

# Insight Gleaned from Our Participation in a Faculty Self-Study Learning Group



Jason K. Ritter, Rachel A. Ayieko, Xia Chao, Odeese Khalil, Laura Mahalingappa, Christopher J. Meidl, Carla K. Meyer, Sandra Quiñones, and Julia Ann Williams

## Introduction

The first chapter in this section, written by the department chair who oversaw the formation of the Department of Instruction and Leadership in Education (DILE) self-study of teacher education practices (S-STEP) group, explored some of the challenges and opportunities in creating a place for self-study research within a school of education in the United States that, like so many others, desires to offer quality courses taught by faculty who are experts in their field and productive as educational researchers. The second chapter in this section reported on the experiences of the facilitator of the self-study group as he tried to plan and execute learning opportunities for his colleagues to help them better understand and use S-STEP methodology to advance their teaching, research, or both. The chapters immediately thereafter consisted of individual accounts from each member of the group addressing issues related to their learning of self-study and its application to their work. For this final chapter, we present the findings of a collaborative self-study focused on our experiences in the group and our collective learning of self-study research. Specifically we explore issues related to who we are as teacher educators that made us interested in self-study, what we wanted to get from our participation in the group, our collective understandings of self-study methodology, and our perceptions of the usefulness of the group in relation to facilitating such understandings of self-study.

---

J. K. Ritter (✉) · R. A. Ayieko · X. Chao · O. Khalil · L. Mahalingappa · C. J. Meidl  
C. K. Meyer · S. Quiñones · J. A. Williams  
Duquesne University, Pittsburgh, PA, USA  
e-mail: [ritterj@duq.edu](mailto:ritterj@duq.edu); [ayiekor@duq.edu](mailto:ayiekor@duq.edu); [chaox@duq.edu](mailto:chaox@duq.edu); [ghassakhalilo@duq.edu](mailto:ghassakhalilo@duq.edu);  
[mahalingappal@duq.edu](mailto:mahalingappal@duq.edu); [meidlc@duq.edu](mailto:meidlc@duq.edu); [meyerc2@duq.edu](mailto:meyerc2@duq.edu); [quinoness@duq.edu](mailto:quinoness@duq.edu);  
[williamsj@duq.edu](mailto:williamsj@duq.edu)

© Springer Nature Singapore Pte Ltd. 2018

J. K. Ritter et al. (eds.), *Teaching, Learning, and Enacting of Self-Study Methodology*, Self-Study of Teaching and Teacher Education Practices 19,  
[https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-8105-7\\_11](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-8105-7_11)

As was discussed in earlier chapters of this section, the first 2 years of the group were met with mixed results when it came to individuals actually initiating and maintaining self-studies of their practice. The expectation was that everyone would engage in a self-study investigation, yet there seemed to be a holding pattern for implementation. Although the facilitator of the group, Jason Ritter, felt like he encouraged group members to study their own practices from the beginning, some of us were—and some continue to be—more reticent about actually conducting self-study. This haste may be attributed to our discomfort with our positionality as methodologists as well as our vulnerability as junior faculty members. Regardless, something fortuitous happened at the end of our second year together when Jason Margolis, the department chair, emailed Jason Ritter with a question about what the group intended to do with its remaining funds from the budget. After considering a few different options, Margolis suggested investing the money in a Summer Graduate Research Assistantship position to help support and move the work of the self-study group forward. Ritter selected an individual to fill the position and decided to utilize the research assistant to interview all of the DILE S-STEP group members. The idea was that the data that emerged could be analyzed and interpreted for any number of different projects the group was interested in pursuing, one of which included the present inquiry about how the group was collectively evolving as collaborators and practitioners of self-study research. After 2 years of Ritter taking the lead with “teaching” and the rest of the group mainly focused on the “learning” of self-study, the group decided to spend year three engaged in collaborative self-study, using our interview data to explore our perceptions of the theoretical and methodological utility of self-study. This was a most important development for the group because it made it so we were *all* actively *doing* self-study in an environment that had grown to be both critical and supportive.

