware of the possibilities and also the*

limitations of our multiple positionalities. This for me is an important first but also often repeated step in recognizing how we might practice critical pedagogy. At a very basic level, relative age and experience in a particular domain (eg. Critical scholarship in physical education and sport) determine to a large extent the positions we might occupy/live/practice in relation to others and the influence we may have.

It is by understanding teaching as emplacement, to put something into a specific time and place, which allows me to acknowledge where I am and where I might go in the future. For example, I have begun to recognize that while I endeavored to position myself as disruptive of physical education ideology in 'body' I was a *hegemonic functionariate* (Fernández-Balboa and Muros-Ruiz 2006) who served to reproduce the dominant ideologies within the subject. I represented the very phenotypic cues that matched with students' socialized expectations of 'who teaches' in physical education (Douglas and Halas 2013). In other words, students not only came to the class with expectations of *what* they would learn and *how* they would learn, but also *who* to expect as a teacher. This growing awareness was captured in my journal:

As the guest speakers were telling their stories I found myself looking around the room. It dawned on me in this class I was more like my students than I wanted to admit. Furthermore, I represented the very thing that I was trying so hard to trouble, critique, and disrupt. I was white, middle-class, able-bodied, athletic, and had excelled in PE and sport all through school. It was in being a jock/athlete that I had gained social currency and capital, and to a large degree still did.

It is this realization that made me recognize, that had I been a student in the class, I too would have likely resisted. As a 'trim, tight, lineless, bulgeless, and sagless' (Bordo 2003, p. 32) athlete I had easily 'measured up' and 'fit into' the dominant physical culture of health and physical education. In university, as I pursued kinesiology courses that focused on the material body, where the explicit curriculum was teaching the names of body parts and movement principles, the implicit curriculum was reinforcing an objectifying, mesomorphic, anti-intellectual, sexist, homophobic, and competitive jock culture (Hunter 2011; Kirk et al. 1997). This was perpetuated in the ways student performances and participation were systematically quantified, the homogeneity of teachers' and students' dress and body codes, the acquiring and legitimacy of gendered physical capital, and the privileging of the physical above all else. My ability to fit in with this culture not only gave me a sense of security, but it reinforced the subjective sense of who I was and supported my actions and choices in the world. As Bourdieu and Wacquant (1989) write '…when habitus encounters a social world of which it is the product, it finds itself 'as a fish in water', it does not feel the weight of the water and takes the world about itself for granted' (p. 43). Moreover, as Gramsci (1971) points out, it is the very discourses that are normalized and accepted by a culture that often serves to enable injustices and oppression.

As a result of this self-study, I have become increasingly aware of positionality and how teaching is a discursive process of positioning oneself and being positioned by others. It is not sufficient to 'trouble, disrupt, critique, make the familiar strange' (Hunter 2011, p. 198), without also taking into consideration

the context of social conventions embedded in PETE and teacher education more broadly. Hunter (2011) writes:

> …without attending to teaching and learning as embodied [and emplaced] we might leave new teachers, and indeed new teacher educators, with a sense of disempowerment, distorted expectations of agency, feelings of hopelessness, or the only option being to revert, willingly or unknowingly, to the very practices and structures they are critical of and attempting to change (p. 198).

Teaching as Storied

Closely linked to positionality, storying involves our use of stories to make sense of our own life and the lives of others. In other words, the stories we tell of ourselves and the meanings we give stories help to form our subjective sense of self. I appreciated how the scholars I dialogued with reflected upon my story and shared their observations. As one scholar wrote:

> *I am reading a story, on the one hand, about disillusionment or disappointment and a sense of self disrupted or unsettled. But on the other hand, as a counter-point, I am also reading about an opening up of self, a realization of important things beyond what had been a 'comfort zone'.*

While I felt incredibly vulnerable to share my story it also helped me to see things anew through different eyes, and to be able to gain a meditative distance from my storied experience. It was through these new found and different eyes that I was able to see how my story as a beginning teacher educator is deeply connected to my experiences in sport, where sport came to represent both a failed promise and an opportunity for change.

Storying My Lived (and Moving) Experiences

I grew up in the Canadian prairies on a small farm where I was in constant movement. It was through movement that I learned about myself and the world around me. I thrived in anything that involved moving, including sports. At the age of 6 when I went to school, I was confused why we had to sit to learn and why 'real' learning only happened indoors. It contradicted much of how I had learned in the first 6 years of my life growing up on a farm deeply connected in mind and body. As a result, I had trouble sitting for long periods of time and was often disruptive in class. Halas and Kentel (2008) suggest that we rarely 'consider how painful it can be when we hold young people back from the movement their bodies crave, particularly in schools' (p. 214). Such schooling practices are not only counter-intuitive for some children, but they reinforce a Western ideology that privileges the mind over the body, and reduces the body to a machine to control and manage.

Over time I learned how to sit, listen, and obey. As Foucault (1984) has argued, this type of 'biopower' – the idea that individuals and populations are controlled

through practices associated with the body – is a form of invasive and omnipresent governance that acts to regulate similarities and differences among people. In other words, schools are sites where regimes of discourse and power inscribe themselves and where students learn how to think and how to experience their bodies (McLaren 1991). While school became a place where I felt confined and controlled, sport became a place where I could develop a sense of self that wasn't narrowly circumscribed by social conventions. However, over time this began to shift as I became more involved and influenced by the institutionalization of sport. I came to a point where '*all I did was sport, and all I was – was sport*'. While sport claims to provide opportunities for positive development and critical life skill development, I had begun to see past these promises to recognize dominant ideologies of capitalism, elitism, and sexism. I began to recognize, along with many other sport leaders, journalists, and sociologists, that in an increasingly socially conscious world, sport was failing to demonstrate its capacity for moral and social responsibility (Kidd 1996).

As a response, I began to question the sport conventions I had once lived by. Bourdieu (1991) explains that complicity is first necessary for power to occur, which, in my case, took the form of the unconditional support and power I had once given to sport. However, as I began to question, I began the process of reclaiming this power for myself. In fact, it was through my masters research that signaled the start of this reclamation. Inspired by a growing number of athletes seeking opportunities to create positive social change, I examined what I called Athlete Social Responsibility (ASR) (Carter 2009), and its potential positive implications on the Canadian sport system. While a small number of athletes have historically used sport to address social issues such as equality, justice, and freedom, this type of civic engagement has often been discouraged (Wolff and Kaufman 2010). Fueled by the storied experiences of athletes, my research showed that ASR provided an opportunity for Canadian sport to escape from its current trap as a Hollywood fixture; that is, something to watch, but not be a part of. While my sense of a failed sport system is evident in my narrative and storied experience within sport, there is an equally strong sense that sport has a lot of positive things to offer: '*I believe in the power of sport. I believe that we are physical beings and sport has a role in our global world to absorb our physicality. But we will need to change our current system*'.

As a result of my self-study, I have become increasingly aware of the storied journeys we are all on. Each of the scholars I spoke to had a unique story to tell about how they came to think critically about physical education. Regardless of the pathway, all spoke about how reflection has been a critical part of understanding their journeys. As one scholar wrote:

> *I wouldn't claim to have understood my situation all at once back then, but the effort to try to do so was very important in terms of keeping some kind of perspective on life, the universe, etc. And, of course, as things change, the sustainability of criticality requires us to go on recognizing the source/s of discomfort, which may be different from the source/s that gave us initial impetus.*

Most importantly, I have become aware of how important it is to understand our own stories. For the more we can understand our stories and ourselves, the more

we can change ourselves to enact change in the world. Mahatma Gandhi once said, 'Be the change you see in the world' and this idea was captured well by one scholar wrote:

> *Perhaps, more than aspiring to change PE it would be wiser to center your efforts in knowing yourself. As you gain knowledge-feeling in this regard, that which is around you will change as well, much like when you throw a pebble into a pond: The ripple effect comes naturally without the pebble trying to make it happen.*

Teaching as Relational

This self-study has helped me to see the interconnectedness of our humanity. As one scholar wrote, *I understand your struggle, because it is not unlike mine. There lies our kindship – in our humanness.* Despite different ontologies, axiologies, epistemologies, and paradigms, I can now see how students and teachers exist in relation to one another. I now feel that my inability to acknowledge my process of becoming and to share that process with the students in my class was perhaps the downfall of my initial approach to CP. It was as a result of this self-study that I began to acknowledge that while I was in the process of becoming a critical pedagogue, my earlier actions had been oppressive to others in the same way that I was critical of my students.

Admittedly at the beginning of the course, I believed it was important to downplay my background as a professional athlete because I thought that it would reinforce some of the dominant ideologies that I was trying so hard to disrupt. I even went to the extent of denying my past: when my students googled me and brought it up in class, I shrugged it off because I felt that it didn't serve CP. I have come to see how important this gesture was for my students and their need to connect to my athleticism and to me as an instructor. Not only did my history make them feel safe but it also made them feel that they could trust me, two very important aspects of any critical approach! Arguably without first focusing on developing trust and creating a community within a classroom, critical discussions and new ideas won't feel safe and, worse yet, might be overtly resisted.

I now recognize that in my first year of teaching I spent little time engaging the knowledge, attitudes, and values of the students; instead I positioned CP in opposition to the conventional approach to physical education that many of the students knew and loved. This is in itself an act of power over the students and their lived experiences, and an act of privilege in my role as teacher. While my intentions had been good, my approach cultivated an environment of conflict and resistance. Initially I discounted this resistance, but as a result of this self-study I am now learning to reframe this resistance as a 'teachable moment'. As a result, I now share the experiences and learning from this first course as a way to not only show that teaching is a process of becoming but as a way to illustrate that teaching is emplaced, storied, and relational. It is in sharing space with students, to learn from and with each other, that CP can naturally occur. It is not so much the pedagogical

approach that makes the learning rich but the environment in which one creates that enables criticalness to occur. This idea was captured well by one of the scholars when he wrote:

> *Think of yourself as a flute at the service of a GREAT FLUTIST. You see, the flute is neither the flutist nor the music, IT, the FLUTIST, will blow through you and wonderful MUSIC will emerge, also through you. The ego will try to make you believe that you are the creator of such music, you (with the ego in check) must know better. Others, upon hearing that (not your) MUSIC, will recognize its power, will envi [sic] and criticize you (thinking you as the author), and you (from the ego) may fell the temptation to either convince them of the rightness of the music or defend yourself from their envi and criticism. Refrain from both. Keep conscious of, and grateful to, the FLUTIST for the MUSIC, and just remain in peace, open to be played again and again. There is no need for labels, there is no need to convince or defend. A flute is a flute and as long as it knows it, lives peacefully enjoying what comes through it while contemplating the delight in others (through not everyone) upon hearing that music.*

An Emerging 'Gentle' Pedagogy

I went into my first year as a beginning teacher educator believing that change needed to happen. While I still think change is needed, I now 'acknowledge more fully the significance of learning from and with the teacher candidates I instruct' (Grierson 2010, p. 11). I feel as though my greatest shortcoming as a teacher educator was my focus on teaching a course rather than on creating a community of learners. I was so focused on reforming the course content and disrupting the dominant discourses and ideologies that I spent little time actually helping teacher candidates develop their reflexive abilities. Through this self-study I have come to acknowledge that the student resistance I encountered was more a reflection of my inadequate understanding of the knowledge teacher candidates require (and desire) and the complexity of facilitating reflexive practice.

While admittedly not the fault of CP but my implementation of CP, I have come to see the importance of finding 'teaching and learning approaches that resist binaries and consider complexities' (Bowes and Bruce 2011, p. 29). It was evident in my discussions with the numerous critical physical education scholars that while many of them continue to challenge dominant discourses and ideologies in physical education, many have moved from activist-oriented approaches to more modest-oriented approaches that acknowledge different ways of knowing and being in the world. This idea is captured well by Tinning (2002) who calls for more modest pedagogies that combine and interweave analytic voices of critique and truth, voices of rage for injustices, and personal voices of lived stories and culture. As such, he highlights the importance of embracing diversity, relationality, and contextuality within pedagogical approaches, while working to advance a more socially just world.

Social justice pedagogy arguably fits within the frame of a modest pedagogy in that it focuses both on process and goals (Bell and Griffin 1997). In other words, there is an acknowledgement of the process involved in building relationships and

contextuality in a highly diverse world. Kumashiro (2004) writes that within social justice pedagogy there is no 'best' approach but rather a commitment to turning inward, to explore perspectives and practices that make change possible and impossible, and outward, to explore perspectives and practices that have yet to addressed.

Through this self-study I feel I have gathered more tools in my developing pedagogical repertoire to help teacher candidates prepare to teach in a more socially and culturally responsive way. While it may be hard for me to see all the facets of my developing pedagogy, this study provides a jump-start for this process. I draw hope from dialoguing with critical scholars in physical education, many of whom are further along in their critical journey, who articulated that the effort to understand one's developing pedagogy is very important for keeping some kind of perspective on life and scholarly work.

Conclusion

Through this critical autoethnographic self-study, I have endeavored to show that taking time to become deeply conscious of one's multiple selves is a worthwhile journey. It builds upon the notion that we build stories through our life experiences and that these 'storied' selves are worth deconstructing because 'the simplicity of Cartesian rationalism and mainstream forms of educational knowledge production has not met our needs' (Kincheloe and Tobin 2006, p. 6) to date. A critical approach to self-study research not only emphasizes a journey of becoming but it is 'well suited to addressing the complexities and subtleties of the human experience in teaching and learning' (Webster and Mertova 2007, p. 1). This approach not only enabled me to explore the complexities within my journey as a scholar, it also helped me to better understand my developing teaching pedagogy and practice. My hope is that by sharing my experiences I have opened up a space for students and teachers alike to examine their own experiences.

References

Azzarito, L. (2007). "Shape up America!": Understanding fatness as a curriculum project. *Journal of the American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies, 3*, 1–25.

Bell, L., & Griffin, P. (1997). Designing social justice education courses. In M. Adams, L. Bell, & P. Griffin (Eds.), *Teaching for diversity and social justice* (pp. 44–58). New York: Routledge.

Bordo, S. (2003) *Unbearable weight: Feminism, Western culture, and the body* (10th anniversary Ed.). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1990). *The logic of practice*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. Cambridge, MA: Polity Press.

Bourdieu, P., & Wacquant, L. (1989). Towards a reflexive sociology: A workshop with Pierre Bourdieu. *Sociological Theory, 7*(1), 26–63.

Bowes, M., & Bruce, J. (2011). Curriculum liquefaction (shifting sands) in senior school physical education in New Zealand: Critical pedagogical approaches and dilemmas. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Health, Sport and Physical education, 2*(3–4), 17–33.

Breunig, M. (2006). *Critical pedagogy as praxis* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (ISBN 9780494311783).

Bullock, S., & Ritter, J. (2011). Exploring the transition into academia through collaborative self-study. *Studying Teacher Education, 72*, 171–181.

Cameron, E., Oakley, J., Walton, G., Russell, C., Chambers, L., & Socha, T. (2014). Moving beyond the injustices of the schooled healthy body. In I. Bogotch and C. Shields (Eds.), *The international handbook of social justice and educational leadership* (pp. 687–704). New York, NY: Springer Publishing.

Carter, E. (2009). *Athlete social responsibility (ASR): A grounded theory inquiry into the social consciousness of elite athletes*. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses, ISBN 9780494558690.

Clandinin, D., & Connelly, F. (2004). Knowledge, narrative and self-study. In J. Loughran, M. Hamilton, V. LaBoskey, & T. Russell (Eds.), *International handbook of self-study of teaching and teacher education practices* (pp. 575–600). Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Conrad, P. (1992). Medicalization and social control. *Annual Review of Sociology, 18*, 209–232.

Davies, B., & Harre, R. (1990). Positioning: The discursive production of selves. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior, 20*(1), 43–63.

Davis, N. (1992). Teaching about inequality: Student resistance, paralysis, and rage. *Teaching Sociology, 20*(3), 232–238.

Douglas, D., & Halas, J. (2013). The wages of whiteness: Confronting the nature of ivory tower racism and the implications for physical education. *Sport, Education and Society, 18*(4), 453–474.

Ellsworth, E. (1992). Why doesn't this feel empowering? Working through the repressive myths of critical pedagogy. In C. Luke & J. Gore (Eds.), *Feminisms and critical pedagogy* (pp. 90–119). New York: Routledge.

Evans, J., Rich, E., Davies, B., & Allwood, R. (2008). *Education, disordered eating and obesity discourse: Fat fabrications*. London: Routledge.

Fernández-Balboa, J. (1995). Reclaiming physical education in higher education through critical pedagogy. *Quest, 47*, 91–114.

Fernández-Balboa, J. (1997). *Postmodernism in human movement, physical education and sport*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Fernández-Balboa, J., & Muros-Ruiz, B. (2006). The hegemonic triumvirate – ideologies, discourses, and habitus in sport and physical education: Implications and suggestions. *Quest, 58*, 197–221.

Fitzpatrick, K. (2010). *Stop playing up! A critical ethnography of health, physical education and (sub)urban schooling*, The University of Waikato Dissertation. Retrieved from http://waikato.researchgateway.ac.nz/

Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. London: Allen Lane.

Foucault, M. (1984). Space, knowledge and power. In N. P. Rabinow (Ed.), *The Foucault reader* (pp. 239–256). New York: Pantheon.

Gard, M., & Wright, J. (2005). *The obesity epidemic*. London: Routledge.

Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the prison notebooks.* (Q. Hoare, Ed. and Trans.). New York: International Publishers.

Grierson, A. (2010). Changing conceptions of effective teacher education: The journey of a novice teacher educator. *Studying Teacher Education, 6*(1), 3–15.

Halas, J. (2011). Aboriginal youth ad their experiences in physical education: "This is what you've taught me." *PHENEX Journal, 3*(2), 1–23.

Halas, J., & Kentel, J. (2008). Giving the body its due: Autobiographical reflections and utopian imaginings. In G. Fenstermacher, R. Colvin, J. Wiens, & D. Coulter (Eds.), *Why do we educate in a democratic society?* (pp. 208–223). Malden: National Society for the Study of Education and Blackwell Press.

Halas, J., Cameron, E., & Chhin, S. (2012). *Putting critical in pedagogies: Tangible ways of addressing physical education's exclusionary culture*. Paper presentation at the National Physical and Health Education Conference, Halifax.

Hamilton, M., & Pinnegar, S. (1998). Conclusion: The value and the promise of self-study. In M. Hamilton, S. Pinnegar, T. Russell, J. Loughran, & V. LaBoskey (Eds.), *Reconceptualizing teacher practice: Self-study in teacher education* (pp. 235–246). London: Falmer.

Hamilton, M. L., Smith, L., & Worthington, K. (2008). Fitting the methodology with the research: An exploration of narrative, self-study and autoethnography. *Studying Teacher Education, 4*(1), 17–28.

Hunter, L. (2011). Re-embodying (preservice middle years) teachers? An attempt to reposition the body and its presence in teaching and learning. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 27*, 187–200.

Kidd, B. (1996). *The struggle for Canadian sport*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Kincheloe, J. (2005). Critical ontology and auto-biography: Being a teacher, developing a reflective teacher persona. In W. Roth (Ed.), *Auto/biography and auto/ethnography: Praxis of research method* (pp. 155–174). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Kincheloe, J., & Tobin, K. (2006). Doing educational research in a complex world. In K. Tobin & J. Kincheloe (Eds.), *Doing educational research: A handbook* (pp. 3–13). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Kirk, D. (2010). *Physical education futures*. London: Routledge.

Kirk, D., Macdonald, D., & Tinning, R. (1997). The social construction of pedagogic discourse in physical education teacher education in Australia. *The Curriculum Journal, 8*(2), 271–298.

Kumashiro, K. (2004). *Against common sense: Teaching and learning toward social justice*. New York: Routledge.

LaBoskey, V. (2004). The methodology of self-study and its theoretical underpinnings. In J. Loughran, M. L. Hamilton, V. K. LaBoskey, & T. Russell (Eds.), *International handbook of self-study of teaching practices* (pp. 817–869). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Lichtman, M. (2010). *Qualitative research in education: A user's guide*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Lincoln, Y., & Denzin, N. (2005). Epilogue: The eighth and ninth moments: Qualitative research in/and the fractured future. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 1115–1126). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Loughran, J. J. (2006). *Developing a pedagogy of teacher education: Understanding teaching and learning about teaching*. London: Routledge.

Lupton, D. (2013). *Risk*. London: Taylor and Francis.

Lyle, E. (2009). A process of becoming: In favor of a reflexive narrative approach. *The Qualitative Report, 14*(2), 293–298.

Macdonald, D., & Brooker, R. R. (2000). Articulating a critical pedagogy in physical education teacher education. *Journal of Sport Pedagogy, 5*(1), 51–63.

McLaren, P. (1991). Essay review of 'literacy: Reading the word and the world' by Freire and Macedo 1987. In M. Minami & B. Kennedy (Eds.), *Language issues in literacy and bilingual/multicultural education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Educational Review.

Melnychuk, N., Robinson, D., Lu, C., Chorney, D., & Randall, L. (2011). Physical education teacher education (PETE) in Canada. *Canadian Journal of Education, 34*(2), 148–168.

Morrow, D., & Wamsley, K. (2005). *Sport in Canada: A history*. Don Mills: Oxford University Press.

Muros-Ruiz, B., & Fernandez-Balboa, J. M. (2005). Physical education teacher educators' personal perspectives regarding their practice of critical pedagogy. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 24*, 243–264.

O'Sullivan, M., Siedentop, D., & Locke, L. (1992). Toward collegiality: Competing view-points among teacher educators. *Quest, 44*, 266–280.

Palmer, P. (1998). *The courage to teach*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Pennington, J. (2006). The mission of disposition: A white teacher educator's press for race consciousness. *The International Journal of Learning, 12*(4), 299–308.

Pennington, J., & Brock, C. (2012). Constructing critical autoethnographic self-studies with white educators. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 25*(2), 225–250.

Pennington, J. L., Brock, C. H., Abernathy, T., Bingham, A., Major, E., Ndura, E., & Wiest, L. R. (2012). Teacher educators' dispositions: Footnoting the present with stories for our pasts. *Studying Teacher Education, 8*(1), 69–85.

Phillips, M., & Roper, A. (2006). History of physical education. In D. Kirk, D. Macdonald, & M. O'Sullivan (Eds.), *Handbook of physical education* (pp. 123–140). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Pinnegar, S., & Hamilton, M. (2009). *Self-study of practice as a genre of qualitative research: Theory, methodology, and practice*. Dordrecht: Springer.

Pithouse, K., Mitchell, C., & Weber, S. (2009). Self-study in teaching and teacher development: A call to action. *Educational Action Research, 17*(1), 42–62.

Rail, G. (2009). Canadian youths' discursive constructions of health in the context of obesity discourse. In J. Wright & V. Harwood (Eds.), *Biopolitics and the "obesity epidemic": Governing bodies* (pp. 141e–156e). New York: Routledge.

Sicilia-Camacho, A., & Fernandez-Balboa, J. (2009). Reflecting on the moral bases of critical pedagogy in PETE: Toward a Foucaultian perspective on ethics and the care of the self. *Sport, Education and Society, 14*(4), 443–463.

Tidwell, D., Heston, M., & Fitzgerald, L. (2009). Introduction. In L. Fitzgerald, M. Heston, & D. Tidwell (Eds.), *Research methods for the self-study of practice* (pp. xiii–xxi). Dordrecht: Springer.

Tinning, R. (2002). Toward a "modest pedagogy": Reflections on the problematics of critical pedagogy. *Quest, 54*, 224–240.

Van Dalen, D., & Bennett, B. (1953). *A world history of physical education: Cultural, philosophical, comparative*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Webb, L., Quennerstedt, M., & Ohman, M. (2008). Healthy bodies: Construction of the body and health in physical education. *Sport, Education and Society, 13*(4), 353–372.

Webster, L., & Mertova, P. (2007). *Using narrative inquiry as a research method*. London: Routledge.

Wilcox, S., Watson, J., & Paterson, M. (2004). Self-study in professional practice. In J. Loughran, M. Hamilton, V. K. LaBoskey, & T. Russell (Eds.), *International handbook of self-study of teaching and teacher education practices* (pp. 273–312). Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Williams, J., Ritter, J., & Bullock, S. (2012). Understanding the complexity of becoming a teacher educator: Experience, belonging, and practice within a professional learning community. *Studying Teacher Education, 8*(3), 245–260.

