Volume 26, Issue 2 (Special Edition)

cjsae
the canadian journal for the study of adult education

la revue canadienne pour l'étude de l'éducation des adultes
rcééa

What Do You Think You're Doing? An Examination of an Evolving Praxis of Teaching Teachers

Erin Graham

The Canadian Journal for the Study of Adult Education/
La Revue canadienne pour l'étude de l'éducation des adultes
Editor-in-Chief: Donovan Plumb
www.cjsae-rceea.ca

26,2 Special Edition April/avril 2014, 21–32
ISSN1925-993X (online)

WHAT DO YOU THINK YOU'RE DOING? AN EXAMINATION OF AN EVOLVING PRAXIS OF TEACHING TEACHERS

Erin Graham
University of British Columbia

Abstract

This paper examines some of the tensions, contradictions, and opportunities that arise for new graduate teaching assistants (GTAs) in the teacher education program of a large research-intensive Canadian university. I am a long-time feminist activist with experience in informal and community education and political organizing, now gaining more experience as an instructor in a teacher education program. This paper charts my analysis of various tensions between the university and the teacher education program and between teacher candidate students and their instructor (me) who has not been in a K–12 classroom since my own high-school days. As part of this examination, I offer an analysis of the training PhD candidates receive for teaching in the teacher education program. My experiences and observations of these tensions contribute to a developing praxis as an educator and academic.

Résumé[1]

Ce travail pour les nouveaux assistants en enseignement de troisième cycle universitaire examine quelques tensions, contradictions et opportunités dans le contexte d'un programme de professeurs en faculté d'éducation. Observations basées sur une université canadienne assez axe sur la recherche. Dupuis très longtemps je suis une féministe active avec expérience dans l'éducation non-formel et communautaire ainsi que dans l'organisation politique; me perfectionnant en acquérant plus d'expérience comme institutrice dans un programme d'enseignement en faculté d'éducation. Cet article explique mon analyse des diffèrent tensions vécus entre l'université, le programme des professeurs et entre les candidates en program et leurs professeur (moi).

L'évolution constant de nos actions dans le domaine académique et en tant que éducateurs bénéficierais si mes expériences et observations puissant contribuer à un nouveau point de vue.

1 I am grateful to Deborah Knapp of Laval, Quebec, for her generous and competent translation of the abstract into French.

The Canadian Journal for the Study of Adult Education/
La Revue canadienne pour l'étude de l'éducation des adultes
26,2 Special Edition April/avril 2014, 21–32
ISSN1925-993X (online)

Introduction

In June 2013 at the Canadian Association for the Study of Adult Education (CASAE) conference at the University of Victoria, I had an opportunity to participate in a panel discussion of teacher educators located in adult education programs across Canada. I prepared some notes, but not a paper, as I anticipated that our discussion and the audience contributions would serve to extend my thinking and further inform this article. I was correct in that assumption. I also recorded some of my remarks. This introductory section will describe some of my thoughts and feelings about what I heard in the recording.

I had to take a few runs at listening to myself on the recording. What I found most distressing was the initial apologetic tone of my voice and words. I bordered on obsequious when I thanked everyone for their attendance, "even though it's nap time," and introduced myself, each sentence rising slightly in the end to transform declaration into uncertain questions. "My name is Erin Graham …? I'm a PhD candidate? at UBC in Educational Studies?"

I am a radical feminist and have for many years worked in front-line anti-violence, mental health, and anti-poverty organizations. I am also a performer, a stand-up comedian and storyteller. I have training, for heaven's sake! I notice the differences between how men talk, perform, and tell stories and how women talk, perform, and tell stories. Men take up space and talk with authority and pride (and, in comedy clubs, at least, quite often about their penises); women "shrink to fit" and self-deprecate – not everyone, of course, but often enough that even a casual observer can determine where the stereotypes come from. I know about the pressure on women to defer to male authority, to hold ourselves in, to take up less space. But I did not consider that I was reproducing the very behaviour that makes me cringe when I observe it in other women. So, of course, I pushed *pause* quite often, sighed heavily, muttered curses in the direction of the patriarchy, and took my time to get through the recording.