## Methodology

As mentioned above, all group members were interviewed by a research assistant during the Summer of 2016, immediately prior to the commencement of our third year of DILE S-STEP group meetings. The interview guide (see [Appendix](#)) was developed by Ritter, who was the facilitator of the group and the individual to whom the research assistant was assigned. He had an interest in discovering what motivated his colleagues to join the group, their experiences participating in the group, as well as their views on the usefulness of self-study to their work. He also thought the process of being interviewed might help the group members to reflect on the answers to these questions for themselves. Ritter did not participate in any of the interviews nor did he read any of the interview transcripts until the group devised a plan for what to do with them. During the first meeting of the third year, a mutually agreed upon plan was hatched to group all of the responses from the interviews together in one master transcript, totaling 78 single spaced pages, and to spend our remaining meetings collaboratively analyzing that data. The group continued to

meet about once every 3 weeks for 2 h meetings during the 2016/2017 academic year. Most of our time was spent in the meetings discussing/doing our analysis.

The analysis process itself evolved over the course of our time together. Since the group is quite diverse and individual members were trained to do research in a variety of ways, we began slowly by simply having discussions on the underpinnings of various methodologies and methods (Moss and Haertel 2016), as well as strategies for data probing (Strauss and Corbin 1998) and coding (Saldaña 2016). From there, Jason Ritter started assigning “homework,” usually in the form of ten or so pages of the transcript at a time, for everyone to attempt to code in preparation for each meeting. The collaborative analysis process for the group most resembled inductive content analysis in so far as we were not operating from preexisting theories on how individuals learn self-study methodology. Instead we individually reviewed the transcripts and identified those words or phrases that emerged for each interview question through identifiers of salience such as primacy, frequency, uniqueness, negation, emphasis, errors, omission, isolation, and incompleteness (see Alexander 1988). Each group member’s individual findings were then shared and discussed in our meetings, where we would dialogue with each other to reach shared understandings around the codes to our interview questions. Our coded responses to the interview questions, verified and enriched by discussion during our meetings, were ultimately consolidated into four categories that are presented in the findings section of this chapter. While we acknowledge our own subjectivities and theories of learning influencing our coding, as with all qualitative research, we also believe the process for collaborative discussion and joint authorship of this manuscript serve to provide a reasonably trustworthy account of our collective experiences learning self-study.

## Findings

Although some overlap is inevitable, we attempt to present the findings of our collaborative self-study below according to four categories: (a) who we are as teacher educators engaging with self-study research, (b) what we wanted from our participation in the self-study group, (c) what we now understand about self-study methodology, and (d) on the usefulness of the group in relation to facilitating such understandings.

### *Who We Are as Teacher Educators Engaging with Self-Study Research*

Research exists that documents why individuals choose to become teacher educators (Ducharme 1993) as well as their early experiences becoming socialized to their new roles in higher education (e.g., Dinkelman et al. 2006a, b; Harrison and

McKeon 2010; Murray and Male 2005; Ritter 2009). However, not as much is explicitly known about why certain teacher educators turn to self-study in their work, especially when already accomplished and trained in other research methodologies. The first two sections of these findings respond to this gap in the literature.

The interview data from our self-study group indicated striking similarities in our responses to the question of how our values and/or beliefs factored into our career choices. For example, a personal love of learning and recognition of its potential importance to others factored into all of our decisions to pursue our chosen profession. Rachel explicitly addressed how she loves her subject matter and enjoys putting it to use in figuring out problems, claiming “I love mathematics. I love the beauty of mathematics. I love the intrigue of doing mathematics, and I like the satisfaction of playing around with numbers and coming up with a solution.” Sandra also expressly stated: “I love to learn. And I love to support the growth and development of myself and others, but mostly others. So, to me teaching was just a natural profession, and a service profession.” The interviews collectively indicated how members of our group desired to pass this love of learning on to their students and help them to recognize why such a stance might be important to their students as future teachers.

Coupled with the idea that teachers should be—and should strive to facilitate pupils who are—lifelong learners, members of our group also uniformly cited the importance of empathy and care in the educational process. For instance, Laura stressed how people often “forget about the cultural aspect, or identity issues that [student] may have when trying to fit in....I think that’s what got me into the field I’m in....the empathy and diversity.” Julia made it clear how she understands that her students come to her “wholly, holistically. So I need to keep that in mind when teaching them.” Similarly, Rachel claimed “something I believe in is helping my teachers to create a caring environment where students feel safe to express their ideas and to critique each other’s ideas.” These responses suggest that, for members of our group, empathy and care ought to represent the conditions under which learning occurs *and* the ends toward which our learning should be directed.