Wolff, E., & Kaufman, P. (2010). Playing and protesting: Making a case for sport as a vehicle for social change. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues, 34*(2), 154–175.

Zeichner, K. (2005). Becoming a teacher educator: A personal perspective. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 21*(2), 143–156.

Scaling Up SSTEP in Physical Education Teacher Education: Possibilities and Precautions

Michael W. Metzler

Introduction

While research on teaching and learning in teacher education programs has a long and impressive history, its offspring, the self-study of teacher education practice (SSTEP)[1] is still very much in the early stages of development. If the establishment of a dedicated, refereed, scholarly journal can be regarded as a key indicator of a field's emergence, then SSTEP reached that distinction just 9 years ago with the inaugural publication of *Studying Teacher Education: A journal of self-study of teacher education practices* in 2005. Certainly, some SSTEP inquiry was conducted well before then (Loughran 2005), but SSTEP research was typically not the main content of any of the journals and books in which this research was published. Other indicators have emerged, such as the establishment of a SSTEP Special Interest Group (SIG) in the American Educational Research Association, and its 'Castle Conference', but again, those developments have been recent.

In that inaugural issue of *Studying Teacher Education*, Editor John Loughran stated that '…self-study has emerged from and been influenced by a range of events and has been built on the works of fields such a reflective practice, action research, and practitioner research' (Loughran 2005, p. 5). To this day, those modes of inquiry have been predominant in *Studying Teacher Education* and represented in SSTEP as a field. They can be characterized, but certainly not stereotyped, as small-scale, short-duration, qualitative studies of mostly individual teacher educators, some of their students, and limited parts of their programs. Zeichner (2007) adds to this

---

[1] The author acknowledges that other terms and conceptualizations of SSTEP have emerged in this line of scholarship, such as *self-study research* (Zeichner 2007). The term SSTEP, which specifically includes the *practices* of teacher education was adopted early by the GSU PETE faculty to guide the research project described in this chapter.

M.W. Metzler (✉)
Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA, USA
e-mail: mmetzler@gsu.edu

characterization by commenting that few SSTEP studies have been conducted within larger research programs or connected to other lines of research in teacher education. These studies have served the nascent field of SSTEP well and should continue as integral inquiry going forward. However, the question is raised here: Can SSTEP inquiry be scaled up to conduct studies that involve multiple investigators, entire cohorts of students, a broad range of program components, with longitudinal and mixed methods designs? If realized, would that shift the foundation of SSTEP inquiry as we now know it, or would it provide additional ways to understand the practice of teacher education? It should be made clear that scaling-up SSTEP is not meant to set aside the existing methodological traditions; it is proposed as a means to arrive at understandings of teacher education that I believe are not attainable with the current scope and modes of inquiry in SSTEP. In this chapter I will describe a longitudinal self-study of the PETE program at GSU. That project will be used to highlight both the possibilities and some necessary precautions for designing and conducting large-scale SSTEP in PETE.

Defining 'Self' and 'Practice' in SSTEP

While not exclusive, the primary participants in the practice of teacher education are professors and students; in some circumstances and at certain times, the participation of P-12 teachers is also primary. Attributable in large part to the predominant traditions of inquiry in SSTEP (i.e., reflective practice, action research, and practitioner research) it can be argued that the 'self' in SSTEP is more often an individual teacher educator who is attempting to explore and communicate his/her own personal experience and/or meaning as a teacher educator to an audience (Loughran 2010; Zeichner 2007).

In the GSU SSTEP project that is described in the next section, we came to define 'self' from a collective perspective that included all faculty members who held major and regular instructional and supervisory responsibilities, involved graduate students, and PETE collaborators from other universities. Such an approach is similar to the notion of 'institutional self' as described by Hamilton (2002) and Loughran (2010). Clearly, we all learned individually from our SSTEP work, but we valued and pursued collaborative effort and collective learning first. From that commitment, we have used our institutional SSTEP data as the source for many and often extended group discussions about what those data are telling us, and what we as a group should do with that knowledge to improve our program.

Similarly, we have expanded our functional definition of 'practice' in SSTEP to include not only descriptions of what we do to design, implement, and manage the curriculum, but also our efforts to study the impact of those practices on the program itself. Studying program effectiveness and the impact of decisions made at the program level has been an integral part of our SSTEP philosophy and project design from the very beginning (Metzler and Tjeerdsma 1998, 2000).

The GSU PETE Assessment Project

The GSU Physical Education Teacher Education Assessment Project (PETEAP) began in the 1994–1995 academic year and has been ongoing since then. Initially the purpose of PETEAP was to compare students in the pre-1994 program with cohorts in the post-1995 program on many measures of teacher content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, and dispositions. That purpose proved to be unattainable due to the lack of sufficient numbers of pre-1994 students to use for comparisons with later cohorts. We then re-purposed the project to examine the program's effectiveness at meeting its major outcomes for our pre-service teachers. By faculty consensus, those outcomes were identified as the National Association for Sport and Physical Education's (NASPE) Standards for Beginning Physical Education Teachers (NASPE 1995), which were coincidentally established as the PETEAP began. In addition to studying program effectiveness, we also designed mechanisms for studying the teacher education practices that were used to pursue those standards in the program.

Galluzo and Craig (1990) suggest that the place of program assessment research (and similarly SSTEP) can be elevated simply by being more clear about why a teacher education faculty/department would take on assessment in the first place. Once the main purpose of such efforts becomes clear, the faculty can better determine a plan for doing assessment. Galluzo and Craig (1990) propose four main purposes for teacher education program research and assessment: (1) Accountability – to meet external accreditation review standards; (2) Improvement – to gather and use data for making program revision/improvement decisions; (3) Understanding – to understand the experiences of pre-service teachers in the program; and (4) Knowledge – to increase the existing body of knowledge on teacher education – to generalize.

While all four of these purposes can drive program assessment and research, Galluzo and Craig (1990) advocate that the 'overarching purpose' should be to 'develop a comprehensive knowledge-production effort about the relationships among a program's context, inputs, processes, and products' (p. 606). It is clear that the improvement purpose should be placed ahead of the others whenever possible. We agreed with that at the start of the PETEAP, and have maintained that priority throughout the entirety of the project (Metzler and Tjeerdsma 1998). Improvement is determined from multiple sources of data, such as interviews and surveys of program completers, interviews and surveys of cooperating teachers, document analyses, direct observations of instructional practice, measures of teaching efficacy, and more.

During the early years of PETEAP we designed data collection methods and protocols to conduct SSTEP analyses to address questions relative to the initial Standards for Beginning Physical Education Teachers (NASPE 1995), as well as additional questions based on program-specific content knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge (e.g., MBI). Our data gathering efforts quickly grew to include a large number of data sources (students, faculty, P-12 pupils), methods (surveys, interviews, direct observations, and more), and administrative matters (pre-admission,

Table 1 The GSU PETEAP data collection matrix

	Pre-admission	In "Benchmark" courses[b]	Start PCK sequence[c]	End PCK sequence	During student teaching	End student teaching/ program[d]
Teacher efficacy scale	X		X	X	X	X
Biodata and interviews	X					
Teacher/coach warrant and grade preference[a]	X			X		X
Assignments, projects, exams		X	X	X	X	
Analysis of instructional planning, skills, and assessment			X	X	X	X
Analysis of model-based instruction				X	X	X
Students' assessment of program						X
P-12 pupils' perceptions of teaching effectiveness					X	
Program coherence		X	X	X	X	X

[a]Expressed preferences for teaching v. coaching responsibilities and grade levels to teach
[b]Movement and skill content courses in the program
[c]The pre-student teaching practicum courses that develop pedagogical content knowledge
[d]The end of student teaching and the completion of the program occur at the same time

in key courses, pre-student teaching, during student teaching, and after student teaching [end of program]). This plan is summarized in the PETEAP data collection matrix shown in Table 1.

By 2006 we had a well-established plan that annually produced a prolific amount of data and artifacts used to answer many questions about our program. It was also around that time that all teacher education programs in the United States started to be held more accountable for generating and reporting data to external agencies. The list of those agencies grew to include: several administrative units on campus, state teacher licensing commissions, NASPE, program accrediting organizations, state legislative bodies, and more. On first glance it appeared that most of these agencies were requesting data that were similar to what we were already producing and using for our institutional SSTEP. However, these agencies imposed more and

varied data-reporting requirements, making it clear that those added requirements would place a large burden on our time and personnel resources for SSTEP. So, 2006 started a watershed period when we began to shift in how we approached our SSTEP, including elements of our original faculty-designed SSTEP *and* elements that were externally driven. More on that shift will be discussed later in this chapter.

The PETEAP also features a longitudinal approach to SSTEP. We have collected, stored, and analyzed data and artifacts on nearly all of the 350 students who have entered the program since 1994. In addition, we have identified 18 cohorts of students who began and completed the program since that time. A cohort is formed in the term an intact group starts the program and completes it approximately 3 years later. With this design we can study trends over long periods of time, and we can compare cohorts of students who completed the program before certain major changes were made with cohorts of students who completed the program after those changes were implemented. The expanded scope of the PETEAP design has allowed us to conduct longitudinal, large-scale studies of the pre-service PETE program and its graduates (Metzler and Tjeerdsma 1998, 2000). Because many of our graduates have remained in the Atlanta Metropolitan area to teach, we have also been able to study their successes and challenges as they attempted to use MBI during and beyond their professional induction years (Gurvitch and Blankenship 2008; Gurvitch et al. 2008).

We also made another key commitment as part of our early SSTEP efforts – to use instrumentation and protocols that could generate 'research quality' data, which can be differentiated from 'assessment quality' data (Metzler and Tjeerdsma 1998, 2000). The former meant that we would seek out and use data collection and analytic methods that would meet standards for acceptance in refereed research publications as much as possible. The latter meant data that would be collected to meet less-stringent collection and reporting requirements needed for the previously mentioned external agencies. What we discovered is that by meeting the standards for research quality data as often as possible, we were avoiding duplicative work needed to meet the other reporting requirements; research quality data could be used for assessment reports, but assessment quality data could not be used for scholarly research reports.

Possibilities with Longitudinal, Large-Scale SSTEP

Current SSTEP scholarship might be fairly described as predominantly: individual, introspective, practice-oriented, and short-term (Zeichner 2007). That characterization is not meant to be dismissive of current SSTEP scholarship; certainly teacher educators and their pre-service teachers have reaped great benefits from those types of studies, and they must remain as a key part of the growing field of SSTEP inquiry. While some examples of longitudinal research do exist in SSTEP (*cf.* Kosnik and Clift 2009), such studies are not common. Longitudinal, large-scale SSTEP (LLS-SSTEP) opens doors to other and different possibilities for PETE faculty. In our

18 years of conducting LLS-SSTEP at GSU, we have discovered that many promising possibilities can turn into valuable lessons learned through such a model; some of those possibilities were anticipated and served to drive our initial commitment, while other possibilities became apparent as the project continued over those years.

Collaboration

The simple reality of conducting SSTEP over long periods of time to collect and analyze large amounts of data and artifacts is that it quickly becomes much more work than any PETE professor can carry out alone. It also requires a greatly expanded base of expertise that is unlikely to be possessed by any single PETE professor. Collaboration is essential and raises certain possibilities for all involved. From our experience, PETEAP has fostered both internal and external collaboration. All of the GSU PETE faculty have willingly contributed individually to our institutional SSTEP efforts, and in doing that work we have found many mutual interests and learned much from and with each other. At other times our collective base of expertise was not adequate to allow us to pursue important SSTEP questions on our own. At various times we have sought the expertise of PETE faculty from other institutions to design and carry out parts of our SSTEP research agenda (Lund and Veal 2008a, b; McCullick 2008; McCullick et al. 2008; Mitchell 2000). From both the internal and external collaborations, we have formed a number of professional learning communities around various parts of the larger project.

Deeper and Shared Understandings

Not limited to a single research paradigm or to short-term analyses, LLS-SSTEP makes possible deeper understandings through the ongoing triangulation of data collected with different instrumentation and/or through different paradigms. The explanatory power of carefully triangulated evidence is much greater than that of discrete, disconnected evidence. Through collaboration and open discussion, these deeper understandings can be arrived at and shared by all faculty participants engaged in this process. At GSU we hold regular meetings to analyze and discuss our SSTEP data and artifacts so that all can contribute to a collective interpretation of what that evidence means for our program.

Trend Analyses and Forward Planning

The ongoing collection of data in LLS-SSTEP makes possible periodic analyses to detect trends in a PETE program over time. Some of these trends can be detected with casual observations by faculty, but many others lie hidden and cannot be seen

until data are carefully selected and analyzed in a time series. These analyses allow a PETE faculty to 'use the past' to 'see the future' and to either change or carry on accordingly. At GSU these trend analyses provide the basis for group discussions on topics such as program admission policies, course content and sequencing, field experience placements, teaching rubrics, and student teaching supervision assignments.

Evidence-Based Decisions

The collection of LLS-SSTEP data makes it possible for PETE faculty to collectively consider programmatic decisions from a solid base of evidence, especially when that evidence emanates from research quality data. This is in contrast to decisions that are made from limited, anecdotal, one-off studies derived from assessment quality data. We have found that our discussions around programming decisions are much more focused when they stem from trustworthy data, giving us greater confidence that the resulting decisions are as well-informed as possible.

Examination of Programming Decisions

Once a PETE faculty group has used existing data to make decisions and implement some type of change from that evidence, it becomes possible to analyze the efficacy of those decisions – if data on those decisions are collected after a change is enacted. This allows the group to determine if the change was in the desired direction and as effective as it was intended. It also provides some explanatory evidence for failed or less-robust planned changes in the program. As outlined by Metzler and Blankenship (1998, 2000) decisions by PETE faculty about their programs can be categorized within four levels: (1) Maintaining – not changing at all; (2) Adjusting – making single small changes; (3) Revising – making multiple large changes; and (4) Restructuring – changing the goals and/or major structural features of one or more parts. A study by Gurvitch and Metzler (2009) typifies how a restructuring decision led to a major positive outcome in our PETE program. In 2000 we changed the structure of the practicum experiences that PETE students had prior to entering formal student teaching placements. Specifically, we changed from practicums that were laboratory (on campus)-based to field-based, taught entirely in local schools with full classes of P-12 students and full-length class periods. From our longitudinal data we were able to measure the teaching efficacy (Gibson and Dembo 1984) of pre-2000 cohorts before and after formal student teaching and compare those data with cohorts from 2000 to 2005. What we learned is that the teaching efficacy of the laboratory-based cohorts was stronger upon entering student teaching, due to their success in the less complicated laboratory settings. However, their efficacy weakened considerably once the realities of student teaching were encountered.

Conversely, the efficacy of the field-based cohorts was lower going into student teaching due to the authenticity of those settings; their efficacy strengthened significantly during student teaching once they realized they had the skills and confidence to instruct well – having had more authentic pre-student teaching experiences.

Precautions for LLS-SSTEP

While the GSU PETE faculty remain strong advocates for the conduct of LLS-SSTEP, we have learned much over these 18 years that can serve as sage advice for PETE groups who might consider using an 'institutional SSTEP' approach in their own programs. It should be noted that the following precautions are not meant to steer other PETE groups from doing LLS-SSTEP. Just the opposite: they are offered to provide some points to consider ahead of implementing such an approach locally.

Do Not Start Without Full Disclosure and Commitment

LLS-SSTEP is a massive undertaking; doing it well and sustaining it requires enormous amounts of time and effort by all involved. All PETE faculty/researchers need to have a firm understanding of the scope of the local project and express a commitment to it. We spent many months meeting to lay out the GSU PETEAP and formulated a draft of the project that was shared by all PETE faculty at the time. We all knew what we planned to do and each one of us was committed to the project before it started. As we recruited new faculty members for PETE later on, we were very clear to explain the project to those we interviewed, and sought an initial commitment to the project as a consideration in their hiring.

Do Not Attempt This Alone

LLS-SSTEP, by design, cannot be planned, implemented, and maintained by a single PETE professor/researcher, or even a small group of collaborators. The more minds involved at the planning stage, and the more hands available for the large amount of work needed during implementation, the better. Right from the start, this should be viewed as a shared, collaborative effort – and active contributors should be sought out at every stage. It would be advantageous to seek out external collaborators who have different expertise and who can lend new insights into the plan and eventual discussions and decisions.

Do Not Run When You Start – Walk!

Even if the initial LLS-SSTEP plan is ambitious, it will be best to implement the plan incrementally, demonstrating the ability to do each part well before pursuing additional parts of the plan. This strategy can avoid problems that eventually compound themselves as PETE faculty must divert attention from new research efforts while at the same time resolving issues embedded in ongoing work.

Do Not Use Outdated Data Collection Technologies

The GSU PETEAP started at a time of transition from data collected mostly by hand from hard-copy instrumentation to using electronic, on-line data collection technologies. Over the years we have shifted fully to collecting data with modern technology (e.g. Surveymonkey); none of our quantitative data are presently collected from hand-copy versions of instruments. The use of electronic technology also prevents problems from having massive amounts of hard copy (paper) data to store, manage, secure, and analyze. This precaution might be obvious for today's technology-savvy PETE faculty members, but it needs to be expressed nonetheless.

Do Not Re-invent the Data Instrumentation Wheel

Regardless of what research questions are asked by PETE faculty today in SSTEP, it is very likely that valid and reliable instruments (quantitative) or accepted protocols (qualitative) already exist for that purpose; they can be used as presently designed, or with some simple modifications. It would behoove PETE faculty members to search those out first, rather than spending the considerable time and expertise needed to develop new instrumentation on their own.

Do Not Be Parochial with LLS-SSTEP

PETE faculty groups that pursue LLS-SSTEP will learn many things along the way, and have many experiences and insights to share with others. One of Galluzo and Craig's (1990) priorities for program assessment research is that it be used to inform other teacher educators, so that they may also benefit from what is learned by the 'local' group. Most often that benefit is derived from reading publications or attending presentations at conferences. If SSTEP data are of research quality (Metzler and Tjeerdsma 1998, 2000), there is a greater chance that those data will be disseminated in refereed scholarly outlets. Our commitment to collect research quality data has led

to many single data-based publications and two research monographs in the *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education* (Metzler and Tjeerdsma 1998; Gurvitch et al. 2008), thus sharing what we have learned with other PETEs around the world. As sharing is a key aspect of self-study research (Loughran 2005), dissemination becomes an important consideration in designing and conducting LLS-SSTEP.

Do Not Be Intimidated by External Demands for Data

As mentioned earlier, at least in the United States, PETE faculty face onerous demands for providing program accountability data to a large number of external agencies. On the surface these demands may seem duplicative, but if the LLS-SSTEP data-base is designed and managed well, duplication can be greatly reduced and even avoided. It has been our practice at GSU to design our data plan so it *first* produces the data we need for SSTEP and simultaneously provides data needed for the many external reports we must generate annually.

Final Thoughts

Since the PETEAP began at GSU in 1994, there have been over two dozen contributing researchers: GSU PETE faculty and graduate students, PETE faculty from other universities, and P-12 teachers – many of whom graduated from our preservice teacher education program. It has truly been a collaborative effort, in the very best sense of that term. In different combinations over the years, we have maintained an ongoing professional learning community, centered in the project and dedicated to gathering usable evidence to make informed decisions about our preservice PETE program. And, we have been able to conduct that inquiry in a manner that has allowed us to disseminate it to other PETE professionals in the US and abroad. It has never been easy, and it has sometimes not been perfect, but the work we have done to achieve a longitudinal, large-scale institutional self-study of teacher education practice in PETE has been well worth the toil. In the end, we have all learned more about PETE through this collaborative effort than we could have possibly learned through individual inquiry.

References

Erickson, L. B., Pinnegar, S., & Young, J. R. (2012). A programmatic self-study of practice: Exploring teacher educator knowledge. In J. R. Young, L. B. Erickson, & S. Pinnegar (Eds.), *The ninth international conference of self-study of teacher education practices* (pp. 98–101). Provo: Brigham Young University Press.

Galluzo, G. R., & Craig, J. R. (1990). Evaluation of preservice teacher education programs. In W. R. Houston, M. Haberman, & J. Sikula (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 599–616). New York: Macmillan.

Gibson, S., & Dembo, M. (1984). Teacher efficacy: A construct validation. *Journal of Education Psychology, 76*, 569–582.

Gurvitch, R., & Blankenship, B. J. (2008). Chapter 6: Implementation of model-based instruction – the induction years. In R. Gurvitch, M. Metzler, & J. Lund (Eds.), Model based instruction for physical education: The adoption of innovation. *The Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 27*, 529–548.

Gurvitch, R., & Metzler, M. (2009). Teaching efficacy in preservice physical education teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 25*, 437–443.

Gurvitch, R., Metzler, M., & Lund, J. (Eds.). (2008). Model based instruction for physical education: The adoption of innovation. *The Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 27,* 447–589.

Hamilton, M. L. (2002). Change, social justice, and reliability: Reflections of a secret (change) agent. In J. Loughran & T. Russell (Eds.), *Improving teacher education practices through self-study* (pp. 176–189). London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Kosnik, C., & Clift, R. T. (Eds.). (2009). Longitudinal self-studies of teacher education practices. *Studying Teacher Education, 5*, 103–199.

Loughran, J. (2005). Researching teaching about teaching: Self-study of teacher education practices. *Studying Teacher Education, 1*(1), 5–16.

Loughran, J. (2010). Searching for meaning in structuring preservice teacher education. In L. Erickson, S. Pinnegar, & J. Young (Eds.), *Navigating the public and private: Negotiating the diverse landscape of teacher education* (pp. 133–136). Proceedings of the eighth international conference on the self-study of teacher education practices, Herstmonceux Castle, East Sussex, England. Provo, UT: Brigham Young University.

Lund, J. L., & Veal, M. L. (2008a). Chapter 7: Influences on cooperating teachers' adoption of model-based instruction. In R. Gurvitch, M. Metzler, & J. Lund (Eds.), Model based instruction for physical education: The adoption of innovation. *The Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 27*, 549–570.

Lund, J. L., & Veal, M. L. (2008b). Measuring pupil learning: How do student teachers assess within instructional models? In R. Gurvitch, M. Metzler, & J. Lund (Eds.), Model based instruction for physical education: The adoption of innovation. *The Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 27,* 487–511.

McCullick, B. (2008). Assessing a PETE program through the eyes of cooperating teachers. In M. Metzler & B. Tjeerdsma (Eds.), The Georgia State University Physical Education Teacher Education Program Assessment Project. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 19,* 508–521.

McCullick, B., Metzler, M., Cicek, S., Jackson, J., & Vickers, B. (2008). Kids say the darndest things: PETE program assessment through the eyes of children. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 27*, 4–20.

Metzler, M., & Tjeerdsma, B. (Eds.). (2000). The Georgia State University Physical Education Teacher Education Program Assessment Project. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 19,* 399–555.

Metzler, M., & Tjeerdsma, B. (1998). PETE program assessment within a development, research, and improvement framework. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 17*, 468–492.

Mitchell, M. (2000). An approach to program assessment: Locating indicators of a coherent program. In M. Metzler & B. Tjeerdsma (Eds.), The Georgia State University Physical Education Teacher Education Program Assessment Project. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 19,* 522–537.

National Association for Sport and Physical Education. (1995). *National standards for beginning physical education teachers*. Reston: Author.

Zeichner, K. M. (2007). Accumulating knowledge across self-studies in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 58*(1), 36–46.

