

Chapter 3

Learning Educational Theory in Teacher Education

Ela Sjølie

Abstract This chapter uses the theory of practice architectures to disrupt common framings of the problem of teacher education as centrally about a theory-practice ‘gap’, and of the solution as integrating the two. Despite the fact that a persisting criticism is directed towards the ‘academic’ part of teacher education, we know little about student teachers’ academic learning practice as learners in higher education. The chapter reports on a Norwegian study of 78 student teachers and shows how the theory of practice architectures can usefully illuminate some of the difficulties student teachers encounter when engaging with educational theory as part of their initial teacher education. It also offers a more nuanced understanding of the claim that teacher education is ‘too theoretical’. Drawing on the findings from the study, the chapter argues that the ‘project’ of ‘integrating theory and practice’ might sustain the (inappropriate) dichotomy of theory and practice. It also suggests that the ‘project’ should rather be to support students in navigating how different practices hang together, not expecting coherence, but learning the skills to anticipate and respond productively to differences and tensions.

This chapter explores student teachers’ learning of educational theory in university coursework and draws on a study of 78 student teachers enrolled in a Norwegian secondary teacher education programme. The backdrop for the study is the persisting criticism of professional education in general and teacher education in particular. Teacher education is claimed to be overly theoretical, unrealistic, and distant from practice (Darling-Hammond 2010; Lid 2013; Niemi 2002). Newly graduated and pre-service teachers feel inadequately prepared, and call for topics that can help them with the real challenges they face in the classroom (see, e.g., Aspfors 2012; Lid 2013; Roness 2011). Despite numerous efforts around the world over recent decades, the criticism remains strikingly stable, and the ‘theory-practice issue’ seems intractable.

E. Sjølie (✉)

Programme for Teacher Education, Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU), Trondheim, Norway
e-mail: ela.sjolie@plu.ntnu.no

An extensive literature review of research on teacher education reveals a paradox. Despite the fact that the persisting criticism is directed towards the ‘academic’ part of the studies, and that considerable efforts around the world have focused on developing more successful *university-based* models (e.g., Calderhead and Shorrock 1997; Darling-Hammond and Lieberman 2012; Grossman et al. 2009; Korthagen et al. 2006; Loughran 2006), researchers rarely consider pre-service teachers as *learners* in higher education. With few exceptions, they are viewed as future or ‘not-yet-’ teachers. Research on student teachers exists almost in isolation from research on higher education. It follows from this that we know little about student teachers’ *academic learning practice* as learners in higher education.

The main focus of the chapter is on how the theory of practice architectures can usefully illuminate some of the difficulties student teachers encounter when engaging with educational theory as part of their initial teacher education. The chapter uses the theory of practice architectures to disrupt common framings of the problem of teacher education as centrally about a theory-practice ‘gap’, and of the solution as producing ‘harmony’ or ‘coherence’ between the two.

‘Learning to Teach’ – A Discourse of Harmony and Coherence?

In literature on teacher education, the ‘problem’ of the ‘theory-practice gap’ in teacher education is often taken for granted as a point of departure for research, and the aim is to integrate, bridge, or close the gap. The use of the phrase ‘theory-practice gap’ or complaints about a ‘disconnection’ between theory and practice have become common, taken-for-granted parts of the cultural-discursive arrangements in the field of teacher education. Contained within these words is a wish for congruence or equilibrium between theory and practice or between university and school.

Furthermore, in the semantic space of teacher education in Norway as well as internationally, ‘integration’ and ‘relevance’ are key issues. For example in Norway, a main ambition is to make the different parts fit into an *integrated totality* and to create *coherence* within teacher education courses (KD 2003). An important factor for the students in experiencing ‘relevance’ is that the students need to understand *why*: Why are we learning about this? How does this fit into the overall plan? What are the connections between the different parts that we are studying – between university courses and school practice, between different topics or university disciplines, and between teaching and assessment? Finally, the need for making connections is encompassed in the ‘academic ideal’ of learning in higher education. The student is expected to make “the task coherent with their own experience; relating and distinguishing evidence and argument; looking for patterns and underlying

principles; integrating the task with existing awareness; seeing parts of a task as making up a whole” (Prosser and Trigwell 1999, p. 3).