In addition to these broad values, certain core beliefs appeared across the interviews. These beliefs focused on the importance of providing equal opportunity to students, empowering students through critical thinking and more open ways of being, and focusing on relationships to improve communities and society. In terms of equality of opportunity, Carla made it clear how she has “always been someone who thinks everybody deserves an equal chance, who believes where kids are born or what their circumstances are shouldn’t dictate what opportunities they are given.” Laura similarly proclaimed her belief “in equality for everybody, and education [as] the big equalizer.” While access to opportunity is part of the challenge, it also matters what teachers do with the given students under their charge. In this way, everyone in the group also professed the importance of empowering students through

critical thinking and more open ways of being. For example, Xia described how she thinks “to educate” means to “let [students] think thoroughly and critically.” She continued:

being an educated person is not only how much knowledge you know, it’s about how you think. And so I think I just want to make some difference in my students, and let [them] have a broader horizon so they can have more options for their life.

Perhaps as a corollary to our beliefs on the importance of opportunity and empowerment for all, everyone in the S-STEP group believed education should involve forging relationships to strengthen and improve communities. Christopher discussed how he came to recognize that he “really values relationships, so often what I’m doing is challenging [students] to build those relationships.” Sandra similarly stated how she values education, “not only in terms of individual improvement, but also the self and others....I value interdependence, community.”

The interview data presented in this section serves to portray members of our S-STEP group as teacher educators who recognize and have experienced the power of learning for themselves and who desire to help others experience that same learning and power so that they might be emboldened to work toward improving or strengthening their own relationships and communities. While it is not possible to definitively claim that such values and beliefs caused any one of us to join the DILE S-STEP group, we can acknowledge that each of us saw something about the group and its focus that we believed would help us to more fully embody or live out our values and beliefs in our practices as teacher educators and/or researchers.

### ***What We Wanted from Our Participation in the Self-Study Group***

Interest in joining and participating in the DILE S-STEP group seemed to derive from five sources. In no particular order, the interview data revealed how group members were motivated by the notion of finding a space to reflect, focusing on or improving their teaching, becoming better socialized to the norms and practices of the institution, fostering collegiality, and facilitating their own ongoing learning. For some, the need for a space to reflect harkened back to their days in graduate school and what they understood as effective teacher education practice. Rachel noted how during her first semester as a faculty member at Duquesne she realized:

we were not reflecting on what was happening as the course went on. And that is something that I was used to doing as a teaching assistant. We would meet every month and reflect on what was working, what was not working. Without that, I found myself on a sort of island where I felt the course was not going in the way in which it should go, and we were not talking about what could we change.

For Rachel, regular meetings of the self-study group would help to fill this void. Similarly Carla shared how the group “has really helped me to be reflective with a critical eye.”

Closely connected to the desire for a space to reflect was our collective interest in focusing on or improving our teaching. Christopher appreciated the inherent recognition in self-study that “what we’re doing teaching-wise is worth studying.” Julia claimed her reason for joining the group was because she “wanted to look at my own teaching practices.” Rachel also noted the importance of studying one’s teaching but highlighted the role of self-study in improving teaching for her as well as others. She noted how in “self-study the reflection goes a step further in that you talk about what is happening in the process of reflection, what changes you are making, and giving that out to other people. It makes your practice and potentially the practices of others better.”

Perhaps owing to the fact that many in the group were newer to the university and not yet tenured, the interview data also revealed a more general interest in joining the DILE S-STEP group to become better socialized to the norms and practices of our university and to foster collegiality with other faculty in the department. As an example, Xia commented “I came here last summer. I really want to socialize into researchers’ professional lives here. This is a good opportunity for me to be a part of that community of practice.” Christopher, another new hire with Xia, noted how he was drawn to the group after Ritter’s invitation “to the table” because there seemed to be “a collegial aspect to it [self-study] and I thought it was a great opportunity.” Sandra similarly noted how she “values collegiality and creating a support network with your peers and colleagues.” She continued, “Getting a publication is almost icing on the cake. But the process, the collegiality and the learning that happens is great.”