On Shaky Ground: Exploring Shifting Conceptualisations of Knowledge and Learning Through Self-Study

Judy Bruce

Context and Purpose of the Study

My interest in this research project developed primarily out of earlier research relating to recent physical education curriculum change in New Zealand. As a physical education teacher trained within a technocratic paradigm, I quickly became disillusioned with what I perceived to be a disconnection between content, meaning, and relevance for young people. However, *The New Zealand Health and Physical Education Curriculum* (Ministry of Education 1999) presented a significant philosophical shift that drew upon critical humanistic traditions and this shift sparked new possibilities for me as a teacher, and as an emerging teacher educator and researcher. The corresponding epistemological shift that occurred in my thinking strongly influenced my teaching practice. Through an exploration of physical education as a socio-critical discipline, and through an easy synergy that this generated with my own beliefs about education, I developed practices that were centred primarily on critical pedagogical thought. Comfortable working within a critical humanistic tradition, I was challenged to think 'otherwise' through involvement in a collaborative project with a team of researchers and researcher-practitioners. The collaborative project sought to explore shifting conceptualisations of knowledge and learning in the integration of the *New Zealand Curriculum* (Ministry of Education 2007). The self-study that I undertook was one case study within the larger collaborative project. The collaborative project explored post-traditional[1] thought and implications for teaching and learning (Andreotti et al. 2012). While 'post' ideas and thinking began as murmurings during this time, they soon became

---

[1] Post-traditional thought in this context stems from postmodern rejections of epistemological and ontological positions as fixed and certain. I use the term post-traditions to refer to a resignification of epistemological and ontological Enlightenment and Modernity paradigms operating within the discursive turn. E.g. postmodernism, poststructuralism, and postcolonialism.

J. Bruce (✉)
University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand
e-mail: judy.bruce@canterbury.ac.nz

Table 1 Overview of modern and postmodern constructions of knowledge and learning

Modern construction of knowledge and learning	Postmodern construction of knowledge and learning
Fixed	Changing
Certain	Partial
Universal	Contextual
Noun	Verb (performative)
Object(ive)	Subject (ive)
Students as 'storers' of certain knowledge	Students as producers of knowledge
Students as passive receptors of fixed knowledge	Students as creators
Universal fixed ideas of morals	Shifting ethical positions
Multiple expression of the same truth	Multiplicity—diverse ways of knowing are legitimated

increasingly disruptive. The firm and stable ground that was, to me, the critical humanistic epistemology and ontology driving my own teaching practice began to shift, shake, and move: I found myself on shaky ground. Ideas that were to me obvious, clear, and fixed, became over the period of this self-study muddled, confused, and constantly changeable.

As I entered the self-study project and began to talk with my mentor and other researchers and participants (who were part of the wider collaborative project), I was confronted head-on with challenges to my firmly grounded and established ways of 'knowing' and 'being'. Through engagement with post-traditional thought I was presented with tensions and challenges regarding the limitations of critical humanistic paradigms. Today as I write this, I am conscious of the opportunities that critical humanistic perspectives present in particular contexts; however, it is the limitations that prompted my epistemological and ontological shifts. The journey toward engaging with post-traditions was in answer to questions that were just beneath the surface of my practice as a critical pedagogue.

The central premise and motivation for exploring epistemological and ontological shifts in knowledge and learning came largely from an understanding that this is desirable for twenty-first century education to equip students with the skills, knowledge and attitudes necessary for them to engage successfully in the 'knowledge society'. Gilbert (2005) describes how knowledge societies have changed the meaning of knowledge so that it is now considered performative, generative, fluid, and contextual. Within knowledge societies, knowledge is perceived as being partial and contextual; that is, no longer fixed. Table 1 provides a simple overview of modernist and postmodernist constructions of knowledge and learning. While in actual practice the distinctions are more nuanced, it is useful to draw a comparative, dualistic picture for the purpose of understanding the differences more clearly.

As I journeyed through this self-study project it became clear that concepts such as universal, fixed, and certain notions of truth clashed with knowledge as partial, context-dependent, and constantly changing. For example, when teaching within a physical education teacher education programme I was aware at times of student teachers' resistances to dialogue where ideas differed from my own. Participating in

this project led me to question the problems of engaging in a form of critical pedagogy that seemed at times to be dogmatic and closed to difference (Duncum 2008; Ellsworth 1989). Furthermore, the answers that I gave to critical issues were usually predetermined and 'scripted' and this seemed to discount other possibilities (Todd 2009). Within service-learning[2] contexts other dilemmas emerged. For example, I found that the server-served dichotomy positioned the role of students as 'knowers', experts, and helpers and this foreclosed the possibility of learning from the 'served'. Learning to think 'otherwise' from within post-traditions provided me with the skills and opportunities to consider other possibilities for service-learning. Dilemmas and tensions that emerged from this self-study in relation to conceptions of service-learning are discussed later in this chapter.

In light of curricular and pedagogical dilemmas, and tensions emerging from within a knowledge society context, the purpose of this self-study was to explore shifting conceptualisations of knowledge and learning. Specifically, through participating in this project, I explored the following questions:

1. What factors contributed to epistemological and ontological shifts in my own thinking?
2. How are shifts in conceptualisations of knowledge and learning interpreted within service-learning and physical education?
3. What are the implications of these conceptual shifts for service-learning and physical education teacher education?

In this chapter I will provide an overview of the epistemological and ontological shifts that occurred throughout the self-study research process and discuss the implications of these shifts for service-learning.[3]

Methods

This section addresses the first research question through the shifting process I experienced. That is, what factors contributed to epistemological and ontological shifts in my own thinking? Participating in this study provided me with the opportunity to engage in discussions relating to epistemological shifts in understandings of concepts such as the 'knowledge society', post-modernity, and knowledge and learning in twenty-first century education contexts. I began to explore both the ways that I 'know' (an epistemological shift) and the ways that I 'see' (an ontological shift). These explorations led to both an unsettling and a welcoming awareness of the process of becoming. Experiencing the shifting process through conscious reflection led me to an understanding that this is a holistic process of engagement; the emotional, cognitive, and spiritual are all affected in varying ways.

---

[2] Service-learning is defined here as a pedagogical approach that combines community service with classroom-based preparation and reflection.

[3] For an exploration of dilemmas and tensions with physical education specifically, see Bruce (2011).

I selected self-study as a methodological approach for this project as it provided an appropriate framework through which to capture the journey of epistemological and ontological shifting, and to examine the implications of these shifts for my own teaching practice. Self-study is a methodological approach concerned with understanding, reflecting upon, and improving practice through interaction and reflexivity (Hamilton et al. 2008; Kleinsasser 2000; Pinnegar 1998). Self-study has been described as 'a look at self in action, usually within educational contexts' (Hamilton et al. 2008, p. 17), with the aim of producing new knowledge (Loughran and Northfield 1998). LaBoskey (2004) suggests five components for self-study implementation. That is, that self-study is: self-initiated and focused; improvement aimed (and transformational); interactive; includes multiple, mainly qualitative methods; and defines validity as a process based on trustworthiness.

Regarding trustworthiness I employed Loughran and Northfield's (1998) guidelines for trustworthiness. They suggest that a report 'includes sufficient detail of the complexity and context of the situation for it to 'ring true' for the reader; provides and demonstrates some triangulation of data and a range of different perspectives around an issue; and makes explicit links to relevant educational literature…' (p. 13). Trustworthiness, variation, and depth in the self-study were created by collecting data through a number of interactive processes, and through investigating and sharing the data analysis and findings with my mentor (critical friend) (LaBoskey 2004).

The interactive processes are framed as factors contributing to the shifts I experienced and include ongoing discussions with the researchers in the wider collaborative project (and in particular my mentor), recorded interviews with my mentor and with researchers in the collaborative project, participation in collaborative project workshops, use of conceptual tools, journal writing, memos, and reading and writing as part of the research process. Throughout this time, journeying with other researchers and researcher-participants provided the opportunity to engage critically around research-related issues. Furthermore, support provided by my mentor was a pivotal factor in this shifting journey and this is explained further in the following section.

There were a number of useful conceptual tools that contributed to an understanding of epistemological shifts in my own thinking, in particular *Magolda's Model of Epistemological Development* (Magolda 1992) and the *Multiple Meanings Tool* (Andreotti and Souza 2008). Through the application of 'theory to practice' concepts, and in dialogue with the collaborative research team, I began to perceive of the possibility of 'knowing' in other ways.

Additionally, reading and writing as part of the research process facilitated epistemological and ontological shifts for me. Reading helped to give me a new language. I found that reading helped to make the tacit explicit; the unconscious conscious. Reading helped to legitimise my epistemological and ontological shifts and increase my confidence. As part of the research process, along with another colleague I wrote a journal article on service-learning (Bruce and Brown 2010). I chose to do this as a way of wrestling with previously held views of service-learning that had become unsettled by this journey. Service-learning had been a context that I had previously explored through a critical paradigm as a useful, action-oriented

approach to implementing a critical pedagogy in physical education. Wrestling with new ideas and varying conceptualisations demonstrated for me the importance of the reading and writing process in contributing to the shifting journey.

The multiple qualitative data sources were collated together using a research log (Samaras 2011). The research log is essentially a 'notebook of sorting, meaning making and documenting insights, questions and reflections about [the] research' (p. 285). Both during and at the end of the data collection period, I analysed the data using the constant comparison methods (Glaser and Strauss 1967; Strauss and Corbin 1990). Two significant categories developed that were then explored and themes began to emerge. These included the ontological shifting process (described in the following section) and epistemological shifts (understood through physical education and service-learning contexts).

Outcomes

Through the self-study process, my core beliefs were challenged in ways that I found to be profoundly difficult, uncomfortable, and unsettling. Berger (2004) calls this transformational reflection the 'edge of knowing'—the space where our limits are stretched. She observes that people 'respond differently when confronted with the edge of knowing—either we embrace, question, engage or retreat to comfort' (Berger 2004, p. 342). For the most part, my experiences seemed to reflect the former; I sought to embrace, question, and engage. I do also, however, recall times when I retreated to comfort, to habitual ways of thinking and knowing. This process for me was like moving between stable and shaky ground. Stable was old, familiar (and safe) thinking, and shaky was unpredictable and constantly shifting. In this section I will explore the ontological shifting process before turning to pedagogical implications.

On shaky ground there is a sense of both excitement and fear. Exploring new possibilities and considering the possibility of developing new understandings was exciting. I felt energised by the opportunities that were opening up. By nature I am curious and adventurous and so walking on shaky ground was exciting and I welcomed the opportunity to experience new ways of knowing and becoming. Yet at the same time there were feelings of fear and uncertainty. What had been for me a very certain way of being and knowing was now being challenged, and this was unsettling too. In one interview that was undertaken as part of the wider collaborative project, when asked if this process was 'an emotional thing' for me, I responded:

> Yep. Um, for example, emotions of highs and lows. Like, fear, but also excitement. Feelings of confusion, um, feelings of incredible uncertainty. Feelings of being threatened (laughs). Um, feelings of loss, was one, that's right, that I wrote about…Um, loss of a way of seeing and viewing, because really it's connected to my identity, so a loss of a way of being. But also, you know an excitement about embracing a different way of seeing and perceiving. So goodness, it was an emotional journal, it was very emotional, it was quite tumultuous.

Given the above quotation, it is probably not surprising that on shaky ground there is a lack of confidence. As my previously held knowledge about pedagogical

concepts such as power, democracy, indoctrination, justice, morality, agency, and ethics were challenged I began to lose confidence in my own teaching philosophy and practice. I no longer had 'the answers'. I was concerned about my inability to make changes and experiment with new ways of knowing and being that could be reflected in my pedagogical practice. I felt much less sure of myself and my abilities—much less certain, and this connected to a sense of loss, as the following interview excerpt shows:

> *I felt very secure and comfortable with the worldview that I had. And very certain. And, so it was challenging because it stretched that, and kind of threatened, in a way, my perceptions of the world, and that's unsettling.*

On shaky ground there is a sense of loss. Berger writes that 'to begin a transformative journey is to give up an old perspective, to actually lose a sense of the former world before the new world is fully articulated' (p. 338). Keegan (1994) refers to the middle zone as the place of sometimes using one hand and sometimes using another. One could say this is a place of oscillation and of internal conflict; a place of living in two worlds. This is the place where I found myself—in the middle zone. I could see and understand the other, but I was also partly the same.

On shaky ground there is confusion. Placing one foot in a new world view while still having a strong sense of my 'home' world view meant that I was very confused. In a journal entry I noted:

> *To be honest most of the time I am confused. When people ask me how the research is going, or what the project is about, I actually don't know what to say. I stumble and trip over words. On one level I know, but it's intuitive knowing. If [my mentor] explains things from a 'post' perspective, I'm like, yes that's it. But I don't know how to explain things myself.*

I was seeking to understand new ways of being but this contradicted previous ways of knowing. I could see that this called into question most of my teaching practice and also my own epistemological and ontological self. Keegan (1994) writes that this change of perspective comes with a loss—a loss of satisfaction with earlier perspectives. A change in perspective is marked by confusion at first. This is called the *liminal* space—'no place'—the edge of knowing or the edge of meaning. Berger (2004) notes that 'the hardest piece of transformation is the 'neutral zone' when the past is untenable and the future is unidentifiable' (p. 344).

On shaky ground there is the need for support. Transformational teachers help students to find and recognise the shaky ground, provide company on the shaky ground, and help to stabilise the constant shifting. Once they come to shaky ground, students 'need help to sustain the courage to stand and work to grow' (Berger 2004) (p. 347). This most definitely reflected my journey. Without the mentoring support from the researchers throughout this process it is unlikely that shifts would have occurred. In particular, my mentor did all the things mentioned above. She helped me to find and recognise this new place. With her company, I was supported to explore without feeling pressure to shift. Dialogue was open-minded and non-judgemental. A lot of questioning and storytelling was used and the pace of the journey was determined by where I was (with the occasional gentle prod). Most importantly I never felt pushed or pressured to shift. This last point created for me a

space on shaky ground that was actually safe, while at the same time challenging. Additionally, I understood the ways in which reflection that deconstructs without considering new possibilities is unable to lead to different actions (Berger 2004). As I journeyed with my mentor through a process of deconstructing critical paradigmatic thought, different possibilities and ways of 'knowing' and 'seeing' were also explored. This process provided me with a way forward. The pace was slow as new possibilities and ways of thinking and knowing required time.

Part of the reason for slow shifts, I think, is the depth of movement that occurs at an ontological level. For me this speaks to the subconscious. While aware of being stretched by new ways of thinking and of knowing, I experienced so much confusion that I found it very difficult to articulate what it was that I was trying to say. In interviews with researchers in this project, I recall moments of brain fog; a glazing over, a tripping over words and forgetfulness about the question and about the responses. As my mentor and I explored new possibilities and challenged previously held beliefs, she would talk on and I would be lost in the previous train of thought. At times I recall feeling overwhelmed and very slow to process ideas. As mentioned earlier when colleagues asked me to explain the project and my journey, at times I was unable to articulate what I was learning. This resonates with Berger's (2004) findings as she notes that 'we struggle with words when we reach the edges of understanding. We ramble and apologise and forget what the questions are' (p. 342). This inability to express that which is known intuitively is articulated by Polanyi (1967) through his expression, 'We know more than we can tell' (p. 4). Regarding knowledge, Polanyi provides a useful distinction between explicit and tacit ways of knowing when he observes that 'one often reaches a … conclusion and only later constructs an argument that leads up to it' (Polanyi cited in Scott and Moleski 2005, p. 208). This inability to at first explicitly articulate an idea ought not to discount that there is a knowing.

Significance

In this section I will explore how shifts in conceptualisations of knowledge and learning are interpreted within service-learning in physical education. I constructed the conceptualisations while participating in this self-study project, and they reflect a particular orientation toward an exploration and interrogation of post-traditions (Andreotti 2010). Andreotti provides a useful conceptual analysis of understandings of 'post' possibilities and consequent implications for education. Within post-traditions there is a re-conceptualisation of understandings of the nature of knowledge, language, and learning which are reflected in knowledge society discourses (Andreotti and Souza 2008; Claxton 2008; Gilbert 2005; Richard and Usher 1994). However, an understanding of 'post as after' or an understanding of 'post as interrogation' signifies a difference in purpose, particularly relating to the political economy of knowledge production and socio-cultural contexts constructing understandings of (for example) power/privilege/identity (Andreotti 2010). A reading of 'post as after' suggests the

need for shifting conceptualisations of knowledge and learning so that people may adjust to rapid changes occurring through neoliberal agendas, knowledge societies, and constructions of a new world order (Claxton 2008). A reading of 'post as interrogation' calls for a rearrangement of systems and structures that will challenge existing violences. Post-colonialist and postcritical perspectives call for a 'difference focus' inherent within epistemological pluralism (Andreotti 2010). These perspectives present monumental challenges and possibilities within the education system. The conceptualisations outlined below are a small, yet perhaps important attempt at engaging with the postcritical perspectives. It is important to note here that I intentionally draw 'hard', distinctive lines between varying theoretical perspectives and orientations for the purpose of understanding and illustrating the possibilities and limitations of theory to practice. I acknowledge that in many instances the lines are less absolute than the text below describes, and practices are more nuanced.

Conceptualisations of Service-Learning

Service-learning as a movement is growing rapidly, partly in response to globalisation, particularly in North America. Service-learning as a pedagogical approach has particular relevance to the *New Zealand Curriculum* (Ministry of Education 2007) as it provides the potential for community–school partnership links and for the exploration of values and principles such as diversity, equity, community engagement, and ecological sustainability. Furthermore, service-learning may provide an ideal opportunity for students, to develop key competencies from the curriculum such as participating and contributing, and relating to others.

As previously mentioned the *The New Zealand Health and Physical Education Curriculum* (Ministry of Education 1999) was socio-critical in nature and drew upon critical-humanistic traditions in order to conceptualise and provide meaning to the movement context. In seeking to contextualise the movement culture from a critical perspective, many physical education teachers within New Zealand adopted a critical pedagogical approach that primarily centred on developing critical thinking skills among students (Culpan and Bruce 2007). However, instances of moving students beyond critical thinking toward social action have been limited and so I, along with a number of other physical education teacher education practitioners, began to explore service-learning, and in particular a critical service-learning approach, as a pedagogical tool that was primarily action-oriented (Bruce et al. 2010).

However, participating in this self-study project challenged my thinking further to consider the limitations of operating within a critical paradigm and the possibilities (and also limitations) of a postcritical approach to service-learning. Through the application of 'theory to practice' tools and concepts, and in dialogue with my self-study mentor, I began to perceive of the possibility of 'knowing' in other ways. This shift was facilitated through engagement in discussions relating to epistemological shifts in understandings of concepts such as the 'knowledge society', postmodernity, and knowledge and learning in twenty-first century education contexts. Modernist

notions of knowledge as fixed, certain, stable, and universal became problematic for me as I moved toward understandings of knowledge as contextual, contingent, and provisional. Considering the possibilities of knowledge and learning constructed through epistemological plurality within service-learning provided me with a useful context for engaging with shifts. This led to the development of a third possibility for service-learning; what I call here a postcritical approach. Before outlining this approach, I will firstly provide a brief critique of two dominant approaches to service-learning: the traditional and the critical.

A traditional approach to service-learning draws upon liberal humanist perspectives. This is by far the most prevalent form of service-learning, almost entirely uncritically implemented through a range of higher education and schooling contexts internationally. Students are encouraged to undertake acts of charity and acts of generosity either within their local context or through service abroad projects. Many service-learning projects are concerned with helping others considered 'less fortunate' (what I term here, the Other[4]). When students are positioned as helpers, 'knowers', and experts, the served are positioned as ones who do not know; who are unable to help. This relationship creates a problematic server-served dichotomy. There is almost always a hierarchy of knowledge and privilege implicit within the server-served dichotomy and this hierarchy reflects modernist understandings of knowledge and learning. Fixed, certain, and universal claims of normative cultural practices are transmitted and reproduced through multiple variations of traditional approaches to service-learning. This reproductive and transmissive form of service-learning has been critiqued by critical service-learning advocates (see for example, Bruce 2013; Mitchell 2007; Wade 2000).

Critical service-learning projects seek to redress the limitations of traditional projects by focusing learning toward social justice oriented curriculum approaches. Through employing critical pedagogical approaches which focus upon both critical thinking and action, service-learning students are taught to understand structural inequities, and are encouraged to take forms of social action to address such inequities. While critical service-learning projects do challenge the limitations of traditional projects, there are also dilemmas evident as modernist understandings influence such developments. Employed within a critical humanistic framework, critical service-learning projects continue to frame students as 'knowers', experts, and helpers who have skills and knowledge to give—often uncritically—to the served. That is to say, there is still present the server-served dichotomy generating a hierarchy of normative knowledge and cultural practice (Bruce and Brown 2010). Therefore, both traditional and critical service-learning projects become motivated by the idea of learning about the Other, in order that one may help or change the Other (Kirby 2009).

Wrestling with these tensions and dilemmas, and in light of my own shifting conceptualisations of knowledge and learning, I began to consider what a

---

[4] The Other is defined here in a Levinasian sense as 'one who is radically different to oneself'. This conception of the Other positions difference as deficit. One radically different to ourselves is oft seen as irrational, and in need of our help in order to become more like us; thus more rational.

post-traditional service-learning project would look like. With an interest in social justice education, and a commitment to the social justice components of physical education in New Zealand, I constructed the idea of a postcritical approach to service-learning (Bruce and Brown 2010; Bruce 2013). Such an approach takes seriously existing critiques of notions such as power, hierarchy, dominance, privilege, and hegemony; while also being responsive to understandings of knowledge, learning, and identities as shifting, contextual, partial, and fluid.

Rather than learning about the Other in order that one may help or change the Other, a postcritical approach to service-learning seeks to position students as those who may learn from the Other (Biesta 2012; Levinas 1991; Todd 2004). This orientation to relationship with the Other acknowledges that the Other is also one who knows, who can help, and who may teach; the Other has knowledge, that like 'us' is partial and contextual. Students entering into an ethical relationship with the Other cannot foretell what will be learned. Consequently, there are pedagogical and ethical risks that evolve with such an approach (Bruce 2013). Furthermore, the notion of 'service' is reframed as one where both parties are served by the other, through the establishment of an ethical relationship. Neither party is positioned as more knowledgeable than the other, but the ideas of knowledge as partial and contextual are explored in ways that legitimate difference, no longer seen as deficit.

Conclusion

There is simply not the scope to explore service-learning conceptions in further detail here.[5] My purpose in writing this section is to introduce the ways in which the self-study process unsettled (and continues to unsettle) current pedagogical projects that I was (and still am) involved with. Through the self-study process, while the conceptualisations I explored regarding both service-learning and socio-cultural orientations of physical education (Bruce 2011) are useful, it is necessary to consider both the limitations and the constraints that are inherent within. When writing of a cosmopolitan ethic, Todd (2009) cautions against the use of scripts as a pedagogical tool. If we are to, for example, subscribe to a particular approach, we may risk uncritical engagement, and thus limit possibilities for other conceptualisations. While the conceptualisations that I have discussed here served a useful purpose in helping me to engage with epistemological and ontological shifts, following a particular script puts me at risk of being unresponsive to varying contexts. Consistent with post-traditional thought, what I can do is signal a temporal approach while also being aware of the limitations, and the need to constantly critique and redevelop works. This is consistent with self-study methodology that also resists notions of settling (Bullough and Pinnegar 2001).

The purpose of exploring varying conceptualisations of service-learning and physical education was to consider how my teacher educator self may respond to

---

[5] For a full exploration of this approach see Bruce 2013.

global shifts in an increasingly cosmopolitan world. Engaging with the *New Zealand Curriculum* (Ministry of Education 2007) (including values such as diversity, equity, sustainability, and respect and principles such as inclusion and cultural diversity) requires shifts beyond current practices. Through this self-study process I have come to a realisation that the ground will always be a little shaky, if I am to continue to shift epistemologically and ontologically. If my teaching practice is to move with changing times, then I will need to become comfortable with the uncomfortable.

References

Andreotti, V. (2010). Cognitive adaptation versus epistemological pluralism. *International Journal of Development Education and Global Learning, 2*(2), 5–22.

Andreotti, V., & Souza, L. (2008). Global learning in the 'knowledge society': Four tools for discussion. *Journal of International Educational Research and Development Education, 31*(1), 7–12.

Andreotti, V., Abbiss, J., & Quinlivan, K. (2012). *Shifting conceptualizations of knowledge and learning in the integration of the New Zealand curriculum in teacher education: Project summary*. Wellington: Teaching and Learning Research Initiative.

Berger, J. (2004). Dancing in the threshold of meaning: Recognizing and understanding the growing edge. *Journal of Transformative Education, 2*, 336–351.