Notwithstanding the importance of integration and coherence, there is a risk in unreflectively adopting a discourse of ‘harmony and coherence’. Indications of such a discourse are often found in descriptions of the overall aim in teacher education as making the different parts ‘fit seamlessly’ into each other, or to ‘close the gap’ between theory and practice. The words we use shape practices, which in turn shape other practices (cf. Kemmis et al. 2014). There is, for example, a difference between talking about a ‘practice shock’ (which is easily associated with something unwanted) and talking about the conflicting and frustrating process of learning to teach – in a tension between idealism and practicality (e.g., in Johnston 1994). Britzman (2003) notes that learning to teach is often dominated by a discourse in which contradictory realities are underplayed and the difficulties and frustrations of learning to teach are left unspoken. As a result, student teachers may end up blaming themselves for failing, rather than reflecting upon the complexity of pedagogical encounters.

Teacher educators are participants of the practice of educating teachers. According to the theory of practice architectures, the particular kinds of sayings, doings, and relatings of this practice are harnessed together in the pursuit of the *project* of the practice. The project of a practice is the answer to the question ‘*what are you doing?*’, and encompasses shared or individual *intentions* of the people within the practice (Kemmis et al. 2014). Situated within a national and international discourse about ‘the theory-practice gap’, this chapter asks in a provocative way whether one of the current projects of teacher education is to create coherence and harmony between theory and practice, and thus whether it should or ought to be a project of teacher education.

The Study

The study described in this chapter started within a larger project that aimed to integrate theory and practice through an alternative model of organising practicum. The main idea was to have a continuous alternation between campus activities and school practicum throughout one entire semester. In general, the students were based in school 2 days a week, and on campus 1 or 2 days. In the ‘traditional’ model in the university being studied in this research, the students were based 4 weeks on campus, then 6–8 weeks in school, followed by another 4 weeks on campus.

The original research question of the study was “How can practicum be used to integrate theory and practice?” However, through the course of the study, the focus moved towards a critical inquiry using practice theory as a lens. Instead of accepting the claim that teacher education is too theoretical and asking the question of how to use the practicum to integrate theory and practice, I asked: *why do student teachers*

think teacher education is too theoretical? Are there any alternative explanations to those which have been reported in the research literature to date? Student teachers' engagement with university coursework became the main issue of interest, and the focus of the data collection was primarily on the university coursework.

The data comprise qualitative and quantitative data from a total of 78 student teachers from two different year cohorts of a 5-year combined degree Master's programme.¹ Twelve semi-structured interviews were conducted with a total of 24 student teachers. The interviews (a combination of individual interviews and focus groups) covered different aspects of the student teachers' learning practices, including questions about experiences from practicum and questions about being a university student. All 78 participants also provided written answers to the two questions: (1) "Describe in your own words what theory is to you", and (2) "What role do you think theory has for you as a student teacher and later as a teacher?" In addition, a whole year cohort (53 students) filled out a questionnaire about how they go about their academic studies.²

Learning 'Theory' Through the Lens of Practice Architectures

Within the framing of the problem of teacher education as centrally about a theory-practice 'gap', and of the solution as producing 'harmony' or 'coherence' between the two, the focus is often on how the programmes are structured and organised. In other words, the focus is on material-economic arrangements such as models of practicum or university-school collaborations. As for the student teacher, the main interest of researchers is the students' *teaching practice* (either actual teaching or how they think about teaching), but not the students' *learning practice* as learners in higher education (Sjølie 2014b).

As indicated above, I wanted to challenge the taken-for-granted and search beyond the surface of the claim that teacher education is too theoretical. The theory of practice architectures proved very useful for this purpose. The theory provides a holistic framework for exploring the dynamic relationship between conditions within the site of teacher education and the practices that unfold within them. In particular, the findings direct attention to the semantic and social space of this particular programme; including a focus on issues of discourse and power which are rarely discussed in literature on teacher education.

¹In this programme, the students are provided with teacher education combined with a Master's degree in one academic subject (e.g., Norwegian) as well as one year's study in a secondary subject (e.g., History).

²For more details about methodology, see Sjølie (2014b).