As one final motivation, some members of the group expressed an interest in their ongoing learning and development. Sandra described the self-study group as “a space where we meet to learn, where we learn from each other in a safe, purposeful way. But it’s work. And I really love that.” Laura also noted how she thought of the group:

as an opportunity to explore other ways of looking at my own practices....I was intrigued, I guess. I was intrigued by the idea of it. And I like the idea of Dr. Margolis starting the group with a leader. It was almost like grad school. Having a teacher, but not a teacher. Not being graded, but still trying to learn something. I think, as a faculty member, unless you have a specific research team or mentor assigned to you, mostly about how to be a faculty member, not about research, it’s hard to discover new things. I mean, you might go to conferences and things like that. You’re kind of on your own.

Although initial motivations for joining and/or wanting to participate may have varied slightly from participant to participant, Laura’s hope and desire of wanting to discover “new things” (e.g., about our teaching, our research, our institution, each other)—but discovering them in a way that is not so insular or competitive—cut to the core of what all found intriguing and rewarding about participation in the S-STEP group. Interestingly, some of the most important features of S-STEP methodology (see LaBoskey 2004)—like focusing on the legitimacy of teaching, critical reflection, and interaction/collaboration—coincided with what members of our group sought when they joined the group in the first place.

## *What We Now Understand About Self-Study Methodology*

Although everyone in the group was a newcomer to S-STEP at the outset of our journey, by the end of our second year together, the interview data revealed a more or less shared understanding of the methodology. Specifically, 11 recurring codes emerged from the data related to how we discussed our understandings. These descriptors included how S-STEP is intentional, focused, systematic, reflexive, critical, exploratory, ongoing, interactive, emotionally laden, tied to development, and outcome-oriented. Upon further discussion of these codes, the group decided the first nine codes seemed to be indicative of what self-study actually involves and should look like in practice.

To that end, intentionality featured prominently in how Rachel answered the question of what self-study means to her, stating, “it is the intentional reflection on my teaching that includes research on what I do, why I do it, how I do it... basically the process of doing it and sharing it with others in my profession.” Julia shared a description of self-study with a similar focus when she claimed, “I think it’s being intentional. Utilizing what you have gained in being reflective. Looking at the impact that you have on your students. Understanding how you can frame that. Being more deeply reflective.” She further explained, “I think reflection becomes easier, that is more intentional, when things aren’t going well, but even reflecting on when things go well, you have to stop and take time to do that.” In addition to being intentional, there was agreement within the group that self-study should be focused. Laura noted how self-study should be “really focused on the self”; similarly Rachel noted the “need to think about what I want to study and how to focus on what it is that I am doing. More than that, I also need to focus on why I am doing it.” The group further developed the understanding that for self-study to move beyond simple reflection it has to be systematic. Christopher spoke on behalf of the group when he defined self-study as “a systematic and structured way to think about your teaching, and I’d add the component where you change or adjust or critically analyze what you do to make a change or adjustment. I think it’s a systematic methodological framework.”

Xia perceptively described additional features of S-STEP when she stated how “self-study means two words for me: reflexivity, criticality... both reflexivity and criticality focus on self-study, on self-exploration.” Describing self-study as a methodology, Carla also focused on the importance of:

reflection, critical feedback. That’s huge. That you have to have somebody looking at you and saying, “Hey, did you think of it this way?” or “What could you do here?” It’s just talking that process through, having that ‘critical friend’ as they call it in the method going and looking over your shoulder and saying, “Are you being honest?”

In addition to its reflective and critical aspects, the group also understood self-study as exploratory in nature. Laura commented how “it’s about thinking about who you are as a person and how that interplays with what you do.” Connected with the exploratory nature of self-study was the recognition that self-study is likely to be an ongoing process as opposed to a finite journey. Carla discussed how self-study has



helped in “how I approach things and when do I need to approach things to make it align with my students better, to meet the needs of my students better.” Moreover, as an important way to assess when such changes should take place, the group also came to understand self-study as interactive and/or collaborative. Sandra explicitly stated how “part of the process is you have to talk to others about your work.” She went on to note “I value collaboration....I value self-learning.”