Biesta, G. (2012). Receiving the gift of teaching: From 'learning from' to 'being taught by'. *Studies in Philosophy and Education, 32*(5), 449–461.

Bruce, J. (2011). Dancing on the edge: A self-study exploring postcritical possibilities in physical education. *Sport, Education and Society, 18*(6), 807–824. doi:10.1080/13573322.2011.613457.

Bruce, J. (2013). Service-learning as a pedagogy of interruption. *International Journal of Development Education and Global Learning, 5*(1), 27–41.

Bruce, J., & Brown, S. (2010). Conceptualising service-learning in global times. *Critical Literacy: Theories and Practices, 4*(1), 6–15.

Bruce, J., Martin, T., & Brown, S. (2010). Seeking change: A model for critical service-learning in physical education teacher education. In M. P. Miller & J. Rendell (Eds.), *Service-learning in physical education and other related professions: A global perspective* (pp. 333–341). Sudbury: Jones and Bartlett Publishers.

Bullough, R. V., Jr., & Pinnegar, S. (2001). Guidelines for quality in autobiographical forms of self-study research. *Educational Researcher, 30*(3), 13–21.

Claxton, G. (2008). *What's the point of school? Rediscovering the heart of education*. Oxford: Oneworld Publications.

Culpan, I., & Bruce, J. (2007). New Zealand physical education and critical pedagogy: Refocusing the curriculum. *International Journal of Sport and Health Science, 5*, 1–11.

Duncum, P. (2008). Thinking critically about thinking critically: Towards a post-critical, dialogic pedagogy for popular visual culture. *International Journal of Education Through Art, 4*(3), 247–257.

Ellsworth, E. (1989). Why doesn't this feel empowering? *Harvard Educational Review, 59*(3), 297–324.

Gilbert, J. (2005). *Catching the knowledge wave? The knowledge society and the future of education*. Wellington: NZCER Press.

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory*. Dallas: Houghton Mifflin.

Hamilton, M. L., Smith, L., & Worthington, K. (2008). Fitting the methodology with the research: An exploration of narrative, self-study and auto-ethnography. *Studying Teacher Education, 4*(1), 17–28.

Keegan, R. (1994). *In over our heads. The mental demands of modern life*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Kirby, K. E. (2009). Encountering and understanding suffering: The need for service learning in ethical education. *Teaching Philosophy, 32*(2), 153–176.

Kleinsasser, A. (2000). Researchers, reflexivity, and good data: Writing to unlearn. *Theory into Practice, 39*(3), 155–162.

LaBoskey, V. K. (2004). The methodology of self-study and its theoretical underpinnings. In J. J. Loughran, M. L. Hamilton, V. K. LaBoskey, & T. Russell (Eds.), *International handbook of self-study of teaching practices* (pp. 817–869). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Levinas, E. (1991). *Totality and infinity: An essay on exteriority*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Loughran, J., & Northfield, J. (1998). A framework for the development of self-study practice. In M. L. Hamilton (Ed.), *Reconceptualizing teacher practice: Self-study in teacher education* (pp. 7–18). London: Falmer Press.

Magolda, M. (1992). *Knowing and reasoning in college students. Gender related patterns in students' intellectual development*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Ministry of Education. (1999). *The New Zealand health and physical education curriculum*. Wellington: Learning Media.

Ministry of Education. (2007). *The New Zealand curriculum*. Wellington: Learning Media.

Mitchell, T. (2007). Critical service learning as social justice education: A case study of the citizen scholars' program. *Equity and Excellence in Education, 40*(2), 101–112.

Pinnegar, S. (1998). Introduction to part 2: Methodological perspectives. In M. L. Hamilton (Ed.), *Reconceptualizing teacher practice: Self-study in teacher education* (pp. 31–33). London: Falmer Press.

Polanyi, M. (1967). *The tacit dimension*. New York: Anchor Books.

Richard, E., & Usher, R. (1994). *Postmodernity and education*. London: Routledge.

Samaras, A. P. (2011). *Self-study teacher research: Improving your practice through collaborative inquiry*. Los Angeles: Sage.

Scott, W., & Moleski, M. (2005). *Michael Polanyi: Scientist and philosopher*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Newbury Park: Sage.

Todd, S. (2004). *Learning from the other: Levinas, psychoanalysis and ethical possibilities in education*. Albany: State University New York.

Todd, S. (2009). *Toward an imperfect education: Facing humanity, rethinking cosmopolitanism*. Boulder: Paradigm Publishers.

Wade, R. C. (2000). From a distance: Service-learning and social justice. In C. R. O'Grady (Ed.), *Integrating service learning and multicultural education in colleges and universities*. Mahwah: Erlbaum.

The Calm Before the Storm:
An Autoethnographic Self-Study
of a Physical Education Teacher Educator

Trent D. Brown

'Self-study empowers us to scrutinize our practice'

(Garbett 2013).

Introduction

In this chapter I examine a piece of autoethnographic writing in the quest to understand myself as a teacher educator, the importance of such roles in shaping future teachers, and how such methodological approaches have the potential to contribute to understanding in career-long professional learning. In this way I follow the suggestions of Pelias (2004), who encourages researchers to '…write from the heart, to put on display a researcher who… brings himself [sic] forward a belief that an emotionally vulnerable, linguistically evocative, and sensuously poetic voice can place us closer to the subjects we wish to study' (p. 1).

Context of the Study

I have worked in the field of physical education for the past 20 years. During this time I have taught physical education at primary, secondary, and tertiary levels. These positions have been as a specialist teacher of physical education and have each contributed to a broad set of knowledge and abilities in respect to teaching, as well as a deep commitment to the value of physical activity to the learning and wellbeing of people throughout their lives. My doctoral studies focussed on how

T.D. Brown (✉)
Monash University, Monash, Australia
e-mail: trent.brown@monash.edu

teachers' knowledge about physical activity and fitness influences children's physical activity during physical education. In 2003 I was appointed to my current position as a lecturer in physical education at Monash University and have spent the past 10 years working in teacher education.

During my early time with the university I did not refer to myself as a teacher educator, preferring to be known as an 'academic' or 'lecturer'. For me, the term teacher educator was foreign because I had undertaken postgraduate study in a School of Medical Sciences. It was only after several years of working within a Faculty of Education that I came to understand that teacher education was different to teaching. I perhaps did not engage with the term, for I was still stuck in a logic where my focus was on physical activity participation, not the process of educating students to become teachers. Granted, this may have in part been due to my teaching allocations, and engagement in research that was not focused in this space.[1]

It was around the same time that I began searching for research and methodological approaches to enable me to further examine who I was and whether what I was doing during teaching was beneficial to my practice(s) but, more importantly, to me as a person. In this way I was initially drawn to researchers such as Sparkes (2004), and Denison and Markula (2003) who proposed and championed alternative (re)presentations of the 'moving body' – due in part to their work in the same academic space as I, that being sport, physical activity, and physical education. That being said, I was also encouraged to read work in the teacher education space by my Monash colleagues Amanda Berry, John Loughran, and Judy Williams amongst others – all of whom are active members in the self-study of teacher education practice (SSTEP) community. Conceptually, I attempted to put these passions together in a conceptual paper that I wrote in the *Asia-Pacific Journal of Health, Sport and Physical Education* (Brown 2011), for I saw that self-study and the use of alternative methods (such as autoethnography), in physical education and teacher education could enhance the work of teachers in schools. In many ways this chapter is an extension of this work.

---

[1] My early publications were focused on outputs from my PhD and a sport-related focus. For example:

Brown, T. D. (2004). *The Development, Validation and Evaluation of the Physical Activity and Fitness Teacher Questionnaire (PAFTQ).* (Doctoral Dissertation), RMIT University, Melbourne.

Brown, T. D., & Holland, B. V. (2005). Student physical activity and lesson context during physical education. *ACHPER Healthy Lifestyles Journal*, *52*(3–4), 17–23.

Brown, T. D. (2004). Test-retest reliability of the self-assessed physical activity checklist. *Perceptual and Motor Skills, 99*(3), 1099–1102.

O'Connor, J. P., & Brown, T. D. (2007). Real cyclists don't race: informal affiliations of the weekend warrior. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport, 42*(1), 83–97.

Brown, T. D., O'Connor, J., & Barkatsas, A. (2009). Instrumentation and motivations for organised cycling: The development of the cyclist motivation instrument (CMI). *Journal of Sports Science and Medicine, 8*(2), 211–218.

O'Connor, J., & Brown, T. D. (2010). Riding with the sharks: Serious leisure cyclists' perceptions of sharing the road with motorists. *Journal of Science and Medicine in Sport, 13*(1), 53–58.

Autoethnography and Narratives of Self

> The narratives of self are an evocative form of writing that produces highly personalised and revealing texts in which authors tell stories about their own lived experiences.
> (Richardson 1994 cited in Sparkes 2004, p. 73)

As a form of autobiographical writing, multiple layers of one's consciousness link personal-to-cultural, cultural-to-social, and personal-to-environmental (Ellis and Bochner 2000). As a research method, autoethnographic writing sits very comfortably and consistently with self-study (Hamilton et al. 2008). As a form of research and (re) presentation, autoethnography is well supported within the broader sport studies research literature (Denison and Markula 2003; Markula and Silk 2011; Sparkes 2004) but has yet not found a presence within Physical Education Teacher Education (PETE). Proponents such as Armour et al. (2001), and more recently Brown and Payne (2009), have called for more researchers to use autoethnography as a mechanism to further develop teachers' understanding of their lived experiences, and in particular, to develop further embodied understanding where 'sensuous' qualities such as sight, sound, touch, smell, and taste or 'scapes' (Sparkes 2009) are developed and understood.

According to Patton (2002) autoethnography has as its basis '…your own experiences to garner insights into the larger culture or subculture of which you are a part' (p. 86). As an approach there exists great variability in the position of the researcher with*in* the text. Of importance to the research approach is the notion of self-awareness and how one's experiences and interpretations (or subjectivity) are framed through personal, social, cultural, and environmental lenses. In some ways such representations or lived experiences are examples of the observer's (in this case insider-observer), perception of reality. At the heart of this approach are many qualities that give depth to it as a characterisation, namely: it includes researchers' vulnerable selves, emotions, bodies, and spirits; it examines how the human experience is endowed with meaning, and; it is concerned with moral, ethical, and political consequences. As such, it connects social sciences with the living of life.

When describing these highly personalised and revealing texts, authors use such characteristics to represent lived experiences. Ellis (1999) described these features as characteristics of heartful autoethnographical writing. In line with Ellis and in response to calls for a methodology of heart (Pelias 2004), I seek to have my vulnerable self opened to public scrutiny as I write about my lived experiences in the story: 'The calm before the storm'.

Method

To get at the heart of my teaching I have utilised a methodology known as narrative of self or autoethnography. I was drawn to this after reading a paper by Armour et al. (2001) who recognise its potential for physical educators to engage with meaningful, ongoing professional learning. As I developed more articulate understandings of autoethnography as a methodology and philosophy, I was also grappling with how

such an approach could 'fit' within a broader dialogue known as self-study. To this end, I have been heavily influenced by Taylor and Coia's (2009) use of autoethnographic self-studies.

For the current study I have chosen to focus on a vignette I had written as part of an ongoing autoethnographic project of my teaching during two academic years (2011–2012). As part of this project I generated a series of narratives of my teaching that I posted on a public blog to share with my students. In my mind, these vignettes served two purposes: (a) they were written to prompt undergraduate PETE students (undergraduate and honours students) to consider the complexity of the teaching environment, and; (b) to encourage deeper reflection for meaning about one's individual practice (Brown 2011; Loughran 2006).

In seeking to make deeper sense of these stories I was conscious that in self-study data analysis is dynamic, in that the 'dualisms of theory and practice, subject and object, research and teaching are collapsed' (Anderson et al. 2007, p. 25). To facilitate and provoke a deeper analysis, I worked closely with another teacher educator and researcher from an overseas institution to act as a critical friend. The critical friend utilised a framework underpinned by the following points to support academic exchanges via electronic mail:

1. To consider if there is sufficient detail in the story. What has been missed or glossed over that may be important to making sense of the reflection? What words, metaphors or clichés need clarifying or explaining?
2. To provide commentary on what seems to be significant about the practice. This feedback should provide more than cursory praise; it should provide a lens that helps to elevate the work, and;
3. To ask questions that may nudge (challenge, provoke, irritate) you to see issues, situations, experiences, and actions from different perspectives.

In the following discussion I present the vignette and discuss how I came to use this as a mechanism to understand my own identity as a teacher educator more fully.

Vignette: The Calm Before the Storm

I'm in a lecture room of a campus that I am unfamiliar with preparing for the first seminar of the semester. I am a little early, an hour to be exact as I wanted to get a feel for the room that I would be teaching in for the rest of the semester. It is warm inside the room and I think that I am overdressed wearing jeans, T-shirt, shirt and jacket. I take my jacket off and roll up the sleeves of my shirt.

I take everything out of my satchel and pile it on the desk. My folder with seminar notes, the textbook, the unit guides and the first week's readings. I put them in order from right to left based on how I expect the class to run. I make sure that they are all evenly spaced and think to myself that this is a bit odd as I am not normally that neat. With everything out I can move onto my next task, the technology.

I log myself into the computer as I have done a thousand times over, but the computer does not seem to like it. I hit 'enter' on the keyboard a little harder the

second time, after I have made sure that my username and password have been entered correctly. The computer pauses as I feel a flush of frustration rush over my body. *Why is this taking so long* I think to myself. I pace back to the desk and pull my pencil case and whiteboard markers from my satchel. I hear the familiar sound of the desktop finally recognising my username and password as the operating software chimes and the desktop opens. *Thank goodness that the computer is working, I have done all this work over the past month to make sure that this unit is accessible to students 24/7 with podcasts, embedded videos, Twitter feeds, cheat sheets and how to guides. If I can't get the computer to work now then I will really look like silly in front of my class.*

Shortly I will be joined by 35 final year students about to complete their final semester of study prior to becoming physical education teachers. Most of the students I have taught before as part of their 4-year undergraduate program, the others I will meet for the first time. These students are part of a 1-year program known in Australia as a Graduate Diploma of Education (Secondary). When I think about these 'Grad Dip' students I feel that I have not prepared well enough for this class. *What prior knowledge do these students possess? Who are they? Have I provided them with enough opportunity to develop into effective teachers? Will they have enough tools to use in the classroom?* I continue to question my ability. I move back to the desk at the front of the class and pull my PowerPoint notes out from the plastic pocket that is sitting in the top right corner of the desk. I read through my notes and pay particular attention to my handwritten notes in pencil linked to each slide. I notice that in one example it is perhaps too narrow so I highlight this by underlining the words on the slide and add another comment to the handwritten section that appeases my concern about 'real-world' examples for the 'Grad Dip' students.

I move back towards the computer and log into the online teaching system that is operated by the university. I click on the unit and scroll through all the icons that I have developed. I look up at the screen, as the overhead projector has now kicked in, and feel pleased of that there are tangible outcomes for the world to see. *The site looks good. Yes you have done a lot of work, let's hope that all that time you spent learning how to program html code is useful and that the student's appreciate the time that you have dedicated to the creation of this online portal.* I click through the icons and make sure that I have all the required webpages ready to use.

I start pacing around the room again thinking and reflecting that I have everything ready and in order to give this seminar. I look down at my watch and there is still 35 min before class begins. I go back over to the computer and remember that I have a video clip that I want to show to the students which highlights and important point about creativity and the role of the teacher in developing a nurturing this creativity. I have embedded the URL somewhere in the online portal page and search for couple of minutes trying to find this. *I am sure I put this somewhere, where is it?* I click through a couple of icons and suddenly remember that it is under the folder that I have 'hidden' from view titled seminar. I click on the link and it connects to the internet before going to this well-known video-sharing portal. I press play on the screen and can see it moving but cannot hear the sound. *I am pretty techno savvy and yet I can't hear the sound?* I struggle to get the sound working. I bend down and start playing with dials and knobs that I think are connected to the computer. Nothing. I start

to panic. I look at my watch and see there are now 30 min before class. *What do I do?* I search to room for the phone and find the number for IT support. I call it and mention what the problem is.

I go back to the desk and make sure that everything is OK with how I would imagine the class to run. In what seems like an eternity I wait for the IT support to come into the room. Eventually they arrive and put both my mind and body at rest. I seem to stand over this individual as they explain to me what I have done wrong. They go through the same procedure that I previously did some 10 min ago. He hits a couple of buttons and clicks play on the screen. As if we were both present at a U2 concert, a sudden thunderous noise emanates from the speakers connected to the computer. The IT person and I both try and grab the mouse to change the volume on the video. *Ahh everything seems to be in order.* We continue a conversation about technology and the virtues of using it in class. I thank him deeply. *I really thought I could do this myself. If I can't do this, what will happen if I demonstrate the technology in class and the students can't seem to use it?*

Being a Teacher Educator: A Story Expanded

Given a purpose of writing and sharing this narrative with my teacher education students was to exemplify and model teaching behaviour when meeting a class for the first time. My hope was that the story presented the complexity and multitude of actions required of any teacher, be that student teacher, beginning teacher or teacher educator when preparing before a class. It many ways it is an explicit acknowledgement of what I call a solitary space of the unknown that teachers encounter before their classes begin, where a melange of thoughts, fears, and angsts are felt both rationally and irrationally. Such communication to students and therefore analysis shares similarities to the seminal work of Berry (2007) who wrote about journaling and stories:

> This journal contained a record of my purposes for each session, how I saw these purposes unfold … An important purpose of the Open Journal was to provide prospective teachers with access to my thinking about the classes, including my aims, how I felt about whether or not these aims had been met, as well as other questions, concerns and observations arising from my experiences of the session (p. 24).

The 'solitary space' of being in the classroom by myself, collecting and developing thoughts, preparing the technology in many ways, is an example of the mundane in that it highlights the pedagogical work that is always ongoing in a teacher's life. In many ways it is about acknowledging that teaching requires some technical prowess, or as Shulman (1987) stated, possessing general pedagogical knowledge. What I feel the story reveals to readers are aspects of pedagogy that often go unseen by students of teaching; the preparation, the anxiety, the panic, and the fear. It is about how one negotiates the tasks of a teacher on a daily basis. It is also an explicit demonstration that teachers are always considering their students and the act of teaching, that is teachers are always 'on' – a teacher's life is never ending. Teachers are always considering their students, the content they are going to

teach, and the pedagogies they employ. This happens in the shower, driving home from work, at the gym, or immediately before class begins – such ideas, thoughts, and reflections happen wherever and whenever (Loughran 2010).

Another reading closely connected with the classroom management and preparation described is in some ways a response about risk or perhaps attempting to remain psychologically safe – controlling the unknown. What happens if the video does not work? What do the students think about icons, content management systems, or technology? Have I got a back-up plan for teaching and learning should the tools fail? As is exemplified in the narrative, the processes that I employ as a teacher, e.g. getting to class far too early, setting up the projector and computer system and organizing my notes, highlight my personal approach to teaching that has been developed to decrease or to manage risk and subsequently to decrease my own personal psychological fears about the potential (read negative) outcomes of the class. The preparation was about creating and demonstrating a personal safety net, highlighting that no matter how experienced a teacher you are it is OK to feel anxious, nervous, and worried prior to teaching and acknowledging that classroom preparation of materials, tools, and activities is at the cornerstone of good teaching practice. Additionally and perhaps subconsciously I also possessed concerns about making the tacit explicit, whilst simultaneously being concerned about how I was likely to deliver such content, a point picked up by Williams et al. (2012) in drawing on Loughran's (2006) statement that teacher educators are always teaching about teaching on at least two levels: what they are teaching teacher candidates (content) and how they are teaching teacher candidates (pedagogy).

The process of writing narratives and (re)reading them, provides an excellent opportunity for teachers and teacher educators to consider their practice reflexively, for it 'provide(s) a way of theorising the process of teacher education as it is lived' (Ovens 2007, p. 14). Given that physical education teachers by their very nature are practical people, developing strategies that allow them to explore 'real-world' practical situations through storying, journaling, or similar approaches has the potential to be a powerful professional learning process (Brown 2011). Furthermore for teacher educators, such as myself, I hope that like Berry (2007) I continually re-frame my understanding of teaching teachers. For me this is best achieved through these short narratives that are private, personal, and mine, and which get at the 'heart' (Pelias 2004) of my teaching. Given my interest and presentation of a narrative of self, otherwise known as an autoethnography as part of this book chapter, it is pertinent to examine briefly how autoethnography 'fits' more broadly with the focus of this book, namely self-study. What follows is an attempt to position some of the themes within both approaches that are worthy of interest to readers in self-study and autoethnography.

Personal Reflections

Part of the allure of self-study is that it leads to meaningful pedagogical change, in that 'personal theories are challenged in ways that hep the researcher [here the teacher educator] see beyond the personal alone' (Loughran 2007, p. 13). In my

continuous reading and re-reading of my narrative whilst being open to considering 'outside' readings, my critical friend provocatively gestured that in many ways such a story positioned me as transmission-style of teacher – in that I was driving preparation, content, questions, and flow of the lesson. In reflecting and cogitating on such a point of view, I can see how one would draw such conclusions. Nevertheless, such comments in my opinion were hurtful for I never considered this to be my underlying assumption as a teacher. For me such an overt focus on transmission-style teaching created a 'tension' (Berry 2007) between what I actually do versus what I perceive I do. I do admit that I posses an attitude and belief in teaching that privileges the need for (student) teachers to be prepared psychologically, physically, and emotionally for the teaching episode. In many respects this is especially true for students of teaching who have not engaged with the act of teaching in any real or meaningful way (e.g. actual teaching on professional experience). Such concern probably emanates from observing and working with student teachers across the past 10 years as a teacher-educator where preparation has been considered and enacted only superficially, and it is my overt consciousness wishing that if I could demonstrate such preparedness then my students might consider the importance of such practices as well. Clearly this autoethnographic self-study as an approach utilising a critical friend has stimulated some thinking on my behalf in respect to my teaching and my identity within it. With regard to teaching I continue to think, plan, and advocate for pedagogies and models that are post-traditional (e.g. teacher-directed) which consider teaching and learning 'about, through, and in' (Arnold 1979) physical education as more holistic in nature. Many of these examples emanate from pedagogical models such as sport education, cooperative learning, or guided-discovery learning that acknowledge multiple ways of knowing and therefore multiple ways of teaching.

Beyond that personal level of how my attitudes and beliefs of my teaching have been challenged, I sought also to understand how such approaches as self-study and autoethnography can contribute to my understanding about teacher education. Drawing on Casey (2012), I am a product of my education, my work/life circumstances, and the prior and contemporary histories of people and places of education. In other words, I am part of a cultural history of physical education and simultaneously teacher education. As a proponent of what some have labelled as a pedagogy of teacher education (Loughran 2006), the reason I have chosen to engage with self-study is that 'beyond improvement…is a commitment to teaching, teachers and the profession' (p. 26). Self-study's overt focus on the act of teaching, in line with approaches that are consistent with espousing more subjective understandings of the individuals within the act of teaching (e.g. sensuous autoethnographic approaches), from my perspective strengthens how we come to understand the knowledge and pedagogies of teaching, whereby giving sensuous privilege and deeper understanding to the individual in the classroom known as the teacher.

Concluding Thoughts

The process of writing this chapter or analysing its content, has not been a straightforward or easy exercise for me. At many times I have thought about stopping and quitting and not sharing this with readers, for it presents a public 'vulnerable self' as a teacher and teacher educator. Reflecting on my decade long employment at university and episodic narrative as told here reveals an individual still finding 'my feet' as a teacher educator whilst simultaneously negotiating an identity in higher education (Williams and Power 2010; Williams et al. 2012). In many respects such a public presentation pains me on an unconscious level for I still do not know if I really fit in, or whether (I am or) my work is truly valued. Yet consciously I can understand why such public exhibition of self as part of self-study is a valuable personal and professional 'tool'. I am so grateful for the support that I received from my critical friend in the belief that 'with collaboration with significant others inside and/or outside the school setting…significant change in the cultural histories and predefined expectations we have about teaching' (Casey 2012, p. 231) may change.