Semantic Space: Exploring the Concepts of ‘Theory’ and ‘Practice’

One of the questions explored in this study was how student teachers conceptualise theory. Specifically, student teachers were asked to describe what theory is and what role they think theory has for them as student teachers and later as teachers. The findings show that the participants tended to have a narrow view of theory – a dichotomous view in which theory belongs to the university and is largely seen as the opposite of practice (Sjølie 2014c). Furthermore, the student teachers’ language contained ‘sedimented’ (and perhaps unconscious) patterns of how they talked about university and schools. University was largely referred to as an “artificial world” as opposed to the “real world”. Teacher educators were referred to as “the guys up on the hill”, and words such as “academics” and “research” often had negative connotations, while “those out there” or “those connected to real life” had positive connotations. To treat theory as something dry and boring (and as opposite to practice) is a natural part of everyday language and contributes to maintaining dichotomous conceptualisations of theory and practice. One might also ask if ordinary language and common sense (both in English and Norwegian) comprehend ‘theory’ in terms of ‘sayings’ (only loosely attached or unattached to doings) and ‘practice’ as ‘doings’ (only loosely attached or unattached to ‘sayings’), thus providing an everyday-world validation of the notions of ‘theory’ and ‘practice’? If so, then the so-called ‘gap’ between theory and practice is not a gap but a misalignment: theory and practice can sometimes pass one another in the semantic and physical space-time. When people feel there is not a ‘gap’ between theory and practice, the sayings and doings align with one another.

When asked about the role (or the purpose) of theory, the students’ views were considerably more nuanced and included understandings of different kinds of relationships between theory and practice (see Sjølie 2014c for more details). Considering the common claim that student teachers mostly expect from teacher education to fill a “bag of teaching tricks” (Loughran 2006, p. 45), students could be expected to see the theory presented in teacher education as something to be transferred into practice in the form of *methods* or *rules*. Although this view was common among the students, they described other purposes of theory they regarded as just as important. For example, it was a common view among the participants that teachers need a shared theoretical foundation in education, and that theory can be used to “shed light on practice”, to “give new perspectives”, or to “expand one’s horizon”. The participants seemed to have internalised the value of academic preparation in education, which resonates with other studies (e.g., Roness 2011; Smith and Lev-Ari 2005).

However, an interesting finding was that the students distinguished theory *in general* from educational theory *in particular*. More specifically, they described *educational theory* as opposed to *real theory*. Many students referred to educational theories as “common sense wrapped in difficult language” or “intuition” which just confirmed what they already knew. Some of the students disregarded theory in

education because they felt it contained what they defined as personal views instead of research based, “true” knowledge. This was used as an argument to devalue and denigrate educational theory, and pointed to an ambivalent relationship to theory: On the one hand, teacher education is too theoretical, on the other, theoretical knowledge is important. The student teachers see learning to be a teacher as more than just acquiring a set of professional skills, and they understand that teacher education can provide them with important theoretical insights in that respect. However, educational theory is not really theory, but rather an articulation of what they already know. In other words: some theory is ‘good theory’, some theory is ‘bad theory’. In the study (see Sjølie 2014b, c), these descriptions of theory are identified as the student teachers’ problematic encounter with a new academic discipline – a discipline with a different epistemology compared to the one they know from their non-Education disciplinary studies. And, for some students at least (especially those whose disciplinary studies were in science), educational theory seemed less rigorous and productive (and more “ideological”) than the kinds of theories they encountered in other fields of study.

The main conclusion drawn from the findings above is that the way student teachers conceptualise theory influences the ways in which they engage with theory in their university courses. Furthermore, the difficulties encountered by the students seemed to be manifested in the students’ sayings in their negative characterisations of educational theory. In particular, it is taken for granted that educational theory is frequently “boring”, “irrelevant”, “artificial”, and “idyllic” while practice is “exciting” and “real life”. Teacher educators, meanwhile, are regarded as a rather homogeneous group of “boring” academics “living in a bubble”. Like a collective memory sedimented into the student culture in the course, students share and take for granted particular discourses for discussing ‘theory’.