In terms of ground-level practice, there was also an undeniable recognition among the group that self-study represents an approach to research that can be emotionally laden. Rachel shared how “the fact that I have initiated the self-study is, how do I put it....it’s initiated by something that I’m struggling with or that I want to try out, so it comes out of my own way of teaching.” In teaching a course that our students seem particularly resistant to learning about, Laura acknowledged how self-study has been “helpful and therapeutic in the same way. With the faculty who teach the diversity course, it’s nice to talk about the issues, it’s good to talk about what other people experience....it’s good that we’re not alone thinking about it.” Julia also recognized the emotional element of self-study, claiming “you can be so actively engaged, you have to pull yourself out from what happened.”

Finally, for our group, the last two codes identified in the interview data came to represent what we believed to be the purpose of engaging in self-study. To this end everyone expressed how engaging in self-study should be outcome-oriented by contributing in some way to our professional development as teacher educators and educational researchers. Many in the group appreciated how self-study contributed to our sense of both efficiency and efficacy. With self-study it was possible to simultaneously concentrate on improving our teaching while also writing about those efforts. This helped to ease the pressure to publish by always being in a state of data collection and writing. There was also a sense that this data could ultimately be used to change our individual courses and larger programs offered through our school of education. Laura spoke of the professional development side of self-study in terms of her teaching when she claimed “that’s what self-study is about. It’s about looking at how you can make yourself a better teacher.” Sandra addressed self-study as both a research and teaching professional development tool when she stated, “I think some people see [self-study] as narcissistic or convenient or easy. But it’s not easy. Maybe convenient. Not narcissistic because I’m doing it because I want to be a better teacher educator. You can’t really argue with that.” Indeed, taken as whole, the interview data presented in this section demonstrate how the group developed nuanced understandings of both S-STEP methodology and the purposes it can serve in furthering professional development and, potentially, in fostering institutional change over time.



## *On the Usefulness of the Group in Relation to Facilitating Such Understandings*

In terms of the usefulness of the DILE S-STEP group, the interview transcripts revealed how we collectively felt the group was beneficial because its nature and structure (group dynamics)—coupled with the process used in our meetings (collaborative inquiry)—enabled all group members to learn about and become enculturated to the norms and practices of the wider S-STEP community. With regard to the group dynamics, everyone seemed particularly grateful for two features of the group: our diversity and our supportiveness. Carla addressed the usefulness of diversity within the group when she noted how the “cross-content [aspect of the group] is important ... to see the similarities across teacher education that I might not have paid attention to before.” Sandra also made clear her beliefs on the value of such diversity when she commented about the group, “So, we’re teaching different disciplines, but we’re all teacher educators, so it brings a nice potpourri of perspectives around self-study methodology. And I really appreciate that.” Perhaps owing to such diversity and varying areas of expertise, there was a clear recognition in the group that we were all learning together. This translated into an unusually supportive learning environment. Carla highlighted the importance of this aspect of the group when she stated: “the collaboration of the group... having that critical discussion... and just having support... I couldn’t imagine trying to do this on my own.” Rachel echoed the importance of collaborating in a supportive environment when she noted:

this group has been there for us to bounce off ideas for what we can do, how I can begin writing about what I already have. And we’ve had sessions in which we share with each other about what we think we are studying, and we’re getting ideas on how to improve.

Many expressed how they felt encouraged to share their experiences with other colleagues in the group. Xia recalled how she did “a lot of homework....And then I listened to what other people think about this term, and then I internalized this term into my particular field.” Reflecting on her participation in the group, Xia continued: “I would like to say it expanded my thinking.”

Our group dynamics and the way in which we chose to engage with each other facilitated the learning of self-study and our collective socialization to the norms and practices of the S-STEP community. Rachel noted how:

what I really like in the group was we had been talking about what self-study actually is. We’ve also talked about how to collect data, and we’ve talked about what is data. And then we’ve talked about the importance of having critical friends, and then we’ve talked about what counts as evidence.