Stories, autoethnographies, or narratives of the self and self-study have the power to evoke meanings about our lives. They also have the ability to be considered as part of personal pedagogical change (Casey 2012). Whilst traditionally sports studies have focused on the player or performer and their interpretation of movement, more recently we have seen that the approaches advocated here develop a more positive following within the academic community and present opportunities for the physical education profession to expand our understanding of the profession, and in particular the act of teaching. The focus here has primarily been on autoethnography and self-study, but there also exist fantastic opportunities in the representation of data and experiences, through multiple ways such as co/auto-ethnography (Taylor and Coia 2009), poetic representations (Sparkes et al. 2003), ethnodramas (Brown 1998) or fictional representations (Denison 1999). I leave the final word to Brown et al. (2009, p. 16) who wrote:

> It is important that researchers and practitioners continue to advocate and develop various pedagogies, curricula and approaches to their work, so that the multi-layered qualities of bodily movement and how individuals come to make meaning of their movement, becomes an ingrained component of their moving educational experiences.

References

Anderson, G. L., Herr, K., & Nihlen, A. S. (Eds.). (2007). *Studying your own school: An educator's guide to practitioner action research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Armour, K., Moore, G., & Stevenson, L. E. (2001, September). *Autoethnography and continuing professional development in physical education.* Paper presented at the British Education Research Association conference, Leeds University, UK.

Arnold, P. J. (1979). *Meaning in movement, sport and physical education*. London: Heinemann.

Berry, A. (2007). *Tensions in teaching about teaching: Understanding practice as a teacher educator*. Dordrecht: Springer.

Brown, L. (1998). Boys' training: The inner sanctum. In C. Hickey, L. Fitzclarence, & R. Matthews (Eds.), *Where the boys are* (pp. 83–96). Geelong: Deakin University Press.

Brown, T. D. (2011). More than glimpses in the mirror: An argument for self-study in the professional learning of physical education teachers. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Health, Sport and Physical Education, 2*(1), 19–32.

Brown, T. D., & Payne, P. G. (2009). Conceptualizing the phenomenology of movement in physical education: Implications for pedagogical inquiry and development. *Quest, 61*(4), 418–441.

Brown, T. D., Bennett, R., Ward, L., & Payne, P. G. (2009, November). *The context of movement and its social ecology*. Paper presented at the Australian Association for Research in Education, Canberra, AU.

Casey, A. (2012). A self-study using action research: Changing site expectations and practice stereotypes. *Educational Action Research, 20*(2), 219–232.

Denison, J. (1999). Men's selves and sports. In A. Sparkes & M. Sillvennonlnen (Eds.), *Talking bodies* (pp. 156–162). Jyvaskyla: Jyvaskyla University Printing House.

Denison, J., & Markula, P. (2003). *Moving writing – Crafting movement in sport research*. New York: Peter Lang.

Ellis, C. (1999). Heartful autoethnography. *Qualitative Health Research, 9*(5), 669–683.

Ellis, C., & Bochner, A. (2000). Autoethnography, personal narrative, reflexivity. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (Vol. 2, pp. 733–768). London: Sage.

Garbett, D. (2013). Promotion by teaching distinction: Developing resilience and cache for a track less traveled. *Studying Teacher Education, 9*(2), 108–117.

Hamilton, M. L., Smith, L., & Worthington, K. (2008). Fitting the methodology with the research: An exploration of narrative, self-study and auto-ethnography. *Studying Teacher Education, 4*(1), 17–28.

Loughran, J. J. (2006). *Developing a pedagogy of teacher education: Understanding teaching and learning about teaching*. London: Routledge.

Loughran, J. J. (2007). Researching teacher education practices. *Journal of Teacher Education, 58*(1), 12–20.

Loughran, J. J. (2010). *What expert teachers do: Teachers' professional knowledge of classroom practice*. Sydney: Allen and Unwin.

Markula, P., & Silk, M. (2011). *Qualitative research for physical culture*. London: Palgrave MacMillan.

Ovens, A. (2007). Telling stories about learning to teach. *Journal of Physical Education New Zealand, 40*(3), 11–14.

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Pelias, R. (2004). *A methodology of the heart: Evoking academic and daily life*. Walnut Creek: AltMira Press.

Shulman, L. S. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review, 57*(1), 1–22.

Sparkes, A. C. (2004). *Telling tales in sport and physical activity – A qualitative journey*. Champaign: Human Kinetics.

Sparkes, A. C. (2009). Ethnography and the senses: Challenges and possibilities. *Qualitative Research in Sport and Exercise, 1*(1), 21–35.

Sparkes, A. C., Nilges, L., Swan, P., & Dowling, F. (2003). Poetic representations in sport and physical education: Insider perspectives. *Sport, Education and Society, 8*(2), 153–177.

Taylor, M., & Coia, L. (2009). Co/autoethnography. In C. A. Lassonde, S. Galman, & C. Kosnik (Eds.), *Self-study research methodologies for teacher educators* (pp. 169–186). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Williams, J., & Power, K. (2010). Examining teacher educator practice and identity through core reflection. *Studying Teacher Education, 6*(2), 115–130.

Williams, J., Ritter, J., & Bullock, S. M. (2012). Understanding the complexity of becoming a teacher educator: Experience, belonging, and practice within a professional learning community. *Studying Teacher Education, 8*(3), 245–260.

Part III
Reflecting on the Possibilities
for Self-Study in Physical Education

> We do not grow absolutely, chronologically. We grow sometimes in one dimension, and not
> in another, unevenly. We grow partially. We are relative. We are mature in one realm, child-
> ish in another. The past, present, and future mingle and pull us backward, forward, or fix us
> in the present. We are made of layers, cells, constellations.[1]

This part draws together the collective themes and insights by broadly considering the question of how much an individual can affect and change the discourse within physical education teacher education when this practice is enabled and constrained by its location within university and school settings. In short, the three chapters in this part provide a critical evaluation on the possibilities for self-study in physical education.

---

[1] Nin, A. (1971). The diary of Anaïs Nin: Volume IV. New York, NY: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Reading Self-Study in/for Physical Education: Revisiting the Zeitgeist of Reflection

Richard Tinning

Introduction

Self-study? To be honest I had never heard of self-study until a few years back when Alan Ovens described to me the focus of the Castle conference he attended. My discursive circles are clearly limited. Anyway, when Alan asked me if I would contribute a chapter to this collection along the lines of 'what self-study might offer the field of PE?', I accepted the offer in part because I wanted to find out about this 'thing' for myself.

I have subsequently learnt that self-studies take a teacher-as-learner stance and focus on the teaching and learning process as experienced by the participants themselves (Casey, this collection). I also learnt from Ovens and Fletcher (this collection) that self-study is never a solitary endeavour and that it has three broad framing features:

- A professional network of practitioners who share and evolve their practice;
- An inquiry oriented stance to one's own practice and an emphasis on the self;
- It enacts a disposition of desire; a desire to be more, to improve, to better understand

Apparently these features distinguish self-study from other forms of research such as action research, narrative inquiry, discourse analysis, interpretive phenomenology, or autoethnography (Ovens and Fletcher, this collection).

Hamilton and Pinnegar (1998) see self-study as,

> …the study of one's self, one's actions, one's ideas … It is autobiographical, historical, cultural, and political … it draws on one's life, but it is more than that. Self-study also involves a thoughtful look at texts read, experiences had, people known and ideas considered. (p. 236)

R. Tinning (✉)
University of Queensland, Australia/University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand
e-mail: rit@hms.uq.edu.au

OK, thought I, this is interesting. There is plenty here that connects (in some way) with my own history as a teacher educator. In the interests of self-disclosure, I should tell you that I was part of the discourse community that constituted the 'Deakin perspective' on action research and critical pedagogy. I 'cut my teeth' on critical theory and over many years worked with teachers and student teachers in projects that came under the umbrella of action research. I wrote *Improving Teaching Physical Education* (Tinning 1987a), with the explicit aim of encouraging student teachers to become reflective practitioners by addressing, through action research, questions such as: 'What are the implications of what I choose to teach?' and 'What are the implications of how I teach?' I also wrote about my experiences and was an advocate for action research as a form of reflective practice (see Tinning 1987b, 1992, 1995, 1997).

So, in one sense, I have a long history of thinking and working with *some* of the ideas that seem central to self-study. So why had I not heard of it? Why had it not crossed my field of vision?

What I shall do in this chapter is to discuss some issues of interest with respect to my reading of self-study and then turn attention to reflection as the zeitgeist of self-study. I will finally offer some observations regarding the contributions that self-study might make to the field of physical education.

Issues of Interest

There are three issues that immediately captured my attention in my reading of self-study: similarities with action research; the place of theory; and the centrality of reflection to self-study. I will discuss each in turn.

Similarities with Action Research

Just for interest I did a search through the University of Queensland (UQ) library for holdings on action research and self-study. I found some 182 relevant holdings for action research and only 11 for self-study. Does this reflect the size of the field of scholarship or the specific interests of UQ academics? Are they actually two different fields of study? Considering their similarities and differences it would be useful to me in answering this question for myself.

Zeichner and Noffke's (2001) chapter in the fourth *Handbook of Research in Teaching* (Richardson 2001) provides a useful taxonomy of what they call 'practitioner research'… a broad church of the traditions of teachers (and others) studying their own practice. They include self-study as one of the five traditions. In their discussion of self-study they suggest that its main practitioners are teacher educators (rather than teachers) and that there is a preference for certain methods of inquiry – namely life history and narrative forms of inquiry.

Feldman et al. (2004), in a chapter in the *International Handbook of Self-Study of Teaching and Teacher Education Practices* (Loughran et al. 2004) titled 'Self-study through action research' pursue the question: 'what are the ways that action research is and is not related to self-study?' (p. 943). Feldman et al. (2009) argue that Zeichner and Noffke's (2001) account does not adequately distinguish self-study from other forms of practitioner research. They claim that while action research can be a 'vehicle for systematic critical inquiry into one's self' (p. 943), self-study is more than a method. They suggest that being self-critical is one of 'three methodological features that would be present in self-study' (p. 943), and yet they also recognise that being self-critical as both practitioner and researcher is a feature of emancipatory traditions of action research. Confusing? It sure is.

For me, the search for the salient features that might distinguish self-study from action research, while interesting, does not provide a suitable answer to the question 'Why not call it all one thing?' In other words, why not just call it all action research? I search for a meaningful answer to this question not in taxonomy and defining features but rather in the notion of discourse communities. It seems to me that there are good practical reasons for being part of a smaller discourse community such as self-study.

An important dimension of self- study that Loughran (2004) explains is a desire by the teacher educator to model the type of teaching/learning process that they are advocating their student teachers should adopt. While modeling can by negatively conceived in terms of the old apprenticeship model of teacher education, Loughran's point regards a way of thinking about one's role as a teacher educator and the pedagogy needed to demonstrate that thinking.

In thinking of the marginal success of critical pedagogy within teacher education and PETE (see Tinning 2002), I am left thinking that there has been plenty of advocacy and theorising but very little modeling of what this pedagogy might look like in practice. We all know of the mixed messages conveyed by the 'lecture on inquiry teaching'. In the case of critical pedagogy, it seems to me that a teacher educator who was attempting to model such pedagogy and submit this practice to self-study might be making a step forward in regard to delivering on some of the claims made in the name of critical pedagogy.

Defending Itself Within the Academy

The need to defend one's research within the academy has long been an issue for educational researchers. Part of that defense has often centred on the issue of rigour and the expectation that research is a form of systematic inquiry. The need for self-study to be systematic and rigorous has certainly been identified as a concern for self-study scholars. LaBoskey (2004) informed self-study participants at the 2004 Castle conference that for self study to be accepted by the educational community it must be systematic, less idiosyncratic, and more rigorous (see Lassonde et al. 2009a).

Maybe the history of action research is instructive in this regard. Although action research is a very broad church (see Feldman 2009) I will use the interpretation of

Robin McTaggart's (1991) *Action research: A short modern history* as the historical source. McTaggart was part of the 'Deakin school of action research'.

McTaggart (1991) argues that the writings of Stephen Corey from the Horace Mann Lincoln institute at Teachers College, Columbia University, introduced and developed the idea of action research in the 1950s with many teachers in the United States. However, as McTaggart points out, his efforts to popularise and legitimise action research actually made it more vulnerable to its critics. Thus, during the 1950s, a time in which educational research was increasingly under the dominance of positivistic social science, action research failed to achieve legitimacy and its popularity declined. In this climate Hodgkinson (1957) regarded action research as a common-sense rather than a scientific approach and judged it against the criteria necessary for valid scientific experimentation. He concluded that it was 'only problem-solving ("easy hobby games for little engineers"); was statistically unsophisticated; did not lead to defensible generalization; did not help to create a system of theory; and was practised (and not very well) by amateurs' (McTaggart 1991, p. 15).

In contrasting the idea of action research with 'fundamental' research and in his efforts to argue that action research was a way of achieving 'generalisation', Corey was unwittingly paying deference to the prevailing dominant research ideology which in-turn 'owned' the criteria by which action research was to be judged. Thus 'action research was not to find and assert its own criteria for legitimacy' (McTaggart 1991, p. 11). My reading of self-study is that it is not going down 'that track' and seems a more hospitable discourse community that is articulating its own criteria (see Young et al. 2012) and may be less likely split into different factions as action research did.

Two trends in action research, it seemed to me, lead to a rather confusing and perhaps less encouraging future for action research. On the one hand it might be argued that action research became over theorised and even divided into its own smaller discursive communities. Maybe this was an attempt to prove its worth in the educational research community. Certainly *Becoming critical: Education, knowledge and action research* (Carr and Kemmis 1986) was a seminal text in this regard, challenging as it did, positivistic research and offering what they called an educational science of action research.

On the other hand, in a completely atheoretical approach, many took the action research cycle as a simple set of procedures without any understanding of the ontological and epistemological ideals upon which the cycle was conceived. This led to an appropriation of the action research process as a tool of management, rather than a process of self-discovery and emancipation as originally advocated by Carr and Kemmis (1986).

I was most interested to read that action research has had a strong influence on self-study research and that it is considered to provide a useful method to conduct systematic inquiry into one's teaching practices (Samaras and Freese 2009). Samaras and Freese claim that action research 'involves a systematic approach to problem solving' (p. 4). This interpretation, however, confines action research to its technical orientation (Grundy 1987) and this has certainly been the main orientation when action research has been used in the physical education context (see Tinning

1992). This interpretation reproduces a rather limited understanding of action research since, as Kemmis and McTaggart (1990) make explicit in *The action research planner,* action research is not simply problem solving. Action research involves problem-posing, not just problem solving. It does not start from a view of 'problems' as pathologies. For Carr and Kemmis (1986) there are other orientations that action research can take and these include a practical and a critical orientation. It is these two orientations that, at least for me, offered the most potential for physical education.

The claim that self-study is open to public scrutiny and hence to judgments of trustworthiness seems to be a response to the need to defend self-study in the general educational research community. But the fact that self-study should be made public seems to me to be a feature that might give it a different future to that of action research. Action research, while often appropriated by the administration, seems to have run out of steam in the academy. Maybe it became too concerned with its own internal theoretical debates. In this regard, while there are plenty of debates within the self-study community, it seems (from the outside at least) that as a discourse community there is a more inclusive, less doctrinaire, attitude prevailing. That is a good thing.

The Place of Theory?

Some years back I read Frank McCourt's (2005) *Teacher man*. It's the story of McCourt's 30 years as a high school English teacher in New York. Perhaps you have read his most well known work, *Angela's ashes*. I loved *Teacher man* because it spoke to me about the indeterminate, unpredictable nature of teaching, and the increasing tensions experienced in trying to standardise teaching and the folly of considering schools as providers of an educational service to clients (be they parents or young people). McCourt's insight into the hearts and minds of adolescents is wonderful. His story is a powerful mixture of the voices of *mythos* and *thymos* (see Tinning 2002) as he dealt with the daily dilemmas of teaching.

The question for me is: Can McCourt's (or anybody else's for that matter) autobiographic account of his teaching be considered a form of self-study? Checking the features of self-study reported by Ovens and Fletcher (this collection) it seems not. McCourt is not part of the professional discourse community of self-study. His work is not inquiry-oriented but it is explicitly about the self, and finally there seems no premeditated desire to improve his practice.

There is another dimension of McCourt's autobiographical account of his 30 years of teaching that would seem to me to discount it as self-study. There is no explicit attempt to better understand his practice by means of theorising. In this regard I ask: Is theorising a necessary aspect of self-study?

Practice is clearly central to self-study and there is a good deal of theorising practice within the literature on self-study (*cf.* LaBoskey 2004; Pinnegar and Hamilton 2009). There is, for example, considerable attention to Polanyi's (1958) notion that tacit knowledge is part of all practice. Also, Clandinin and Connelly's

(2004) theorising of personal practical knowledge features prominently in discussions of practice in self-study. What is interesting, however, is that there is no connect within self study literature of the sort of theorising of practice that characterises the contributions to the edited collection: *Understanding and researching professional practice* (Green 2009). Moreover, the discourse community that makes contributions to Green's book makes no mention of self-study. It seems that there are at least two different discourse communities that orbit around the goal of understanding and researching professional practice yet they don't talk to one another. What's even more bizarre is that Green's book and that by Lassonde et al. (*Self-study research methodologies for teacher educators,* 2009b) were both published by Sense Publishers in the same year!

Of course this is not a novel observation. But it does speak to the perspectives offered by the different discourse communities. Although a simplistic analysis, I would contend that, while both communities give a cursory genuflection to the legacy of Dewey, the sort of theorising offered by the self-study community tends to be less philosophical and perhaps, as a result, more approachable for most teacher educators or teachers.

Goodson and Walker (1991) offer a caution that is worth considering in regard to the centrality of practice. They make a general claim that it 'does not follow logically or psychologically that to improve practice we must initially and immediately focus on practice' (p. 141). Their point is that 'to place the teachers' practice at the centre of the action [for action researchers or for self-study researchers] is to put the most exposed and problematic aspect of the teachers' world at the centre of scrutiny and negotiation' (p. 141). It seems to me that by placing the self in practice at the centre of its project, self-study may be vulnerable to such criticism.

Goodson and Walker (1991) go on to argue that the use of teacher biographies, examining the nature of teachers' work in the context of teachers' lives is a more appropriate and productive place to start. There are, however, numerous examples of self-study beginning with personal history (see Samaras et al. 2004) so it seems that self-study offers many ways to achieve its ends.

Theorising the Self in Self-Study

The reflexive project of the self is not an easy one. What dimensions of the self are to be exposed in order to better understand the self? Here we can slip easily into such fields of inquiry as psychoanalysis. The psychoanalytic work of Alice Miller (1987) is interesting here. Miller first coined the term 'poisonous pedagogies' to refer to those unrecognised pedagogical 'strategies' that one picks up from one's parents and that are often, unknowingly, reproduced in the next generation of parenting. From her work we can see that understanding the self as parent might necessitate some psychoanalytic work on one's self in order to reveal deeply hidden pedagogical dispositions.

In this regard, Feldman (2009), in a chapter titled '*Making the self problematic*' (in Lassonde et al. 2009b) claims that 'existentialism and psychoanalytic theory provide us with perspectives that allow us to recognize the problematic nature of the

self in self-study' (p. 42). Of course there are many other perspectives, or theoretical frames (Tinning and Fitzpatrick 2012), that might be brought to bear in regard to better understand the self, and in particular the self in the practice of teaching. For example, Paugh and Robinson (2009) suggest that the unit of study for self-study is 'not an essentialized "self" but the relational self (or selves)' (p. 88). This picks up on what Gee (1990) termed the 'social turn' in postmodernity wherein the notion of selves is a social construction and always in relationship to context and power relations. My question is: How might such theorising of the self be pursued within self-study, and can it be useful (authentic) without it?

In his provocative book *The Heretics: Investigations with the enemies of science,* investigative journalist Will Storr (2013), introduces the reader to the contemporary brain research that demonstrates how we all self-delude. We constantly filter things that don't fit with our sense of 'which way is up'. Our own brain conspires to delude us. How can we be sure that self-study doesn't wallow in self-delusion? Is making self-study public and working with a critical friend/community all that is needed?

Self- study is certainly influenced by Merleau-Ponty's (1968) ideas about embodied knowledge. However, it seems that the self must always be understood as relational:

> While various theories of the self can be helpful as we engage in research on our practice, conceptions of the self are in many ways tangential since it is not the self but the self and the other in practice that is of most interest. (Pinnegar and Hamilton 2009, p. 12)

The Centrality of Reflection

According to Samaras and Freese (2009), 'Research in the area of reflection and reflective practice has had a strong influence on self-study' (p. 4). Further, action research as a form of reflective practice has had a 'strong influence on self-study research' (p. 3). In offering a take on what seems to be the potential for self-study in/for the field of physical education, I return to the notion of reflection and its possibilities and problematics.

Loughran (2004), however, argues that self-study is not the same as reflective practice. 'Reflection is a thoughtful process, but it is something that largely resides within the individual' (p. 25). Self-study, he claims ' …pushes the virtues of reflection further' (p. 25) because self-study requires that it is available for public dissemination and critique. Presumably this occurs largely within the discourse community of self-study teacher educators and teachers.

The 'Reflective Turn' in Teaching and Teacher Education

There is no doubt that one of the major trends in teaching, teacher education, and PETE over the last few decades has been the rise of reflection as a dominant concept. All across the Western education world it seems that reflective teaching/practice is part of the 'official' text.

But even as this trend began some scholars were concerned with the increasing popularity of reflective teaching. Liston and Zeichner (1987) argued that in the 1980s reflection was becoming something of an 'educational slogan…that lacks sufficient conceptual elaboration and programmatic strength' (p. 2). Smyth (1992) expressed concern that reflection is such a commonsensical notion that '…who could possibly be against reflection; it's an indisputable notion like "quality" and "excellence"' (p. 285). Also, because of its universal appeal, reflection can mean all things to all people and, accordingly, 'it runs the risk of being totally evacuated of all meaning' (p. 285).

Smyth (1992) suggested that '…we are witnessing… a kind of conceptual colonization in which terms like reflection have become such an integral part of the educational jargon that not using them is to run the real risk of being out of educational fashion' (p. 286). Even in the physical education community at that time there was concern that critical reflection was becoming 'the patchwork panacea of teacher educators of all theoretical persuasions' (Martinez 1990, p. 20). In 1991, Hellison and Templin (1991) also expressed a similar concern claiming that reflective teaching had become a buzzword in the educational community.

By the early 1990s Joe Kincheloe (1993) lamented that reflection had become just another checklist-type competency-oriented question asked in the process of making judgments on a teacher's performance. When reduced to a set of procedures, teacher reflection becomes little more than a skill to be learned as part of a larger battery of competencies. Viewed in this way, reflection sits alongside other technical skills such as classroom management, planning, and pupil discipline as competencies to be demonstrated. Reflection for the student teacher then becomes simply the rational exercise of determining the gap between their current level of competency and the required level need for certification. In this context, questions relating to the value or meaning of the actual competencies themselves are unlikely to be asked.

Another trend is the recent move in many countries (following trends in the UK and the USA) to develop a national set of competencies for teacher education (for example the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) in the USA). The thrust of the NBPTS in Physical Education is clearly upon self-assessment and self-renewal positing the responsibility for self-monitoring with the individual teacher while at same time using performative mechanisms of public submissions and appraisal as evidence of reflective practice (Macdonald and Tinning 2003).

Taking individual responsibility for one's self-assessment and self-renewal as a teacher is consistent with neo-liberal values that have come to dominate the educational landscape (see Luke 2002; Macdonald 2011). At first blush it might seem consistent with the ideals of self-study. However, self-study has a different take on individual responsibility. As Pinnegar and Hamilton (2009) argue:

> The self in self-study research, positions the researcher as a particular kind of inquirer and declares the relationship of that inquirer both to the practice and to others who are engaged with the inquirer in constructing the practice. It also marks who takes responsibility for doing, understanding, enacting, and improving the practice. In asserting this position,

inquirers embrace Dewey's (1933) notions of the learner as open-minded, wholehearted, and responsible, since it is these orientations of working to learn from, understand and take action toward improvement that the "self" in this kind of research embraces. (p. 12)

Reflective Practice: Ways of Seeing and Thinking in/Through PETE

Notwithstanding the expressed concerns over the ubiquitous, and problematic, use of the term reflection, several PETE undergraduate texts were written that placed reflection at the centre of becoming a (good) physical education teacher; for example, *A reflective approach to teaching physical education* (Hellison and Templin 1991), and *Becoming a physical education teacher* (Tinning et al. 2001). Moreover, there were some PETE programs that were clearly, and explicitly, being oriented around critical reflection (Ovens 2004). However, we know that attempts to date by teacher educators to introduce PETE students to some of the ideas and principles of the socially critical curriculum by means of critical pedagogy have been less than enthusiastically received (see Gore 1993; Tinning 2002; Macdonald and Brooker 1999). It seems that without a certain level of emotional commitment (a certain disposition) by the students to the values underpinning critical reflection, the success of teacher education will be marginal.