Altogether, these findings direct attention to the semantic space and the cultural-discursive arrangements that help to shape student culture in this particular teacher education programme – one which may or may not be like other programmes elsewhere. In this study, the students’ sayings about theory were explored in depth, and the findings pointed to possible conflicts and tensions in their assumptions about theory and also to possible differences between students’ and teacher educators’ assumptions about theory. ‘Theory’ and ‘practice’ are two very common words; by studying the learning practices that unfolded within this particular site, and the cultural-discursive arrangements that made possible the sayings of their practices, it was possible to show how these words were used and understood by students as participants within this particular practice of teacher education. While a common claim in literature about teacher education is that teacher education *is* too theoretical and hence the content must be changed, the findings in this study suggest there is a need for more explicit and critical dialogue amongst and between teacher educators and student teachers about the concepts of ‘theory’ and ‘practice’, and what each means in the field of education (and as distinct from their meanings in other fields of study).

Semantic Space: Learning to Read and Write Academic Texts

When exploring the students' reading and writing practices,³ the participants reported considerable struggles linked to literature in their university courses in education (Sjølie 2015). The students appeared to be predominantly meaning-oriented, which means that they wanted to *understand*, not just *memorise*, the content of the texts they read. The students did, however, reveal considerable difficulties in achieving this understanding. They blamed authors for poor writing and for using difficult language, and seemed at times to be "put off" by the reading before they had even begun. As suggested in the previous section, this initial reaction might have been because the epistemology and genre of education texts differed from the epistemology and genre of texts in other fields they studied. The findings suggest that the intention of reading for understanding is not enough, which is often assumed in literature on student learning in higher education (Francis and Hallam 2000).

As for the discussion in the previous section about theory, the lens of practice theory provided an alternative interpretation of the common claim that teacher education is too theoretical. Although the participants in this study also made this claim, exploring their reading practice in more detail revealed that their difficulties in reading were not necessarily because the topic of the literature was irrelevant or that the theory was too abstract and general (cf. Darling-Hammond 2010). It could also be related to difficulties in understanding the language of the text that was different from what they had read before. This finding directs attention to cultural-discursive arrangements within the site. Previous academic experience, in this case successful experiences with reading and understanding academic texts in one field, do not necessarily translate into understanding new courses or texts in another. The theory of practice architectures conceptualises learning and education as processes of being initiated or stirred into practices by participating (Kemmis et al. 2014). This means that the student teachers are stirred into the sayings, doings, and ways of relating whilst reading and writing academic texts. Learning 'theory' is not only an induction into a body of knowledge but also an induction into the particular communicative practices of that body of knowledge – like the teacher education programme, and the discourses of teacher education and school pedagogy and didactics (for example).

The processes of being 'stirred into' the practices of reading and writing often contain a level of frustration. Within a discourse of harmony and coherence as mentioned earlier, there is a risk that the role of this frustration is underplayed; the consequence being that students' frustrations and following complaints are predominantly regarded as negative rather than educative (for all concerned). The indicator of success in higher education is student evaluations (cf. the student as consumer, McCulloch 2009) – evaluations in which the students are asked how they *value* the program, for example, how they value the *integration* of theory and practice and the *coherence* of different elements within the program. Frustration is a necessary part

³This was explored in both the questionnaire and the interviews.

of learning, and it is crucial that student teachers as well as teacher educators accept *and emphasise through their sayings* that being stirred into the practice of learning to teach is permeated by tensions and conflicts.

Semantic Space: Drawing on Different (and Separated) Discursive Resources

The most commonly explored of the aspects of the theory-practice gap in teacher education are the perceived disconnections (a) between what happens in students' academic studies and their field experiences (e.g., Zeichner 2010), and (b) between the theory studied in the teacher education programme and the practice the students observe in practicum (e.g., Allen 2009). Student teachers in this study also commented on these disconnections. They talked explicitly about it (in a negative way), and, as discussed above, their language about the course reflected a dichotomy between 'theory' and 'practice' as part of a taken-for-granted discourse about their studies in the university and their experiences in schools. Through the lens of practice architectures, this disconnection can be understood in terms of two distinct sets of practices in which the students participated, one enmeshed with the practice architectures of the university and the other enmeshed with the practice architectures of the schools (composed, in each case, by the cultural-discursive, material-economic, and social-political arrangements found in the different sites). The students experienced these two kinds of practices as disconnected, although they expected that they should be connected.

Although often described as *two* different arenas (or here, 'sites of practices'), analysis of the semantic space of the student teachers' learning practices revealed a third arena. The findings suggest that the students draw upon at least three sets of discursive resources associated with three different 'communities' they must relate to as student teachers: academia, school, and the student community. While taking a 'future teacher' perspective in school, they adopted two different perspectives in the university arena: one associated with the future teacher and the other associated with the role of a student in higher education. The shifting of perspective between university and school and between teacher and learner was particularly visible in how the participants talked about learning and teaching (see Sjølie 2014a).