This suggests that we were learning about the methodology by engaging in collaborative inquiry with one another. The facilitator of the group, Ritter, deliberately tried to choose resources that would help all members feel more comfortable with the central tenets of S-STEP methodology and its scholarly legitimacy. Xia shared

how her initial questions and confusion were reduced by having access to such resources, stating:

I did not know what they were talking about [after my first meeting]. Self-study? I had joined in the middle. By the second meeting of this group, I was kind of clear about what they were talking about especially after I read the journal associated with this group.

When asked if the group helped her develop a better understanding of the process, Xia replied: “Yes. Definitely. Especially they give us some examples of how, in a particular content area, they would use self-study. So, this is really a cool example for me to expand my understanding about self-study in my expertise.” Rachel also shared how “We’ve been introduced to the conferences that promote self-study, and in the process I’ve also learned to find out what can be a good self-study topic and how to go about it.”

Of course, despite these successes, there were also ways in which members of the group felt our time together could have done more to contribute to our developing teacher educator and researcher identities. One common theme in the interviews revolved around the notion of providing more support in action. This was noted to include things like practicing presenting and actively writing articles with an S-STEP audience in mind. To the first point, Rachel suggested that the group work together more by not only discussing the self-study journals but also by practicing presentation for conferences. She said: “We could also use the group to rehearse what we are going to be talking about in our presentations, to get ideas.” Sharing her hopes for the future, Rachel continued by describing how she “would like if our group became a writing group where our group could sit together and read each other’s work, critique each other’s work, improve each other’s work, and make us better self-study researchers.” Sandra also noted how it would be useful to engage more with actual self-study articles so that she might better understand “what it might look like or sound like in publication form.”

Related suggestions for improvement involved our efficiency as a group. Christopher directly remarked on how he “thought some of the sessions were not used as efficiently as they could have been.” Perhaps shedding some light on this perceived lack of efficiency, Laura said “He [Ritter] does this inquiry-based style. I’m too old and impatient for inquiry. I need to be given the information directly. Inquiry works well with students, but maybe just a little more direct with us.” Sandra further elaborated on how:

sometimes I get anxious, not anxious but impatient, because I want the meetings to be work time where someone brings an article and we discuss it on the spot, or we have something to read and we come back with it with our notes. Not just a session where we just talk.

Given the expectations and demands placed on faculty members, especially pre-tenure faculty members, members of the S-STEP group were especially eager to not waste time. After missing a couple of meetings in a row, Carla shared how “finding the time to meet and actually have that dialogue is really hard with all the other demands that are placed on us. So it’s not really a criticism of the group, it’s a criticism of how things are.”

Finally, there were hints that some members of the group might like greater autonomy and/or self-direction. For instance, Rachel discussed how maybe instead of leaving the planning of the meetings to Ritter exclusively, perhaps the group members “can also help him, and make his work easier.” She continued by stating how the group members should start

suggesting things we can do in the group rather than him always calling for a meeting, and he has to think about what’s going to happen in the meeting, which he has been very good about, but I think there needs to be more input on our side.

Xia further suggested how “maybe, in one or two years, we can explore something further and something more interdisciplinary... I’d like to find more integrated ways to develop my research through participating in this group.”

## Discussion

The purpose of this chapter was to take a closer look at the DILE S-STEP group and to more fully examine what we learned about, and though, our participation in a faculty self-study learning group. To that end, in the preceding sections, we considered four facets of our group, including who we are as teacher educators engaging with self-study research, what we wanted from our participation in the self-study group, what we now understand about self-study methodology, and the usefulness of the group in relation to facilitating such understandings.

With regard to who we are as teacher educators, we found that, as a group, we not only valued learning for ourselves but also felt a strong desire to share that learning with others so that they might feel empowered to work toward change in their own lives and communities. We noted how each of us saw something about the DILE S-STEP group that would potentially help us to more fully embody or live out our values and beliefs in our practices as teacher educators and/or educational researchers. When fleshed out, some of these motivations included finding a space to reflect, focusing on or improving our teaching, becoming better socialized to our institution, fostering collegiality, and facilitating our ongoing learning. Although we are not dealing in causal relationships here, interested readers can still glean insight regarding who might be attracted to joining faculty learning groups such as the DILE S-STEP group and what they might be looking for out of their participation.