We also know that the results of encouraging reflective practice can be unpredictable. While Socrates was reported as asserting that 'an unexamined life is not worth living' the examined life is not without its problematic side.[1] Two decades ago O'Sullivan et al. (1992) argued that teachers of physical education were 'pragmatists to the core' and in the same year Smyth (1992) expressed concern that the kind of reflection most appealing to many teachers is one grounded in pragmatism – a technical form of reflection. The tendency in such pragmatism is for reflection to be an individualistic process that can very easily lack any understanding of the wider social and structural influences on schooling and teaching. This clearly raises some issues for the possible impact/success of self-study within the physical education field.

Tsangaridou and O'Sullivan (1997, p. 4) argue that it is useful to think of reflection on two 'levels': micro-reflection 'gives meaning to or informs day-to-day practice whereas macro-reflection gives meaning to or informs practice over time'. In my view, however, the micro is always connected to the macro (even if rather distantly) and such a distinction tacitly legitimates technical 'reflection' as sufficient. The term *reflective practice* is a broader concept than the more common reflective teaching or reflection. The distinction is significant. Reflective practice can be considered to be a disposition which functions like a set of lenses through which to view all educational and cultural practices (both micro and macro).

Feiman-Nemser (1990) suggests that 'reflective teacher education is not a distinct paradigmatic emphasis but rather a generic professional disposition' (p. 221) that is found in different forms within the different teacher education program

---

[1] For an example of this in the PETE world, see Devis-Devis and Sparkes (1999).

orientations. As Ovens' (2004) own PhD study of a PETE program underpinned by the notion of reflective practice revealed, reflection is not something that is acquired as a form of discrete knowledge or skill but is something that is enacted as part of the discursive contexts in which student teachers find themselves. That is, the nature of the discourse community in which the individual is situated enables different forms of reflection (see Ovens and Tinning 2009, p. 1130). It seems to me that for teacher educators the self-study discourse community offers a supportive 'space' for development of more informed self-reflective practice.

I am attracted to Cherry Collins' (2004, p. 4) suggestion that, 'The quality of reflection on practice is dependent on the concepts and theories: the ways of seeing; to which teachers have access'. Moreover, these 'ways of seeing' will be taken beyond the classroom and reflective practice will be 'applied to' more than the act of teaching. *Reflective practice* will also engage issues relating to schooling and education as inherently political and ideological social structures. In this sense it will be critically oriented.

As I have outlined elsewhere (see Tinning 2010) my notion of reflective practice is underpinned by a way of seeing/thinking that embodies a sociological imagination (Mills 1970). According to Giddens (1994) 'The sociological imagination necessitates, above all, being able to *being able to "think ourselves away" from the familiar routines of our daily lives in order to look at them anew*' (p. 18 emphasis in original). The development of such a sociological imagination would necessitate some reflection on one's own personal epistemology.

According to Hofer (2010) personal epistemology is philosophy at the individual level and reflects how we think about knowledge and knowing. Not only is it important that student teachers begin to understand their personal epistemology and how it might influence their teaching, it is also vitally important for the teacher educator. In their recent book *Personal epistemology and teacher education* Brownlee et al. (2011) acknowledge the importance of working on personal epistemologies within teacher education. However, they make no reference to any work of the self-study community. It seems they have located their discursive lens to psychologically-oriented literature and have overlooked self-study. Self-study offers a way of pursuing such self-knowledge and its connection to practice.

As Ovens and Fletcher (this collection) point out, self-study enacts a disposition of desire 'to *be more*, to improve, to better understand' (p. X). I think that this desire is at least a close cousin of what Feiman-Nemser (1990) called a generic professional disposition or what I am calling a disposition to/for reflective practice. But how to develop such a disposition within a PETE program remains a crucial issue. Moreover, a disposition is always difficult to assess. It is hard to capture the zeitgeist!

Reflection, Writing and Embodiment in Self-Study

Importantly, if we are to better understand our self in practice (as a teacher educator) we need to remember that it is the *embodied* self that is the performer of practices (Ovens and Fletcher, this collection). Embodiment is, however, a challenging

concept within education, not the least because it's so hard to define – to grasp in a way that doesn't reinforce mind-body dualisms.[2] One thing is certain, however, discussion of embodiment draws us into the discourse on subjectivity and identity.

If, as the late Australian educator Garth Boomer once suggested, 'teachers teach who they are' then teacher identity/subjectivity is crucial and attempts to understand one's embodied self are important. Moreover, since 'the politics of identity is increasingly wrapped around configurations of the body' (Elliott 2001, p. 99), and the body (especially in physical activity) is a central focus of physical education, then understanding how one's embodied learning shapes one's identities and subjectivities (Gard 2006) and how this influences the embodied self as performer of practices would seem important for physical education teacher educators as well as physical education teachers.

Significantly, to develop such understanding requires seems to require some form of reflection – some practical enactment of a disposition. But the process of enacting reflection can be a difficult one. In this regard, although there are other forms of representation that can be marshaled in the pursuit of self-study, for example visual and artistic modes (see Weber and Mitchell 2004) or information and communication technologies (see Hoban 2004) it seems to me that the centrality of writing in the work of self-study should not be underestimated.

It seems that, as part of the reflective process the teacher educator or teacher will, often, need to keep some form of professional journal (see Holly 1984) or reflective portfolio (see Lyons and Friedus 2004) and maybe this requires something I might call a disposition to write and reflect. This, therefore, would be disposition that might be useful in enacting the disposition of desire 'to be more, to improve, to better understand' (Ovens and Fletcher, this collection, p. X). Maybe there are two types of people in the teaching/teacher education world – those who love to keep a professional journal/diary/portfolio and those that don't. Ash Casey's (this collection) confession that he has written some 300,000 words in his professional journal confirms that he is in the former group. There are also many for whom writing such a journal is like 'pulling teeth'. But is writing about one's feelings and emotions regarding one's practice really all that is needed to develop an understanding of the *embodied*-self that is the performer of practices? I'm not sure there is an answer to this question but my guess is that it is but one way *into* such an analytic space.

Regardless of the answer to this question, my (still limited) reading of self-study suggests that one cannot lay legitimate claim to self-study unless one is engaged in some form of reflection on one's self and one's practice. In this sense the notion of reflection is implicit in all self-study, it is the spirit of the time, the zeitgeist that lives in self-study.

---

[2] I know that I have tried to give an account of embodied learning elsewhere (Tinning 2010) and have rightly been criticised (see Standal and Engelsrud 2013) for reinforcing the very mind-body dualism I set out to challenge.

An Ending?

In claiming that there is a zeitgeist of reflection living in self-study I am saying nothing new. But I am saying that reflection is a central ethic, a spirit of self-study.

I take away from this brief engagement with self-study a reinforcement of a number of aspects of professional practice that have long been central to my own mission as a teacher educator. For self-study to be worthy of its name it needs to embrace a reflective disposition to the self-practice relationship and to systematically pursue the inquiry with a critical edge and a certain openness to public disclosure.

In regard to public disclosure, it seems to me that the publication of self-study is a more appropriate/relevant practice for the physical education teacher educator than the physical education teacher. In most contexts the teacher educator now is required to research and publish. It's an institutional requirement of university tenure. So, for the teacher educator, self-study is a perfect form of scholarship on teaching (Boyer 1996). However, the situation for the average physical education teacher is rather different for although there might be expectations to be reflective, there is no expectation to publish.

Like other forms of practitioner research, self-study has some great possibilities. Whether or not one sees merit in identifying with the discourse community of other self-study participants will depend on many individual factors. Personally, I have found my engagement with self-study both illuminating and refreshing. It took me back to the agenda of my action research 'days', but it also took me beyond those days by providing me with new insights into better apprehending the complex nature of how to better enact a critical pedagogy of teacher education. In my view, we in the PETE community should welcome self-study and embrace the zeitgeist of reflection that lives within it.

References

Boyer, E. (1996). Scholarship reconsidered to scholarship assessed. *Quest, 48*(2), 129–140.

Brownlee, J., Schraw, G., & Berthelsen, D. (Eds.). (2011). *Personal epistemology and teacher education*. New York: Routledge.

Carr, W., & Kemmis, S. (1986). *Becoming critical: Knowing through action research*. Barcombe: Falmer Press.

Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (2004). Personal experience methods. In N. K. Denszin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 413–427). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Collins, C. (2004). Envisaging a new education studies major: What are the core educational knowledges to be addressed in preservice teacher education? *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 32*(3), 227–240.

Devis-Devis, J., & Sparkes, A. C. (1999). Burning the book: A biographical study of a pedagogically inspired identity crisis in physical education. *European Physical Education Review, 5*(2), 135–152.

Elliott, A. (2001). *Concepts of the self*. Oxford: Polity.

Feiman-Nemser, S. (1990). *Conceptual orientations in teacher education*. East Lansing: Michigan State University, National Centre for Research on Teacher Education.

Feldman, A. (2009). Making the self problematic: Data analysis and interpretation in self-study. In C. Lassonde, S. Galman, & C. Kosnik (Eds.), *Self-study research methodologies for teacher educators* (pp. 35–53). Rotterdam: Sense.

Feldman, A., Paugh, P., & Mills, G. (2004). Self-study through action research. In J. J. Loughran, M. L. Hamilton, V. K. LaBoskey, & T. Russell (Eds.), *International handbook of self-study of teaching and teacher education practices* (pp. 943–977). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Gard, M. (2006). *Men who dance: Aesthetics, athletics and the art of masculinity*. New York: Peter Lang.

Gee, J. (1990). *Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in discourse*. London: Falmer Press.

Giddens, A. (1994). *Beyond left and right: The future of radical politics*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Goodson, I., & Walker, R. (1991). *Biography, identity, and schooling: Episodes in educational research*. London: Falmer Press.

Gore, J. (1993). *The struggle for pedagogies: Critical and feminist discourses as regimes of truth*. New York: Routledge.

Green, B. (Ed.). (2009). *Understanding and researching professional practice*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Grundy, S. (1987). *Curriculum: Product or praxis*. London: Falmer Press.

Hamilton, M., & Pinnegar, S. (1998). Conclusion: The value and the promise of self-study. In M. L. Hamilton (Ed.), *Reconceptualizing teaching practice: Self-study in teacher education* (pp. 234–246). London: Falmer Press.

Hellison, D. R., & Templin, T. J. (1991). *A reflective approach to teaching physical education*. Champaign: Human Kinetics.

Hoban, G. (2004). Using information and communication technologies for the self-study of teaching. In J. J. Loughran, M. L. Hamilton, V. K. LaBoskey, & T. Russell (Eds.), *International handbook of self-study of teaching and teacher education practices* (pp. 1039–1072). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Hodgkinson, H. L. (1957). Action research – A critique. *Journal of Educational Sociology, 31*(4), 137–153.

Hofer, B. (2010). Personal epistemology in Asia: Burgeoning research and future directions. *The Asia-Pacific Educational Researcher, 19*(1), 179–184.

Holly, M.-L. (1984). *Keeping a personal professional journal*. Geelong: Deakin University Press.

Kemmis, S., & McTaggart, R. (1990). *The action research planner*. Geelong: Deakin University Press.

Kincheloe, J. (1993). *Toward a critical politics of teacher thinking: Mapping the postmodern*. Westport: Bergin and Garvey.

LaBoskey, V. (2004). The methodology of self-study and its theoretical underpinnings. In J. J. Loughran, M. L. Hamilton, V. K. LaBoskey, & T. Russell (Eds.), *International handbook of self-study of teaching and teacher education practices* (pp. 813–869). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Lassonde, C., Galman, S., & Kosnik, C. (2009a). Introduction. In C. Lassonde, S. Galman, & C. Kosnik (Eds.), *Self-study research methodologies for teacher educators* (pp. xi–xvi). Rotterdam: Sense.

Lassonde, C., Galman, S., & Kosnik, C. (Eds.). (2009b). *Self-study research methodologies for teacher educators*. Rotterdam: Sense.

Liston, D., & Zeichner, K. (1987). Critical pedagogy and teacher education. *Journal of Education, 169*(3), 117–137.

Loughran, J. J. (2004). A history and context of self-study of teaching and teacher education practices. In J. J. Loughran, M. L. Hamilton, V. K. LaBoskey, & T. Russell (Eds.), *International handbook of self-study of teaching and teacher education practices* (pp. 7–39). Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Loughran, J. J., Hamilton, M. L., LaBoskey, V. K., & Russell, T. (Eds.). (2004). *International handbook of self-study of teaching and teacher education practices*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Luke, A. (2002). Curriculum, ethics, meta-narrative: Teaching and learning beyond the nation. *Curriculum Perspectives, 22*(1), 49–55.

Lyons, N., & Freidus, H. (2004). The reflective portfolio in self-study: Inquiring into and representing a knowledge of practice. In J. J. Loughran, M. L. Hamilton, V. K. LaBoskey, & T. Russell (Eds.), *International handbook of self-study of teaching and teacher education practices* (pp. 1073–1109). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Macdonald, D. (2011). Like a fish in water: Physical education policy and practice in the era of neoliberal globalization. *Quest, 63*(1), 36–45.

Macdonald, D., & Brooker, R. (1999). Articulating a critical pedagogy in physical education teacher education. *Journal of Sport Pedagogy, 5*(1), 51–63.

Macdonald, D., & Tinning, R. (2003). Reflective practice goes public: Reflection, governmentality and postmodernity. In A. Laker (Ed.), *The future of physical education* (pp. 82–102). London: Routledge.

Martinez, K. (1990). Critical reflections on critical reflection in teacher education. *The Journal of Teaching Practice, 10*(2), 20–28.

McCourt, F. (2005). *Teacher man: A memoir*. New York: Scribner Book Company.

McTaggart, R. (1991). *Action research: A short modern history*. Geelong: Deakin University Press.

Merleau-Ponty, M. (1968). *The visible and the invisible*. Evanston: Northwest University Press.

Miller, A. (1987). *For your own good: Hidden cruelty in child-rearing and the roots of violence*. London: Virago.

Mills, C. (1970). *The sociological imagination*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

O'Sullivan, M., Seidentop, D., & Locke, L. (1992). Toward collegiality: Competing viewpoints among teacher educators. *Quest, 22*, 266–280.

Ovens, A. (2004). *The (Im)possibility of critical reflection: The lived experience of reflective practice in teacher education*. Unpublished PhD thesis, The University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia.

Ovens, A., & Tinning, R. (2009). Reflection as situated practice: A memory-work study of lived experience in teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 25*, 1125–1131.

Paugh, P., & Robinson, P. (2009). Participatory research and self-study. In C. Lassonde, S. Galman, & C. Kosnik (Eds.), *Self-study research methodologies for teacher educators* (pp. 87–107). Rotterdam: Sense.

Pinnegar, S., & Hamilton, M. L. (2009). *Self-study of practice as a genre of qualitative research*. Dordrecht: Springer.

Polanyi, M. (1958). *Personal knowledge: Towards a post-critical philosophy*. London: Routledge.

Richardson, V. (Ed.). (2001). *Handbook of research on teaching* (4th ed.). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Samaras, A. P., & Freese, A. R. (2009). Looking back and looking forward: An historical overview of the self-study school. In C. A. Lassonde, S. Galman, & C. Kosnik (Eds.), *Self-study research methodologies for teacher educators* (pp. 3–19). Rotterdam: Sense.

Samaras, A. P., Hicks, M. A., & Berger, J. G. (2004). Self-study through personal history. In J. J. Loughran, M. L. Hamilton, V. K. LaBoskey, & T. Russell (Eds.), *International handbook of self-study of teaching and teacher education practices* (pp. 905–942). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Smyth, J. (1992). Teachers' work and the politics of reflection. *American Educational Research Journal, 29*(2), 267–300.

Standal, O., & Engelsrud, G. (2013). Researching embodiment in movement contexts: A phenomenological approach. *Sport, Education and Society, 18*(2), 154–166.

Storr, W. (2013). *The heretics: Adventures with the enemies of science*. London: Picador.

Tinning, R. (1987a). *Improving teaching in physical education*. Geelong: Deakin University Press.

Tinning, R. (1987b). Beyond the development of a utilitarian teaching perspective: An Australian case study of action research in teacher preparation. In G. Barrette et al. (Eds.), *Myths, models and methods in sport pedagogy*. Champaign: Human Kinetics.

Tinning, R. (1992). Reading action research: Notes on knowledge and human interest. *Quest, 44*(1), 1–15.

Tinning, R. (1995). We have ways of making you think. Or do we? Reflections on 'training' in reflective teaching. In C. Paré (Ed.), *Better teaching in physical education? Think about it!* (pp. 21–52) Proceedings of the international seminar on training of teachers in reflective practice in physical education. Trois-Rivières, Canada: Université du Quebéc à, Trois-Rivières Press.

Tinning, R. (1997). *Pedagogies for physical education: Pauline's story*. Geelong: Deakin University Press.

Tinning, R. (2002). Towards a 'modest' pedagogy: Reflections on the problematics of critical pedagogy. *Quest, 54*(3), 224–241.

Tinning, R. (2010). *Pedagogy and human movement: Theory, practice, research*. Oxon: Routledge.

Tinning, R., & Fitzpatrick, K. (2012). Thinking about research frameworks. In K. Armour & D. Macdonald (Eds.), *Research methods in physical education and youth sport*. London: Routledge.

Tinning, R., Macdonald, D., Wright, J., & Hickey, C. (2001). *Becoming a physical education teacher: Contemporary and enduring issues*. Melbourne: Prentice Hall.

Tsangaridou, N., & O'Sullivan, M. (1997). The role of reflection in shaping physical education teachers' educational values and practices. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 17*, 2–25.

Weber, S., & Mitchell, C. (2004). Visual artistic modes of representation for self-study. In J. J. Loughran, M. L. Hamilton, V. K. LaBoskey, & T. Russell (Eds.), *International handbook of self-study of teaching and teacher education practices* (pp. 979–1039). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Young, J. R., Erickson, L. B., & Pinnegar, S. (Eds.). (2012). *Proceedings from: The ninth international conference on self-study of teacher education practices*. Provo: Brigham Young University Press.

Zeichner, K. M., & Noffke, S. E. (2001). Practitioner research. In V. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (4th ed., pp. 298–330). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Where We Go from Here: Developing Pedagogies for PETE and the Use of Self-Study in Physical Education and Teacher Education

Mary O'Sullivan

Introduction

The physical education teacher education (PETE) research field is in trouble. The research base of PETE has not grown much in recent years and this is not a healthy sign for the field. I hope this text can bring greater focus to how we think about and facilitate more research on teacher education, and how teacher educators can better support those learning to teach. Many physical education and sport pedagogy researchers are currently more focused on building research careers around how pedagogies of the body and pedagogies of new media impact on young people's understandings of and engagement with sport and physical activity. There is a primary interest for a cohort or early career academics. There is also a small cadre of academics interested in professional development of physical education teachers (Armour and Yelling 2004; Parker et al. 2012) but this research is not a focus of this commentary. I am delimiting my documents to teacher education as in initial teacher education. This focus does not suggest the research topics alluded to above are not important for physical education. They are.

However, we also need more programmatic research focused on how to prepare physical education teachers for the challenges of contemporary schools and society. PETE research is not developing at a pace to match the challenges faced by teacher educators in school or in higher education institutions in helping the next generation of teachers learn to teach or in supporting and facilitating them as lifelong learners. I want my contribution together with the other contributors to this edited volume on self-study to encourage a greater focus on PETE research and the preparation of physical education teacher educators in an increasingly complex and challenging educational environment.

M. O'Sullivan (✉)
University of Limerick, Limerick, Ireland
e-mail: mary.osullivan@ul.ie

The evidence base for professional learning in PETE needs to grow. In preparing a presentation for the 2013 *Association Internationale des Ecoles Superieures d'Education Physique /International Association for Physical Education in Higher Education* (AIESEP) specialist seminar in Finland on teacher education in physical education (O'Sullivan 2013), I completed a short (non-scientific) analysis of three major English language journals in our field (*Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, Sport, Education, and Society, and Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*) over the last 4 years. I had sought contemporary PETE research and was dismayed to find less than 10 % of 400 plus articles reviewed could be classified as research on PETE. My analysis complimented an extensive 10-year review of sport pedagogy literature by Kulinna et al. (2009) who found less than 15 % of sport pedagogy research, published in a more extensive range of English language journals worldwide (1996–2005), was PETE related.

Thus the editors of this edited volume, Alan and Tim, should be thanked for bringing a focus to the need for and relevance of self-study methodology in exploring contemporary PETE practices and understandings of physical education teacher educators. The text is an important addition to the PETE literature. The chapters evidence a cohort of teacher educators passionate about PETE, and shares their understandings and efforts at improving their practices in support of teacher education students.

The authors' interests in teacher education research mirror a focus on general teacher education worldwide. For example, the European Commission (2012) recently called for more research on teacher educators to ensure they have the versatility and competencies to cope with changing times and expectations for schooling. The British Education Research Association (2013) has highlighted a concern about the status of teacher education, and is undertaking a major inquiry into the relationship between educational research and teacher education and how both work to improve outcomes for children and young people. The Dutch have a long history of research in teacher education and Fred Korthagen's writings on reflective practice have been influential in the writings of some PETE academics (Korthagen et al. 2006; Tsangaridou and O'Sullivan 1997). Dutch universities support regional 'expertise networks' of teacher educators that provide professional development support for teacher educators and promote high quality teacher education. PETE has much to learn from their efforts. For example, the Flemish Association of Teacher Education (VELOV) provides professional development programmes for teacher educators (broadly defined) and the Antwerp network (ELANT) was given the responsibility to create a *Profile for Teacher Educators* (VELOV 2012); a tool for professional development with teacher educators. They describe the profile as:

> Providing a solid basis and a common language for teacher education, supervision and for the professional development of teacher educators. Beginning teacher educators can use it as a means of establishing their initial situation and experienced teacher educators can use it to identify which areas they wish to develop further. (VELOV 2012, p. 6)

Such efforts specifically call for the establishment and further development of organised professional groupings and networks of teacher educators both to strengthen professional identity and ensure that the profession is fully represented

in social and professional dialogues. I welcome this attention on teacher education and teacher educators. The work of the teacher education authors in this text focus on the potential of self-study in building a contemporary PETE research base and hopefully will motivate other sport pedagogy academics to consider studying PETE practices and 'build a community of practice in which teaching and scholarship are intertwined' (Kitchen et al. 2008, p. 161). Later in this chapter I share a potential PETE research agenda, considering how different self-study research designs can contribute to the agenda. In the remaining sections of this chapter, I:

- Share insights generated from my readings of the self-study chapters and self-study literature more generally;
- Share some concerns my reading and reflections have raised about contemporary teacher education and PETE research, and;
- Present ideas on future research agendas for contemporary PETE in the hope some readers will take up these challenges.

Some Insights

To underpin policy and practice developments in PETE, it is necessary to further develop the knowledge base about PETE and physical education teacher educators in a changing higher education landscape. There is need for more probing and theoretically driven research on PETE programmes and the work of teacher educators including school mentors, university tutors, and pre-service teachers. The authors' narratives throughout this volume highlighted the complexities of doing teacher education and in aligning practices and contexts with contemporary students' needs and interests. The chapters highlight value in researching teacher education practices and programmes to be better informed in the reshaping of future practice for contemporary schooling. The PETE research complements many of the findings from classroom self-study literature (Donche and van Petegem 2011).