The frequently heard claim that student teachers have narrow, 'traditional' (transmissive) views of teaching and learning was not supported by the findings of this study. In the interviews, each and all of the students communicated 'rich' and *constructivist* views of learning both for pupils' learning in school and for their own learning in the university (see Sjølie 2014a for more details). However, the students' talk about teaching revealed inconsistencies and tensions towards more 'traditional' views of learning when they shifted from talking about learning from a teacher perspective to talking about learning from a student perspective in higher education. When they described teaching in the university setting, there was a noticeable shift

to a *transmission* model of learning. In other words, their ‘rich’ views of learning were not necessarily used to describe their own situation as learners in higher education. While the focus as future teachers was to *change* traditional teaching in school, they seemed to *expect* traditional teaching in university, at times also resisting when it was not. The university, as a culturally and historically situated site for learning, carries strong connotations in terms of what these students expected and how they interpreted their learning experiences. This finding suggests that rich views of learning do not necessarily transfer to the students’ own learning strategies, and might indicate that the students, rather than seeing themselves as part of a practice of becoming a teacher, stay in a passive receptive role in their enactments of practices of studying in their higher education studies in the university.

In research on student teachers’ beliefs, it seems to be taken for granted that beliefs about learning are independent of ‘context’ (school or university, teacher or learner) (Sjølie 2014b). The findings of this study suggest that they are not, and that teacher educators should pay more attention to the discourses employed (and the specific cultural-discursive arrangements students encounter) in the different semantic spaces student teachers inhabit in different sites within their teacher education programmes. This includes attending to how core concepts such as ‘theory’, ‘practice’, ‘teaching’, and ‘learning’ are used and understood in these different sites.

Social Space: Relatings and Social-Political Arrangements

One of the problems with the perceived disconnection between university and school is that the students learn one thing on campus and see something quite different in school. For example, some observe their school mentors’ teaching practices to be very different from the kinds of good teaching practices advocated in their university course. In this study, students frequently described their mentors’ practices as “traditional teaching” which they contrasted with the more “innovative” and “fancy” teaching practices they learned about in their coursework. Some said that they wanted to teach according to the “ideals of teacher education” but that they failed, either because their mentor did not let them try the things they wanted to, or because the “ideal” practices did not seem to work (Sjølie 2014a; Sjølie and Østern [Forthcoming](#)). The cultural-discursive arrangements present in the culture of teacher education seem destined to prepare student teachers for this eventuality and thus to preserve it as an enduring possibility: they understand both these kinds of ‘failures’ in terms of a discrepancy between the ‘ideal world’ and ‘reality’.

This finding became more interesting in light of students’ elaborations about why they did not teach according to their ideals. Several revealed that the ideals (of good teaching) were not so much theirs but rather the teacher educators’ ideals. In terms of *discrepancies*, it could be interpreted as discrepancies between what they know – or have “heard over and over again” – is right and what they end up doing or what they see other teachers do. In other words, they experience a gap between

what they *think* (which could be ‘theory’) and what they *do* (‘practice’). Some talked about how they ended up having teacher-led instead of student-centred teaching since they thought it was easier to ‘control’ learning that way, while others said explicitly that, in the teacher education programme, there had been little room for questioning prevailing views of learning, in particular socio-constructivist views of learning. One of these students expressed her concerns about some teacher educators who acted as *experts* instead of using their *expertise* to support and empower the student teachers (Sjølie 2014a). She highlighted the importance of feeling that her knowledge is important – “that it counts for something”. Another student complained that while the university holds a view of what is right or wrong, there is room for many different views in school. Still another student claimed that “sometimes it becomes more like a morality sermon than actual teaching”. In light of the alleged ‘theory-practice gap’ in teacher education, these findings point to yet another facet of the ‘gap’: the difference between teacher educators’ ideals or values, and student teachers’ existing (and robust) images of learning and teaching.