Further to this, the nature and structure of the group—coupled with the collaborative inquiry process we used in our meetings—enabled group members to develop nuanced understandings of S-STEP methodology and the purposes it might serve. The group collectively came to understand self-study as something that is intentional, focused, systematic, reflexive, critical, exploratory, ongoing, interactive, emotionally laden, and outcome-oriented, contributing in some way to our professional development as teacher educators and educational researchers. It seems likely that some of this nuance naturally developed or flowed from the inherent

diversity of the group, while some of it came about as we worked over the course of 3 years to create a climate that was both challenging and supportive.

Still, for all of the positive features and success of this group, the interview data did reveal a shared notion, at times, that what the group really needed was “a little less talk and a lot more action.” Many commented on the need for more support in action (i.e., carrying out, writing, and presenting a self-study). Despite our regular meetings, there was reticence among some in the group to actually conduct a self-study. This fact, coupled with the criticism that not all of the group meetings were very efficient and possibly consisted of too much inquiry or talking at times, prompted us to consider how there should probably be structured time in early meetings for individuals to hash out specific plans for conducting a self-study. This initial planning should be purposefully followed up on in subsequent meetings to ensure that learning about self-study is accompanied by doing self-study. We realize that not all faculty learning groups will have 3 years time together to grow and mature as we did. Yet we also understand that self-study, similar to any other methodology, takes time to know, respect, and utilize. Findings from this collaborative self-study group highlight the transformative nature of collaboration, which asks for vulnerability and reflection from all participants.

## **Appendix: Interview Guide for S-STEP Group Members**

- Could you briefly describe what led you to becoming a professor of education?
- How did your beliefs and values factor into the decision to become a professor of education?
- When you were in graduate school as a doctoral student, what were your expectations of doing research and how were you trained to do so?
- Could you tell me about some of your research interests?
- What methods or approaches do you usually use to explore your research questions?
- What led you to become interested in joining the DILE self-study group?
- What did you hope to get out of the self-study group? What were your expectations?
- Now that you have participated in the group for some time, could you tell me what self-study means to you?
- One methodological consideration for self-study is that it should be “self-initiated” and “self-focused.” How does this relate to your notion of what self-study is?
- Another methodological consideration for self-study is that it should be interactive and/or collaborative. Could you describe what this might look like and why it might be important?
- Self-study does not have a prescribed set of methods, but rather incorporates a variety of methods to answer a research question. How does this compare to other methodologies you have used?

An important part of self-study methodology is making the work public. Could you provide some examples of how you think this aspect of self-study might be fulfilled?

How you have started to use self-study in your own work as a teacher educator and researcher?

What, if anything, has been useful about the group in terms of developing your understanding of self-study methodology?

What, if anything, has been useful about the group in terms of your development as a teacher educator and researcher?

Could you describe some ways the group could have contributed more to your development as a teacher educator and/or researcher?

Is there anything you would like to add to the interview?

## References

- Alexander, I. E. (1988). Personality, psychological assessment, and psychobiography. In D. P. McAdams & R. L. Ochberg (Eds.), *Psychobiography and life narratives* (pp. 265–294). Durham: Duke University Press.
- Dinkelman, T., Margolis, J., & Sikkenga, K. (2006a). From teacher to teacher educator: Experience, expectations, and expatriation. *Studying Teacher Education, 2*, 5–23.
- Dinkelman, T., Margolis, J., & Sikkenga, K. (2006b). From teacher to teacher educator: Reframing knowledge in practice. *Studying Teacher Education, 2*, 119–136.
- Ducharme, E. R. (1993). *The live of teacher educators*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Harrison, J., & McKeon, F. (2010). Perceptions of beginning teacher educators of their development in research and scholarship: Identifying the ‘turning point’ experiences. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 36*, 19–34.
- 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: Kluwer.
- Moss, P. A., & Haertel, E. H. (2016). Engaging methodological pluralism. In D. Gitomer & C. Bell (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (5th ed., pp. 127–247). Washington, DC: AERA.
- Murray, J., & Male, T. (2005). Becoming a teacher educator: Evidence from the field. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 21*, 125–142.
- Ritter, J. K. (2009). Developing a vision of teacher education: How my classroom teacher understandings evolved in the university environment. *Studying Teacher Education, 5*, 45–60.
- Saldaña, J. (2016). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.