The narratives presented by the authors suggest self-study is a valuable research tool in at least three ways. It helps teacher educators build their capacities as educators, allows for experimentation with pedagogies of teacher education, and provides space for exploration of how/if PETE programme goals are fit for purpose. I address these briefly below.

Studies of Self: Being a Teacher Educator and Doing Teacher Education

There is a knowledge base to teacher education (Cochran-Smith et al. 2008). The chapters by Casey and Attard (early career academics) and MacPhail (an experienced teacher educator) provide powerful illustrations of how self-study allowed

teacher educators to develop/refine their knowledge base and the skills needed as teacher educators. The systematic focus on practice provided opportunities to produce knowledge to inform the nature of those practices with the potential to reframe future practice beyond themselves and their departments.

The self-study process (via reflexive diaries and emails with colleagues) provided space for Casey and Attard (who had been successful secondary school teachers) to manage their transition to novice teacher educators. They note how unprepared they were for the substantively different knowledge, skills, and capacities needed between first and second order teaching responsibilities (European Commission 2012). Their story, unfortunately, is all too common. Much of the published self-study literature provide examples of novice teacher educators seeking colleagues with a shared commitment to learning about and doing teacher education (Casey and Fletcher 2012; Elliott-Johns and Tidwell 2013; Kitchen et al. 2008). What should be a concern is how little preparation is part of the doctoral training of so many novice teacher educators and the recruitment processes do not seem to hold such a knowledge base and experience as essential criteria for the post. I will come back to this later in discussing concerns about self-study in teacher education.

MacPhail, whose doctoral preparation was not in teacher education, noted how the self-study process allowed her to better understand her own practice as a teacher educator and to appreciate the value of a community of practice with experienced teacher educators in the development of her teacher educator expertise. There are lessons in this chapter for departmental leaders from this narrative in relation to the need for formal and informal strategies to build the capacities of newly recruited teacher educators. How can these leaders create support structures between the teaching demands required in delivering on a PETE programme and increased research expectations for a successful academic career? Can self-study research clusters support this effort? The authors in this volume provide some positive evidence in this regard.

Signature Pedagogies in Teacher Education

Self-study as a methodology allows for the exploration for signature pedagogies in teacher education. Signature pedagogies involve taking 'the best practices that we… employ in teacher education and more deeply understand what makes them wise and what makes them flawed' (Falk 2006, p. 76). Four authors (Bruce, Forgasz, Garbett, and Cameron) have shown the value of self-study to explore pedagogies of teacher education. Bruce used self-study to consider the effectiveness of service learning in her teacher education programme and what can and cannot be delivered using this pedagogy. She found the possibilities and limitations of service learning as a counter-hegemonic practice (Cipolle 2004).

The editors included contributions from drama and science educators as to the value of new pedagogies in professional learning of new teachers. Forgasz draws on her drama background and a commitment to the 'wisdom of the body' as a

pedagogical strategy to help prospective teachers understand and learn to cope with the complexities of leading and supporting change in schools. Her students wrote and reflected on their feelings and bodily sensations during their teaching situations, what Forgasz referred to as 'felt sense', noting how reflecting on feelings and self-knowledge helped these teachers learn about teaching and potential learning challenges for students. Garbett, a science educator, used her experience of and reflections on learning to ride a horse as a pedagogical tool to help her science education students learn to teach. She used the self-study approach to critique the effectiveness of this strategy. Cameron used a critical auto-ethnographic case study approach (narrative diaries, emailing expert pedagogues) to understand how and why the critical pedagogy approach she was using as a teacher educator was being resisted by some students and how she could best address their resistance via a social justice pedagogy.

These studies highlight contemporary pedagogies and explore how we can better expose teacher candidates to the complexities of teaching, the uncertainty of knowledge, and the changing needs and interests of the young people they are preparing to teach. We need to work to determine which pedagogies have the potential to develop what Hargreaves and Fullan (2012) refer to as teachers' social, emotional, and decisional capital – critical variables of highly effective teachers. We need to look at the benefits of these pedagogies for pre-service candidates and for the specific objectives of our PETE programme (e.g. content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, social, or decisional capital). Larger scale studies and programmes of research across teacher education departments would allow the investigation of teacher education pedagogies across contextual and cultural environments. This would build a knowledge base of signature pedagogies specific to programme goals and curricular outcomes. I will discuss the value of signature pedagogies for teacher education later in the chapter.

Departmental Self-Studies and Communities of Practice

Although an advocate of self-study, Ken Zeichner (2007) has been critical of self-study methodology in teacher education. His concern has been with the overly individualistic and introspective nature of the self-study literature, and has called for larger sample sizes and programmes of research that have the credibility to change policy and practice beyond the individual person. Metzler's 20-year commitment to a collective/departmental approach to PETE programme assessment, as discussed in his contribution in this volume, is a rare example of longitudinal work in PETE research. Metzler and his departmental colleagues have created a substantial database on student knowledge, attitudes, and teaching practices over the course of their teacher education programme. More importantly, the data have been the basis for individual and collective reflection at the departmental level with a strong individual and collective commitment to programme improvement. Metzler does not speak explicitly about how this commitment has impacted on teacher educator identities

and teacher educator capacities in his department over the duration of this work, but it does present an interesting research question with implications beyond their department.

Departmental self-studies with small cohorts of PETE staff present opportunities to discuss, create, and reshape their visions for teacher education by drawing on systematic exploration of their practices. It allows exploring the values and skills of the partnership schools with which they work and the subsequent outcomes of their graduates. The early work from the Flemish teacher education networks, such as ELANT, allows teacher educators to take time out as groups of staff to consider their teaching and programme vision. It helps them keep their knowledge current and their practices relevant to the needs of their pre-service and in-service teachers, and to the changing educational policy contexts (see VELOV 2012). The collective nature of self-study envisioned in this way would include researching practice with (a) teachers in the field, (b) other researchers, and (c) departmental colleagues and would allow teacher educators to bond (see chapters by MacPhail and Casey). Practices could be explored and assumptions critiqued and challenged (Cameron). An advance in self-study would be to ensure more critical discussion of practice and how the processes engaged have impacted on learners.

Limitations of Self-Study

In this section I briefly explore some concerns with self-study. While appreciating the benefits of the research tradition in teacher education and its potential as a transformative process in teacher education, there were issues that emerged from my readings of the self-study literature including the chapters in this volume. Alan and Tim made a strong case for the benefits of self-study in their introductory chapter and others have noted the 'transformative potential' in being and becoming a teacher educator (Kitchen et al. 2008). Raising these concerns is not meant to diminish the value of self-study as presented to teacher education; rather, I seek to bolster its value as part of a growing evidence base for contemporary challenges to PETE and teacher education more generally.

Self-Study Is Not a Substitute for Formal Preparation in the Discipline of Teacher Education

I noted earlier the existence of a substantial knowledge base on the broad landscape of teacher education with comprehensive reviews of the latest research for major domains of practice (see Cochran-Smith et al. 2008). This literature has provided evidence on what teachers should know, preferred settings for learning to teach, evidence on which pedagogical practices are productive for particular learning outcomes (e.g., teaching for diversity) and what kinds of experiences can better prepare

teachers for which school settings (Seidl 2007). We know about the format and sequencing of school placements and about how specific kinds of partnerships with schools can lead to more effective outcomes (Moran and Clarke 2012).

Despite this knowledge base too many early career academics are being recruited into PETE to educate the next generation of teachers, yet gained little if any knowledge of this literature knowledge as part of their doctoral training. Indeed for some, the nature of their doctoral preparation was focused on a specific research question that may have had little to do with the teaching of prospective teachers of physical education in schools. There is evidence (European Commission 2012) that many teacher educators enter academe from successful teachers as teachers and not as a planned career as a teacher educator. Rather, they had been highly effective second level teachers and in completing post-graduate degrees found the opportunity to work with teacher education students and progress a research career as an attractive proposition. The recent European Commission (2012) report notes teacher educators are different from teachers and have:

> …to deploy specific, additional competences, which set them apart from other teaching staff or academics. In fact, their competences have to do not only with first-order knowledge – about schooling, as related to specific subject areas – but also second-order knowledge – about teacher education itself, teachers as adult learners and related pedagogies, as well as organizational knowledge of their own and their student teachers' workplaces (p. 54).

Most teacher educators disapprove of teachers learning to teach on the job as in the Teach First (UK) or Teach for America schemes (USA). Yet it seems in many higher education institutions that we allow teacher educators to learn their profession/discipline on the job. Does senior leadership believe this learning can/should be done appropriately on the job? What does it say about the legitimacy of a knowledge base in teacher education? What self-study does is provide a space to explore one's understanding of becoming and being a teacher educator. It should not, however, be understood as a substitute for careful study of the existing teacher education knowledge base.

Inclusivity or Exclusivity: Can I Play Too?

The examples of self-study in the previous chapters show clear benefits to the authors from interactions with staff mentors (be they experienced or more senior staff with teacher education expertise). But what of those staff members who are not engaged in a self-study within a department that has such a community? What about members of staff who have not been invited to participate in these 'self-study groupings'? Are there implications for programme cohesion? Is it possible that those not invited to participate (or who do not feel able or willing to join) could become increasingly isolated from their colleagues? I was unable to find studies that address this issue. If self-study groups within departments include influential members of staff, what are the power dynamics both within and outside the group and is there

potential for exclusivity or isolation of staff? Members of self-study communities in either formal contexts or informal groupings must have a degree of sensitivity around these issues but I was unable to find studies that address the impact of self-study communities of practice on department staff. It is in my view an issue that should not be underestimated and is worthy of exploration.

Self-Study Within a Broader Landscape

The commitment to teacher education was quite evident among the authors and editors who contributed this volume. Each, in their own way, made time in increasingly pressurised academic settings to think about, understand, and improve their practice. They created spaces to discuss (if not interrogate) their experiences and feelings on being and becoming teacher educators. Their analyses were situational in that they focused on how their teaching decisions impacted on their students and their own learning.

I had expected to read more about how programme content, assessments of students' professional learning, or engagement with schools and school mentors was influenced (either positively or negatively) by external factors. In other words, I wondered how state and/or national policies impacted on the day-to-day practice of teacher educators. I did not find this analysis. Can or should self-study projects consider such analysis? While teacher education has been in the educational spotlight in many countries in recent years and much of it for the wrong reasons (Furlong 2013), the self-study work reported here was mostly silent on how economic or education policies had (or had not) impacted their work. Such policies may function at the micro level (within departments), meso level (across departments with other subject specialists or within the university) or macro level (national accreditation parameters or funding and education polices for teacher education). Physical education policy research, which is focused on teacher education, is much needed. How policy influences the day to practice of teacher education and the lives of physical education teacher educators is almost non-existent. Self study research with a meso and/or macro policy focus has a contribution to enable better understanding of how teacher education gets done and what the factors are that enhance and/or inhibit that work.

The Value Added of Self-Study Needs To Be More Visible

Teacher education is a labour-intensive enterprise. With few exceptions mentoring of student teachers is done with little or no compensation to the teacher/school/school district. This situation contrasts sharply with the preparation of health professionals. In nursing and therapies, cohorts of clinical tutors work with health care trainees on clinical placement sites. The health service providers pay these clinical tutors. They view a cohort of health professionals in training at their teaching

hospital site as a status symbol. In other funding models, medical schools allocate a significant portion of the income generated (student fee/state funding) to teaching hospitals for clinical tutor staff support and staff development of the consultants who provide additional teaching on site. How might we conceive of self-study research projects to examine how cohorts of teacher education students add value for teachers and pupils in schools? Finland's education system, acclaimed world-wide as an exemplar, supports 'teaching schools' and part of the teachers' job description is the mentoring and support of pre-service teachers (Salberg 2010). Could collaborative self-study research programmes facilitate professional development for a cohort of school and university teacher educators while also creating robust and meaningful school placements for student teachers and better learning outcomes for their pupils? After all, the aim of self-study research as noted by Attard in this volume is to 'provoke, challenge, and illuminate' teacher education practices (Bullough and Pinnegar 2001, p. 20).

Future Possibilities: A PETE Agenda Supported by Self-Study Research

There is no doubting the value of self-study to the authors in this text. This supports Zeichner's (2007) contention that self-study as a methodology has been important in effecting change in teaching practices and understandings of teacher educators. In this text Metzler suggests self-study scholarship in PETE can be described fairly as predominantly: individual, introspective, practice-oriented, and short-term. The early career and experienced teacher educators showed how the self-study process allowed them space to think, reflect on, and discuss their practice with colleagues (both peers and experts). These interactions helped them refine understandings of their role as teacher educator and the appropriateness of teacher education practices and pedagogies to meet their expectations and the needs/expectations of their students who were learning to teach in a variety of school contexts. Other teacher educators (science, physical education, and drama educators) used self-study methodology to study the impact of their pedagogies on students' knowledge, dispositions, and/or practices in learning to teach.

As important as this work was to the authors, self-study research must aspire to more expansive formats, thereby providing the added value that can impact changes to policy and practices across departmental, regional, and national levels. This might include the completion of more longitudinal studies and cross-programme collaborations. Zeichner (2007) called for a shift from careful studies of one's own practice to looking across studies for patterns that might best inform the field. The departmental approach to self-study and the longitudinal nature of work conducted by Metzler and his departmental colleagues is an important example of this work. PETE needs more cross-programme collaborations that can focus on what and how specific programme pedagogies such as case-based teaching (Meldrum 2011) can deliver on key programme outcomes.

This approach to PETE research calls for new self-study designs. First, PETE could benefit from projects focused on key challenges in the preparation of physical education teachers. These would be cross-programme self-study designs interrogating how pedagogies work and for what purposes. This calls for an analysis of 'signature pedagogies' across a number of PETE programmes. These pedagogies (e.g., case-based learning, use of teaching metaphors, school ethnographies) are characteristic forms of teaching/learning in a given professional field and are the types of teaching that organise the fundamental ways in which future practitioners are educated for their profession (Shulman 2005). A recent PETE study by Meldrum (2011), while limited to one programme, is a nice example of studying the value added of a signature pedagogy that looked at how problem based learning might prepare pre-service physical education teachers for an uncertain future. In his chapter Metzler detailed a departmental study that sought to explore the nature of the learning outcomes for pre-service students, some of whom experienced micro teaching while others had a school practice experience. Other aspects of teacher education would benefit from cross-institutional and cross-national collaborative research initiatives. Self-study methodology could allow us to look at key pedagogies that might support important teacher education outcomes such as: teaching diverse learners and teaching for social justice outcomes. In PETE, specific programme outcomes to be studied might include pedagogies to promote lifelong physical activity (see Harris 2013) or teaching for socio-emotional learning in physical education (Klemola et al. 2013).

A second programme of research where self-study methodology would be appropriate is where communities of teacher educators commit to interrogate and challenge habits of practice and allow for alternative readings of teaching/learning contexts in PETE. The added value of the critical self-study approach might best be achieved via engagement within a community of teacher educators in the interrogation of departmental policies and practices and PETE programme goals. In Holland, higher education institutions support an infrastructure of expertise networks to engage teacher educators in professional development. The Flemish Teacher Education network 'ELANT' is a nice example (VELOV 2012).

A final example to be mentioned here is the use of a self-study approach to build a knowledge base on physical education teacher educators. Who are physical education teacher educators and how well prepared are they to support the professional learning of pre-service physical education teachers? What are their signature pedagogies and how effective are they for what learning outcomes? Taylor et al. (2013) reported on the development of a scheme that characterised pedagogical practices in initial teacher education classes. Such a study could be done with particular reference to physical education teacher education. This research could produce detailed and layered representations of pedagogical practices through video recordings (across PETE programmes) and opens a new approach to research on physical education teacher education.

The editors are to be thanked for bringing a focus back to the doing and researching of teacher education. If the text brings awareness to others of self-study methodology in teacher education and generates the potential for transformative pedagogies in PETE, it has been worth the effort. I thank the editors for giving me the opportunity to comment on these possibilities for PETE into the future.

References

Armour, K., & Yelling, M. (2004). Effective professional development for physical education teachers: The role of informal, collaborative learning. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 26*(2), 177–200.

British Educational Research Association. (2013). *Research and teacher education: The BERA inquiry*. London: BERA.

Bullough, R. V., Jr., & Pinnegar, S. (2001). Guidelines for quality in autobiographical forms of self-study research. *Educational Researcher, 30*(3), 13–21.

Casey, A., & Fletcher, T. (2012). Trading places: From physical education teachers to teacher educators. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 31*(4), 362–380.

Cipolle, S. (2004). Service learning as a counter-hegemonic practice: Evidence pro and con. *Multicultural Education, 11*(3), 12–23.

Cochran-Smith, M., Feiman-Nemser, S., & McIntyre, J. (Eds.). (2008). *Handbook of research on teacher education*. New York: Routledge.

Donche, V., & Van Petegem, P. (2011). Teacher educators' conceptions of learning to teach and related teaching strategies. *Research Papers in Education, 26*(2), 207–222.

Elliott-Johns, S., & Tidwell, D. (2013). Different voices, many journeys: Explorations of the transformative nature of the self-study of teacher education practices. *Studying Teacher Education, 9*(2), 91–95.

EU Commission. (2012). *Supporting the teaching professions for better learning outcomes*. Strasbourg: EU Commission.

Falk, B. (2006). A conversation with Lee Shulman – Signature pedagogies for teacher education: Defining our practices and rethinking our preparation. *The New Educator, 2*(1), 73–82.

Furlong, J. (2013). Globalisation, neoliberalism, and the reform of teacher education in England. *The Educational Forum, 77*(1), 28–50.

Hargreaves, A., & Fullan, M. (2012). *Professional capital: Transforming teaching in every school*. New York: Routledge.

Harris, J. (2013). Physical education teacher education students' knowledge, perceptions and experiences of promoting healthy, active lifestyles in secondary schools. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy,* iFirst. doi:10.1080/17408989.2013.769506.

Kitchen, J., Ciuffetelli Parker, D., & Gallagher, T. (2008). Authentic conversation as faculty development: Establishing a self-study group in a faculty of education. *Studying Teacher Education, 4*(2), 157–171.

Klemola, U., Heikinarro-Johansson, P., & O'Sullivan, M. (2013). Physical education student teachers' perceptions of applying knowledge and skills about emotional understanding studied in PETE in a one-year teaching practicum. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy, 18*(1), 28–41.

Korthagen, F., Loughran, J., & Russell, T. (2006). Developing fundamental principles for teacher education programs and practices. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 22*(8), 1020–1041.

Kulinna, P. H., Scrabis-Fletcher, K., Kodish, S., Phillips, S., & Silverman, S. (2009). A decade of research literature in physical education pedagogy. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 28*(2), 119–140.

Meldrum, K. (2011). Preparing pre-service physical education teachers for uncertain future(s): A scenario-based learning case study from Australia. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy, 16*(2), 133–144.

Moran, A., & Clarke, L. (2012). Back to the future: Do lessons from Finland point the way to a return to model schools for Northern Ireland? *European Journal of Teacher Education, 35*(3), 275–288.

O'Sullivan, M. (2013, September). *Comparative and critical issues in the partnership model for PETE.* Keynote address at the AIESEP Specialist Seminar. University of Jyvaskyla, Finland.

Parker, M., Patton, K., & Tannehill, D. (2012). Mapping the landscape of communities of practice as professional development in Irish physical education. *Irish Educational Studies, 31*(3), 311–327.

Salberg, P. (2010). *Finnish lessons: What can the world learn from educational change in Finland?* New York: Teachers College Press.

Seidl, B. (2007). Working with communities to explore and personalize culturally relevant pedagogies: Push, double images, and raced talk. *Journal of Teacher Education, 58*(2), 168–183.

Shulman, L. (2005). Signature pedagogies in the professions. *Daedalus, 134*(3), 52–59.

Taylor, P. G., Low, E. L., Lim, K. M., & Hui, C. (2013). Making learning visible in initial teacher education: A pedagogical characterisation scheme. *Educational Research for Policy and Practice, 12*(3), 193–209.

Tsangaridou, N., & O'Sullivan, M. (1997). The role of reflection in shaping physical education teachers' educational values and practices. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 17*(1), 2–25.

VELOV. (2012). *The Flemish teacher educator development profile.* Retrieved from www.velov.eu

Zeichner, K. M. (2007). Accumulating knowledge across self-studies in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 58*(1), 36–46.

Reflecting on the Possibilities for Self-Study in Physical Education

Tim Fletcher and Alan Ovens

Introduction

In this conclusion to the book, we want to reflect upon and critique the potential of self-study in the field of physical education. While Tinning and O'Sullivan have commented on the value of self-study in addressing the emerging conflicts, dilemmas, and incongruities arising within the pedagogies for contemporary physical education practice, in this chapter we want to consider how self-studies of physical education make contributions to the broader field of teaching and teacher education practices. In doing so, we suggest that the implications of self-study research extend well beyond the individual people who carry out the research, and the programs and contexts in which they work. In other words, we argue that self-study research offers valuable contributions to expanding conversations, knowledge, and understanding of teaching and teacher education practices (Clift 2004).

We believe there are five strands that weave together as a common thread through the chapters of this book. First, there is an awareness that the world we are teaching in has changed. The 'new times' discussed in the introductory chapter have not only greatly diversified the theoretical and methodological resources for inquiry, but have also challenged researchers to find meaningfulness in their research endeavours. There is a new preparedness to challenge convention and become immersed as the subject and object of study.

Second, each chapter is more than just a project of inquiry; it is also a moral and therapeutic narrative of each author's own experience. The research texts are not simply stories that convey the cultural uniqueness of each author's particular setting.

T. Fletcher (✉)
Brock University, St. Catharines, ON, Canada
e-mail: tfletcher@brocku.ca

A. Ovens
University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand
e-mail: a.ovens@auckland.ac.nz

Rather, through self-study each author gains confidence in the validity of their actions and voice, as well as becoming more resilient and supported in their work.

Third, the chapters flow from the liberal and radical politics of action. They reflect commitments to humanism and social justice as the rationale for becoming immersed and enmeshed in affecting change. In each chapter, the author engages in self-study with the commitment to improve their practice and understandings of practice.

Fourth, the chapters enact the body as a medium for making sense of and making connections with a world in which they co-participate in creating (Macintyre Latta and Buck 2007). Performing research in this way enables the researcher-learner to understand their own bodily capacity for thoughts and actions, their own feelings and emotions, as well as their relationships and connections with others.

The last strand centres on transformation and professional learning. In this sense, each self-study becomes more than a mechanism for reflecting on one's teaching and extends to being a tool through which theory can be used to defract, or 'slice through' every-day experience in ways that are transformative for both knowing in action and being a teacher or teacher educator. With respect to the aim of this chapter, we turn to focus on the latter three of these strands.

Enacting a Politics of Action

In taking an improvement-oriented stance to teacher education practice, self-study researchers represent what Tinning (1991, 2002) might consider a 'modest' form of critical pedagogy in teacher education, seeking to disrupt things as they are. The very nature of self-study of practice means that teacher educators reject taken-for-granted assumptions about teaching and teacher education, and wholeheartedly acknowledge the uncertainties of teaching practice. Self-studiers thus take a political stance in sharing how they have been able to disrupt their understandings of practice and ways in which they have sought to create new and meaningful pedagogical situations.

At the heart of each author's teaching and research effort is the intent to provide deeper, more insightful, and more meaningful understandings of personal transformation that have occurred while simultaneously teaching about and learning about teaching (Loughran 2006). In doing so, there is an expectation that improved understandings will impact positively upon student teachers' experiences of learning to teach. Casey and Metzler do this by discussing how they have sought to improve their understanding of teaching and learning in physical education using a models-based approach to practice – an innovation that Kirk (2013) identifies as challenging 'one-size-fits-all' (p. 2) forms of physical education by enabling students to attain a diverse set of educational outcomes. However, as Casey and Metzler both reveal, implementing models-based approaches in teacher education programs is not without its challenges on personal and programmatic levels. Forgasz and Garbett described how using embodiment as a conceptual and methodological approach to studying teaching practice can improve understandings of the nature of teaching relationships and the emotional dimensions that are present in teaching. Both

authors provided (at least for us) a demonstration of how a focus on the body can improve how we as readers might relate at a fundamental level to the feelings and emotions experienced by teacher educators as they describe their practice. MacPhail described working as part of a community of practice (CoP) in a PETE department and explained how a CoP fostered a positive climate for sharing ideas, observing and critiquing one another's practices, and for identifying and addressing challenges. Engagement in the CoP improved how teacher educators at her institution thought about and went about their practice individually and collectively, which, most likely, improved the quality of how student teachers learned to teach.