The normative discourse described here relates to both cultural-discursive and social-political arrangements – in fact, to the way different kinds of arrangements are bundled together in different practices and enmeshed with the practice architectures in different sites. Most of all it directs attention to the student teachers’ view of relations and social-political arrangements within the site. The students are invoking certain distinctions and relations between ‘us’ (the students), ‘academics’ (university boffins), and ‘teachers’ (real practitioners). These relationships work to maintain relationships of power, for example the question of what constitutes valid knowledge. Within the project of creating coherence between theory and practice (as indicated earlier), a ‘disconnection’ is almost exclusively described as something unwanted or negative. Rather than to explore and reflect upon the differences and tensions, the students seemed to face discrepancies with the question of ‘who’s right?’ or ‘who ought to be believed?’: the ‘academics’ or the ‘teachers’ (or ‘themselves’).

Above, I suggested that the students draw upon at least three sets of discursive resources. The academic discourse was then presented as *one* discourse. The students also often referred to university teachers as *one* homogeneous group of academics. Lea and Street (2000) stress the fact that the academy is not a homogeneous culture. This is perhaps particularly true for teacher education. The teacher education faculty in this study comprises any number of combinations across at least three dimensions: (1) from current schoolteachers with a part-time position at the university to ‘pure’ academics, (2) from a background in education science to the various academic disciplines (or combinations thereof), and (3) from professors to administrative staff. It is reasonable to believe that this heterogenic nature implies contradictory ideas and understandings of core concepts between the participants in various practices within the site (such as ‘theory’ and ‘practice’ or ‘integration’ and ‘coherence’). A question that remains open for investigation for future research is: what characterises the semantic and social spaces of this heterogenic faculty? And how do these spaces shape practice architectures for student teachers’ learning?

Concluding Remarks

In this chapter, I have focused on how the theory of practice architectures can shed new light on the persistent criticism and the theory-practice discussion in teacher education. In the research literature, the blame for student teachers' dissatisfaction with teacher education is more often than not put on traditional teaching methods and a prevailing theory-into-practice view of teacher educators (e.g., Korthagen et al. 2006). The argument in this chapter is that this is a far too simplified and generalised description of teacher education programs around the world. I have also suggested that the 'project of creating harmony and coherence between theory and practice' is misplaced. A constant focus on 'solving the theory-practice issue' or 'integrating theory and practice' might sustain the (false) dichotomy of theory and practice. Perhaps the project should rather be to support students in navigating how different practices hang together, not expecting coherence or harmony, but learning the skills to anticipate and respond productively to differences and tensions.

Research literature contains many different representations of the 'theory-practice gap'. Findings from this study add further possible representations or explanations: lack of explicit attention to theory-practice relationships, differences between teacher educators' ideals and student teachers' personal stance, as well as possible different projects of student teachers and teacher educators. For example, while students might be directed towards developing skills and competences, teacher educators might aim to foster critical reflection. Rather than being a 'gap' between theory and practice, it can thus be understood as lack of shared understanding between students and teachers (see also Lea and Street 2000; Storch and Tapper 2000; Wideen et al. 1998).

In the endeavour to reach beyond the surface of the students' practices and spontaneous answers, the practice theory lens has proved very useful. The critical power of the practice lens lies partly in its focus on revealing hidden knowledge of a practice (cf. Gherardi 2009). In the attempts to capture the implicit, this study has directed attention to the dynamic relationship between the conditions in different sites within teacher education and the practices that unfold in these different sites, each enmeshed with the distinctive practice architectures of its site. Particular contributions are the findings related to the semantic and social spaces, which suggest rather different explanations for student teachers' dissatisfaction with theory than those found in much teacher education research to date.

Above all, the findings from this study offer an important contribution to teacher education because they direct attention to a topic that is not discussed in the research literature. Although student teachers are students in higher education, their *academic learning* has not been much studied. Furthermore, issues of discourse and power are rarely discussed in research on teacher education (or higher education more generally). 'Practice' is largely used in relation to school teaching practice, rather than the (very different) kinds of practices of higher education enacted by the different kinds of participants in teacher education programmes. The findings from this study suggest that we start paying more attention to the practices that unfold within the university part of teacher education.