Interactivity

The subtlety of a politics of action is also expressed in the forms of interactivity that are established within each study. Kelchtermans and Hamilton (2004) suggest that 'good self-study scholarship involves collaboration not just with the present others, but with those whose opinions and ideas we value (from personal interaction or from texts) and whose voices become part of our system for considering our own analysis, findings, interpretations, and ideas' (p. 786). Although each of the chapters in this book are authored by individuals, examples of interactivity and collaboration are apparent in each of the works.

This collaboration is easier to see in some chapters than others. For example, in the meta-analysis of self-studies reported by Metzler, the interactivity and collaboration involves several groups of participants: teacher educators and students in the PETE programme at Georgia State University (GSU), programme graduates, field-based cooperating (or associate) teachers, K-12 students, and research collaborators from other institutions. This level of interactivity emphasizes the value that institutional/programmatic self-studies hold, as they enable multiple perspectives on the 'impact' of teacher education practices in a programme, helping to address concerns that some stakeholders (particularly policy makers) have about the trustworthiness of self-studies (Craig 2009). In other chapters, critical friends provided a source of interactivity for the teacher educator-researchers. For instance, Cameron engaged in conversations with several scholars who shared similar beliefs and stances about pedagogy (namely critical pedagogy), working through challenges, sharing experiences, and identifying ways to effectively teach a critical agenda and to 'handle' the struggles they faced personally and professionally. Ovens, Casey, and Brown also worked with critical friends with whom they were able to discuss their respective practices or have them observe classes to offer feedback and critique. In each case, the interaction with others helped the teacher educator-researchers to question and reframe understandings and experiences of teaching practice, enabling new perspectives to be considered (Bullough and Pinnegar 2001).

In some of the chapters the interactivity is buried slightly deeper beneath the surface. For example, although Attard describes his engagement with critical friends during his early years as a teacher, much of his initial interaction came from

conversations that he was having with himself through his journal. Not only does this form of conversing allow for open and unpredictable discourse, when viewed and re-analyzed as an archive (Ham and Kane 2004), it can provide an ongoing source of new data that allows continual reframing of ideas and practices. The caveat to using one's own journaling thus becomes ensuring that honesty and openness form a central platform to guiding journal entries. The value of self-studies for others in teacher education lies in the researcher sharing instances where challenges were faced, vulnerabilities exposed, and problems revealed (Samaras and Freese 2009). Exposing and grappling with the problematic thus becomes the essence of strong self-study research.

The Body as a Medium for Making Sense and Making Connections

The second strand that we wish to draw attention to is the embodied nature of these self-studies. In particular, it is through the emotional dimension that these teacher educator-researchers have made connections with the nature of teaching. Zembylas (2003), Labaree (2004), and Van Veen and Lasky (2005) all offer the fairly obvious, but relatively under-emphasized observation that because the nature of teaching involves human interactions (or the development of relationships) it necessarily involves an emotional dimension, and paying attention to emotions is crucial to foster meaningful learning. Labaree (2004) suggests that the emotional connection that students have with their teachers is perhaps the most powerful tool to encourage engaged learning. Following from this, Kelchtermans and Hamilton (2004) argue that there is a need to place more emphasis on relationships and their 'emotional currents' (p. 785) as a part of teacher knowledge. Such emphasis needs to consider not only the emotions experienced but also acknowledge how curriculum and other structural features of teaching shape emotional experiences (Hargreaves 2001). Despite recognizing the centrality of emotions in teaching and an increase in research on emotions in teaching over the past two decades, it remains a relatively under-researched field of inquiry, and as a result, our understanding of the role of emotions in teaching is somewhat limited (Akinbode 2013). However, the chapters in this volume suggest that self-study can be used as a powerful methodology to explore emotions in teaching.

By committing to explore emotions, Kelchtermans and Hamilton (2004) assert that researchers cannot 'neglect the *embodied nature* of teaching and learning' (p. 800, emphasis in original). Emotions are felt, they are lived, they are experienced through our bodies. Forgasz supports this assertion in Chap. 2 and suggests that the kinaesthetic nature of physical education (as well as drama and various forms of performance art) makes it a suitable context through which to explore embodied ways of knowing in teaching practice through self-study. One example Forgasz describes involved an interaction with her mother, discussing her heart racing prior to a job promotion. Forgasz described to her mother that it 'was your body's way of telling you something about how you were feeling in that moment'. We are sure

most of readers can relate to the feeling of their hearts racing (we certainly can) and can recall some of the embodied emotions attached to the experience, whether fear, excitement, desire, or anxiety. The important point is that the description captures something that most readers can readily relate to and vicariously live through or experience, which we suggest strengthens the abilities of self-studiers to effectively share their work in meaningful ways.

A closer look at the chapters in this volume reveals that emotions are evident in the self-studies of most teacher-educator-researchers. Emotions are revealed through the authors' reporting of feeling, for example, vulnerable, uncertain, disappointed, or elated. Some of these instances occur as a result of conducting self-study – that is, self-study made the author more aware of their emotions – while others used their identification of emotions to drive their self-study. Several examples of embodied emotional responses to teaching and learning situations are evident in Garbett's, Cameron's, Bruce's, Ovens's, and Brown's self-studies, and the emotions revealed provide a lens through which to consider each author's sense of identity (Van Veen and Lasky 2005). As such, we are given a better insight into who teacher educators are and how an understanding of self drives the work they do.

Several authors offer details of their own embodied emotional responses to teaching and learning situations. For example, as others have done elsewhere using self-study (Bair et al. 2010; Skerrett 2008), Cameron described specific emotions she felt in response to some student teachers' resistance to critical pedagogy, a stance and approach to practice that she felt best captured her identity and helped make explicit the identities of her students. Bruce's description of feeling on shaky ground similarly emphasizes the emotions she felt when her own ways of viewing, knowing, and enacting teaching practice were disrupted. In each case, emotions were formed as a result of relationships and interactions that were occurring in teaching. Garbett also recalled a variety of emotions as she learned to ride a horse (ranging from frustration to elation) but notably it was how she used her interpretations of those emotions to gain insights into teaching practice. Garbett states that the self-study provided the context to discover that 'my body has been the medium for making sense of, and connections to, being a teacher educator'. The emotions she experienced and lived through also enabled her to better understand some of the feelings and emotions that her student teachers experienced as they learned the new skills (for them) involved in teaching. Importantly, Garbett also acknowledged that new teachers needed time and space to discuss those feeling and emotions. The self-study process thus allowed Garbett to achieve a sense of emotional closeness to her students, but also led her to be cognizant of highlighting the discrepancies between doing teaching ('going through the motions') and *being* a teacher. These studies provide different ways through which emotions can lead to better understanding – of self *and* practice. Like others who have given attention to the affective domain in teacher education, in each case the authors described ways in which a focus on emotions enabled a deeper understanding of how influential relationships and interactions (with students, colleagues, teachers, and texts) can be in developing pedagogies of teacher education (Garbett and Ovens 2012; Kelchtermans and Hamilton 2004; Ritter 2011).

Emotions also occupied a central role in the chapter by Ovens, and they were apparent in two ways. First, like Garbett and Cameron, Ovens describes the emotions he felt as a teacher educator during peer teaching. By turning the focus of his inquiry on himself, Ovens reports that peer teaching initially led to him feeling 'disoriented' and 'bored' in the teacher education classroom, and as a result he derived less satisfaction from his teaching. While maintaining satisfaction in one's teaching role is crucial to staying motivated and committed to their work (Kelchtermans and Hamilton 2004), self-study led Ovens to the realization that much of the satisfaction he had experienced to that point in his teaching career had come from a transmission-style approach to teaching, where he was in control of the conversations and actions that he and his students engaged in. Yet, reframing both his pedagogies *and* the things from which he gained satisfaction while teaching (focusing on supporting student learning through critical approaches) led Ovens to gain a new found sense of satisfaction in his practice. The second way that emotions were apparent in Ovens's chapter was from the perspectives of student teachers in his class. The emotions student teachers described were a prominent feature in disrupting his assumptions about the authenticity of the peer teaching experience, and the vulnerability that student teachers are exposed to when teaching their peers. Tensions (embodied through emotions) between students were observed to impact upon the peer teaching process, which led Ovens to acknowledge the need to consider the existing and present relationships that student teachers have with each other inside and outside of the teacher education classroom. While teacher educators often go to great lengths to foster positive teacher-student relationships and model this aspect of practice (Bullock 2012; Cole 1999), there is also a crucial need to be cognizant of the student-student relationships that exist, and to think about ways that teacher educators might become members of, at times, already well-established learning communities. An important point to consider here, however, is that already established communities might not be cohesive or positive, and this has implications for how student teachers will experience learning to teach in those environments.

Several of the chapters in this book demonstrate ways in which emotions can simultaneously provide the impetus for and desire to conduct self-study research (that is, by recognizing an emotion or a response to an emotion and seeking further insight about how or why that emotion was present and its implications for practice) *or* enable deeper understandings of teaching and learning through the self-study process. As such, by acknowledging the role that emotions played in self-studies, teachers and teacher educators are offered with a means to 'self-develop' personally and professionally (Zembylas 2003), and create deeper understandings of practice.

Transformation and Professional Learning

Self-study is recognized as a way that teachers and teacher educators might engage in long-term, sustainable forms of professional learning and development (Attard, this volume; Dinkelman 2003). While an extensive discussion on

the nature and characteristics of 'effective' continuing professional development (CPD) is beyond the scope of this chapter, we find the framework offered by Day and Sachs (2004) to be useful in considering contemporary views of CPD. They suggest that CPD needs to provide teachers and teacher educators with mutual opportunities to build knowledge that they may not have had (a deficit model) as well as to improve upon already effective forms of practice (an aspirational model). Practitioners are thus encouraged to engage in CPD that: is represented by a lifelong learning approach (in contrast to one-off workshops); develops knowledge for-, of-, and in-practice (Cochran-Smith and Lytle 1999); is related to teachers' personal and specific needs, and offers extended opportunities to engage in personal reflection to develop knowledge of the self (Day and Sachs 2004). Yet, Loughran and Northfield (1998) suggest that self-study meets these criteria *and more* because it encourages the wider communication of the ideas and knowledge generated through professional learning as part of the culture created by the self-study community. It is the notion of sharing that Tinning (this volume) highlights as setting self-study apart from other practitioner research communities.

The professional learning and development of teacher educators in the early stages of their career represents a growing line of inquiry in the literature (*cf.* Bullock 2009; Casey and Fletcher 2012; Dinkelman et al. 2006; Ritter 2007; Williams and Ritter 2010; Zeichner 2005) and this focus is evident in several of the chapters. For example, Attard's, MacPhail's, and Casey's chapters support claims that systematic forms of professional learning and development are virtually absent from the experiences of many beginning teacher educators (Murray and Male 2005), but importantly, both also show how powerful professional learning can be when it is offered.

Attard describes how he was able to use a reflective approach to self-study to engage in a sustainable form of professional learning, both individually and collaboratively. The value of the process was such that a participant in Attard's collaborative self-study group said that reflective self-study was 'the best type of professional development he had ever experienced'. According to Attard the reasons that reflective self-study was so powerful as a form of professional development was that it was directly relevant to his own and other participants' needs. The self-study process allowed participants to explore issues that *they* had previously identified as warranting change, rather than issues identified by external sources. According to Attard and others (*cf.* Armour and Yelling 2007; Borko 2004; Day 1999; Duncombe and Armour 2004) far too often professional development for teachers is removed from factors deemed personally relevant for teachers issues deemed important by policy makers and conducted in circumstances that ignore the highly contextual nature of teaching. What is somewhat ironic is that teacher educators are seldom offered *any* form of professional development (not even ineffective forms!) and are left to struggle for survival in their professional roles, much like many of the beginning teachers whom they teach. However, Attard puts forth a compelling argument for the value of self-study in addressing the needs of beginning teacher educators.

Another aspect apparent in several chapters concerned the recruitment of faculty members who take on the task of teaching teachers as a major part of their role. While pre-service programs recruit teacher educators because of their postgraduate qualifications, backgrounds in research, or exemplary school teaching practice, it appears that far too often the assumption is made that those recruits can fairly easily display exemplary practice in teacher education programs based purely on their theoretical knowledge of teacher education or by transferring their school teaching practices (Murray and Male 2005). Such assumptions thus limit mentoring, induction, or professional development opportunities offered to teacher educators (Williams et al. 2012). For example, despite being an accomplished high school teacher and gaining accolades for his innovative school teaching practices, Casey arguably felt a sense of 'de-skilling' (Murray and Male 2005) as he realized that his innovative approach to practice could not be readily transferred to the contexts of pre-service teacher education. Unfortunately, Casey's story is all too familiar when considering the experiences of other classroom teachers who make the transition to teacher educator (Bullock 2009; Dinkelman et al. 2006; Ritter 2007; Williams and Ritter 2010; Zeichner 2005). Taking Casey's and Brown's self-studies as examples, the assumption that teachers can easily make the transition to teacher educator continues to be made despite significant changes in institutional culture, the age and maturity of learners, and perhaps most importantly, the content and pedagogies necessary for successfully teaching teachers. When the individual teacher educators who have been lauded for their practice come to the realization that they have to change their practice significantly, this can affect their self-esteem, personal value, and motivation for teaching.

MacPhail's professional learning as a teacher educator was described in terms of her involvement in a PETE CoP. The benefits of collaborative professional learning for teacher educators have been described by other self-study researchers (Bair et al. 2010; Gallagher et al. 2011; Kosnik et al. 2011; Pennington et al. 2012), although others have not necessarily used the conceptual elements of situated learning (Lave and Wenger 1991) and CoP (Wenger 1998) that MacPhail employs. Self-study offered MacPhail ways to more deeply understand the nature of her experiences and the impacts that her involvement in the CoP had on her understanding and enactment of teacher education practices. MacPhail contrasts her experiences as a teacher educator (a) in the first 3 years of her role where her departmental colleagues were not sharing common interests or goals in improving their own practices or students' experiences of learning to teach, with (b) following the arrival of new colleagues who fostered a collegial, collaborative CoP with the aim of improving understandings of teaching and learning for individuals and the group as a whole.

An outcome that was described by both Casey and MacPhail was the importance of providing mentoring and induction opportunities for new teacher educators, with self-study playing an important role. Such opportunities would (hopefully) mean that new departmental colleagues are, at the very least, offered some semi-structured induction and guidance into their institutions and the academy, avoiding the 'sink or

swim' experience of so many new teacher educators (Murray and Male 2005). MacPhail's chapter also suggests that mentoring and induction that occurs in a collaborative setting (such as a CoP) can have benefits for other members of the department as they engage in ongoing professional learning – a point emphasized by the collaborative mentoring experiences of Fletcher et al. (2012). Moreover, for beginning teacher educators self-study offers opportunities to develop both their teaching practice and their scholarship, by encouraging the wider sharing of their experiences in the educational research community. With the current emphasis on disseminating research in university departments, providing new teacher educators with means to focus on teaching and scholarship at the same time may further allow them to feel like full participants in university communities.

Conclusion

Drawing together the self-studies showcased in this book highlights the rich diversity of approaches that have been used to explore the edges of self in the moments of practice. The strength of such an endeavour lies not in being able to make a singular, unifying conclusion, but in celebrating the myriad ways that physical educators are studying their practices in order to improve the learning outcomes for their students. To conclude, it is worth returning to a concept that we proposed in the introductory chapter. We proposed the following: 'When framed as a provisionally rational project, self-study becomes more than a set of techniques, or an exercise in patience, or application of intelligence, or accumulation of evidence. It values alongside these qualities the ability to sense, feel, think, and act with imagination in order to open up more useful interpretive possibilities'. Taken together, we believe that the self-studies compiled in this volume are strong examples of scholarship that not only provide evidence and rigorous analysis that might be deemed 'acceptable' by more conventional interpretations of what counts as research: they offer reflexive, personalized accounts of the humanness involved in teaching practice. As such, the examples are not meant to be taken as concrete solutions to enduring problems or issues: they are subjective snap shots of specific actions, in specific places, at specific moments. Each of the authors describes challenges they have encountered in practice and, importantly, they have shared their lived experiences – the feelings, emotions, doubt, joy, difficulties, and frustrations – in their attempts to improve personally and professionally. In sharing these experiences and their interpretations of the experiences, they seek to better understand what can work in teaching, how it works, and why it works, and to provoke the reader to question their own understandings of practice. If the purpose of scholarship is to provide a platform for knowledge creation and debate, we encourage readers to take what they have read in the preceding chapters and to share their own understandings of scholarship and practice through self-study.

References

Akinbode, A. (2013). Teaching as lived experience: The value of exploring the hidden and emotional side of teaching through reflective narratives. *Studying Teacher Education, 9*(1), 62–73.

Armour, K. M., & Duncombe, R. (2004). Teachers' continuing professional development in primary physical education: Lessons from present and past to inform the future. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy, 9*(1), 3–21.

Armour, K. M., & Yelling, M. (2007). Effective professional development for physical education teachers: The role of informal, collaborative learning. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 26*(2), 177–200.

Bair, M. A., Bair, D. E., Mader, C. E., Hipp, S., & Hakim, E. (2010). Faculty emotions: A self-study of teacher educators. *Studying Teacher Education, 6*(1), 95–111.

Borko, H. (2004). Professional development and teacher learning: Mapping the terrain. *Educational Researcher, 33*(8), 3–15.

Bullock, S. M. (2009). Learning to think like a teacher educator: Making the substantive and syntactic structures of teaching explicit through self-study. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 15*(2), 291–304.

Bullock, S. M. (2012). Creating a space for the development of professional knowledge: A self-study of supervising teacher candidates during practicum placements. *Studying Teacher Education, 8*(2), 143–156.

Bullough, R. V., Jr., & Pinnegar, S. (2001). Guidelines for quality in autobiographical forms of self-study research. *Educational Researcher, 30*(3), 13–21.

Casey, A., & Fletcher, T. (2012). Trading places: From physical education teachers to teacher educators. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 31*(4), 362–380.

Clift, R. T. (2004). Self-study research in the context of teacher education programs. In J. J. Loughran, M. L. Hamilton, V. K. LaBoskey, & T. Russell (Eds.), *International handbook of self-study of teaching and teacher education practices* (pp. 1333–1366). Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. (1999). Relationships of knowledge and practice: Teacher learning in communities. *Review of Research in Education, 24*, 249–305.

Cole, A. L. (1999). Teacher educators and teacher education reform: Individual commitments, institutional realities. *Canadian Journal of Education, 24*(3), 281–295.

Craig, C. J. (2009). Trustworthiness in self-study research. In C. A. Lassonde, S. Galman, & C. Kosnik (Eds.), *Self-study research methodologies for teacher educators* (pp. 21–34). Rotterdam: Sense.

Day, C. (1999). *Developing teachers: The challenges of lifelong learning*. London: Falmer Press.

Day, C., & Sachs, J. (2004). Professionalism, performativity and empowerment: Discourses in the politics, policies and purposes of continuing professional development. In C. Day & J. Sachs (Eds.), *International handbook on the continuing professional development of teachers* (pp. 3–32). Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Dinkelman, T. (2003). Self-study in teacher education a means and ends tool for promoting reflective teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education, 54*(1), 6–18.

Dinkelman, T., Margolis, J., & Sikkenga, K. (2006). From teacher to teacher educator: Experiences, expectations, and expatriation. *Studying Teacher Education, 2*(1), 5–23.

Fletcher, T., Bullock, S. M., & Kosnik, C. (2012). An investigation into collaborative mentoring using self-study: Our processes and our learning. In J. R. Young, L. B. Erickson, & S. Pinnegar (Eds.), *The ninth international conference of self-study of teacher education practices* (pp. 102–105). Provo: Brigham Young University Press.

Gallagher, T., Griffin, S., Ciuffetelli Parker, D., Kitchen, J., & Figg, C. (2011). Establishing and sustaining teacher educator professional development in a self-study community of practice: Pre-tenure teacher educators developing professionally. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 27*, 880–890.

Garbett, D., & Ovens, A. (2012). Being a teacher educator: Exploring issues of authenticity and safety through self-study. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 37*(3), 43–56.

Ham, V., & Kane, R. (2004). Finding a way through the swamp: A case for self-study as research. In J. J. Loughran, M. L. Hamilton, V. K. LaBoskey, & T. Russell (Eds.), *International handbook of self-study of teaching and teacher education practices* (pp. 103–150). Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Hargreaves, A. (2001). Emotional geographies of teaching. *The Teachers College Record, 103*(6), 1056–1080.

Kelchtermans, G., & Hamilton, M. L. (2004). The dialectics of passion and theory: Exploring the relation between self-study and emotion. In J. J. Loughran, M. L. Hamilton, V. K. LaBoskey, & T. Russell (Eds.), *International handbook of self-study of teaching and teacher education practices* (pp. 785–810). Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Kirk, D. (2013). Educational value and models-based practice in physical education. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, *45*(9), 973–986.

Kosnik, C., Cleovoulou, Y., Fletcher, T., Harris, T., McGlynn-Stewart, M., & Beck, C. (2011). Becoming teacher educators: An innovative approach to teacher educator preparation. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 37*(3), 351–363.

Labaree, D. F. (2004). *The trouble with ed schools*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Loughran, J. J. (2006). *Developing a pedagogy of teacher education: Understanding teaching and learning about teaching*. London: Routledge.

Loughran, J. J., & Northfield, J. (1998). A framework for the development of self-study practice. In M. L. Hamilton (Ed.), *Reconceptualizing teaching practice: Self-study in teacher education* (pp. 8–20). London: Falmer.

Macintyre Latta, M., & Buck, G. (2007). Professional development risks and opportunities embodied within self-study. *Studying Teacher Education, 3*(2), 189–205.

Murray, J., & Male, T. (2005). Becoming a teacher educator: Evidence from the field. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 21*(2), 125–142.

Pennington, J. L., Brock, C. H., Abernathy, T. V., Bingham, A., Major, E. M., Wiest, L. R., & Ndura, E. (2012). Teacher educators' dispositions: Footnoting the present with stories from our past. *Studying Teacher Education, 8*(1), 69–85.

Ritter, J. K. (2007). Forging a pedagogy of teacher education: The challenges of moving from classroom teacher to teacher educator. *Studying Teacher Education, 3*(1), 5–22.

Ritter, J. K. (2011). On the affective challenges of developing a pedagogy of teacher education. *Studying Teacher Education, 7*(3), 219–233.

Samaras, A. P., & Freese, A. R. (2009). Looking back and looking forward: An historical overview of the self-study school. In C. A. Lassonde, S. Galman, & C. Kosnik (Eds.), *Self-study research methodologies for teacher educators* (pp. 3–20). Rotterdam: Sense.

Skerrett, A. (2008). Biography, identity, and inquiry: The making of teacher, teacher educator, and researcher. *Studying Teacher Education, 4*(2), 143–156.

Tinning, R. (1991). Teacher education pedagogy: Dominant discourses and the process of problem setting. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 11*(1), 1–20.

Tinning, R. (2002). Toward a 'modest pedagogy': Reflections on the problematics of critical pedagogy. *Quest, 54*(3), 224–240.

Van Veen, K., & Lasky, S. (2005). Emotions as a lens to explore teacher identity and change: Different theoretical approaches. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 21*(8), 895–898.

Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Williams, J., & Ritter, J. K. (2010). Constructing new professional identities through self-study: From teacher to teacher educator. *Professional Development in Education, 36*(1–2), 77–92.

Williams, J., Ritter, J. K., & Bullock, S. M. (2012). Understanding the complexity of becoming a teacher educator: Experience, belonging, and practice within a professional learning community. *Studying Teacher Education, 8*(3), 245–260.

Zeichner, K. M. (2005). Becoming a teacher educator: A personal perspective. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 21*(2), 117–124.

Zembylas, M. (2003). Emotions and teacher identity: A poststructural perspective. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 9*(3), 213–238.