References

- Allen, J. M. (2009). Valuing practice over theory: How beginning teachers re-orient their practice in the transition from the university to the workplace. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 25(5), 647–654.
- Aspfors, J. (2012). *Induction practices — experiences of newly qualified teachers*. Doctoral thesis, Åbo Akademi University, Åbo.
- Britzman, D. P. (2003). *Practice makes practice: A critical study of learning to teach*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Calderhead, J., & Shorrock, S. B. (1997). *Understanding teacher education: Case studies in the professional development of beginning teaching*. London: Falmer.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2010). Teacher education and the American future. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 61(1–2), 35–47.
- Darling-Hammond, L., & Lieberman, A. (2012). *Teacher education around the world: Changing policies and practices*. London: Routledge.
- Francis, H., & Hallam, S. (2000). Genre effects on higher education students' text reading for understanding. *Higher Education*, 39(3), 279–296.
- Gherardi, S. (2009). Introduction: The critical power of the 'practice lens'. *Management Learning*, 40(2), 115–128. doi:10.1177/1350507608101225.
- Grossman, P., Hammerness, K., & McDonald, M. (2009). Redefining teaching, re-imagining teacher education. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 15(2), 273–289. doi:10.1080/13540600902875340.
- Johnston, S. (1994). Conversations with student teachers – Enhancing the dialogue of learning to teach. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 10(1), 71–82.
- KD, Ministry of Education. (2003). *National curriculum regulations for teacher education*. Retrieved from http://www.regjeringen.no/upload/kilde/kd/pla/2006/0002/ddd/pdfv/235560-rammeplan_laerer_eng.pdf.
- Kemmis, S., Wilkinson, J., Edwards-Groves, C., Hardy, I., Grootenboer, P., & Bristol, L. (2014). *Changing practices, changing education*. Singapore: Springer.
- Korthagen, F., Loughran, J., & Russell, T. (2006). Developing fundamental principles for teacher education programs and practices. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 22(8), 1020–1041.
- Lea, M. R., & Street, B. (2000). Student writing and staff feedback in higher education: An academic literacies approach. In M. R. Lea & B. Stierer (Eds.), *Student writing in higher education: New contexts* (pp. 32–46). Guildford: The Society.
- Lid, S. E. (2013). *PPUs relevans for undervisning i skolen [The relevance of PPU for teaching in school]*. Oslo: NOKUT – The Norwegian Agency for Quality Assurance in Education.
- Loughran, J. (2006). *Developing a pedagogy of teacher education: Understanding teaching and learning about teaching*. London: Routledge.
- McCulloch, A. (2009). The student as co-producer: Learning from public administration about the student-university relationship. *Studies in Higher Education*, 34(2), 171–183.
- Niemi, H. (2002). Active learning: A cultural change needed in teacher education and schools. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 18(7), 763–780.
- Prosser, M., & Trigwell, K. (1999). *Understanding learning and teaching*. Buckingham: Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.
- Roness, D. (2011). Still motivated? The motivation for teaching during the second year in the profession. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 27(3), 628–638.
- Sjølie, E. (2014a). In the tension between idealism and practicality: Student teachers' meta-awareness of learning and teaching. *NAFOL Year Book 2014*.
- Sjølie, E. (2014b). Pedagogy is just common sense. A case study of student teachers' academic practices. Doctoral thesis, NTNU, Trondheim.
- Sjølie, E. (2014c). The role of theory in teacher education – reconsidered from a student teacher perspective. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 46(6), 729–750. doi:10.1080/00220272.2013.871754.

- Sjølie, E. (2015). When form stands in the way of content – a study of student teachers' reading and writing practices. *Education Inquiry*, 6(4). doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.3402/edui.v6.24297>.
- Sjølie, E., & Østern, A. L. (Forthcoming). *Student teachers' learning within the practice architectures of teacher education*.
- Smith, K., & Lev-Ari, L. (2005). The place of the practicum in pre-service teacher education: The voice of the students. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 33(3), 289–302.
- Storch, N., & Tapper, J. (2000). The focus of teacher and student concerns in discipline-specific writing by university students. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 19(3), 337–355. doi:[10.1080/758484345](https://doi.org/10.1080/758484345).
- Wideen, M., Mayer-Smith, J., & Moon, B. (1998). A critical analysis of the research on learning to teach: Making the case for an ecological perspective on inquiry. *Review of Educational Research*, 68(2), 130–178.
- Zeichner, K. (2010). Rethinking the connections between campus courses and field experiences in college- and university-based teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 61(1–2), 89–99.