Embarrassment aside, it was instructive to hear the stereotypical feminine way of speaking I'd thought I'd overcome long ago. Once I got over myself, my nerves settled, and I attended to the story and to the ideas, my speech became more confident and relaxed. What follows is my answer (so far) to the question: "What's it like to be an 'outsider-instructor' teaching in a university teacher education program?"

Negotiating the Gap between the Teacher Education Program and the Research-Intensive University: Same Campus, Different Planet

This article is based on my experience of teaching in a teacher education program within a large research-intensive Canadian university. I discuss some observations that indicate a simmering tension between the university and the teacher education program. I argue that this tension is also often felt in the relations between teacher candidates and the PhD candidates who offer instruction in their program. I first offer an autobiographical sketch to help you know how you might interpret me, then show some of the big-picture contradictions between the teacher education program and the university and describe some of the parallel smaller-scale tensions between graduate teaching assistants (GTAs), adult educators, and teacher candidates.

One bridge between teacher candidates and their graduate student instructors or tutors is the field of adult education scholarship, within which we are *all* theorists and practitioners. While at first glance it may appear that teacher education and adult education may share few mutual theoretical or practical interests, in fact teacher candidates are adult learners and their instructors are adult educators. We have, indeed, much in common. All of us place great value on teaching and seek to improve our understanding as well as our practice. Pedagogy and andragogy[2] are not so much in conflict as they are merely located in different places within the wider field of education.

What I Bring to My Teaching Practice – Activist versus Academic

I graduated from the University of Lethbridge in 1986 with a BA in drama. Then I planted trees for between three and five months a year for the next three years, living in the winter on unemployment insurance (when there was such a thing; I'm still a little bitter) and picking up various jobs – cooking, waiting tables, cleaning houses, and modelling for artists and drawing classes. I was a bit aimless there for a while. Then I moved to Vancouver and found the feminists. I joined a feminist anti-violence collective and, to paraphrase Muriel Rukeyser,[3] my world split open.

I don't remember what I expected, but it sure wasn't what I got. At the time, I was yearning to return to school, but that collective, and the work we shared in that time, offered me a better education than I could ever have achieved in graduate school. We read widely and talked about what we were reading, we answered the phones, and we opened our doors and talked to women who told us of the brutality of the men who loved them – women who were escaping a violent husband, or who remembered their father sexually assaulting them, or who were angry about sexual harassment. We went to the hospital with women who'd just been attacked; we facilitated groups for callers and to train volunteers; we changed diapers and washed the floors; we planned demonstrations and actions; we lobbied politicians and held press conferences; we cooked and ate with the women in the transition house; we plotted raids to get women's stuff; we leaned on the police to investigate and the crown to charge – and all kinds of other things. I learned like the dickens, and what I learned about women's lives under patriarchal, imperialist capitalism has stayed with me.

Teaching: Profession? Trade? Vocation? Job?

Whether and to what extent teaching is a profession or a trade are matters of some debate (Runte, 1995). Certainly teachers require particular specialized training to qualify for a licence, but so do pipefitters and sous-chefs. It seems that the training and criteria to become a teacher are placed in a category closer to that required of tradespeople than doctors or lawyers. Engineers, lawyers, and medical doctors, for example, spend more years in study and practical apprenticeship than teachers before they are admitted to their profession. As well as length and expectations of teacher training, the cultural, symbolic,

2 *Andragogy* is the study of adult education, whereas *pedagogy* is the study of the education of children (Pratt, 1998, p. 3).

3 "What would happen if one woman told the truth about her life? / The world would split open." From "Käthe Kollwitz," by M. Rukeyser, retrieved from http://murielrukeyser.emuenglish.org/writing/kathe-kollwitz/.

and economic capital afforded teaching are generally less than that of doctors or engineers. This points to the diminished value placed on teaching (mainly, I dare say, because it's traditionally "women's work," particularly in the pre-school and primary grades (Education International, n.d.). That dedicated teacher education university programs are scarcely 40 years old is another indication that the status of teaching as a profession is tenuous and that teacher education – or teacher training – fits somewhat awkwardly into higher education.

Our university's teacher education program still attracts teacher candidates for whom the Industrial Revolution model (Robinson, 2006) of education was successful. For the most part, teacher candidates and teacher educators (including me) are those who did well in public school, learned adequately from lecture-style teaching, and had the cultural and social capital from their families to attain the required credentials to get into university. Most teacher candidates are interested in learning how to teach within the existing structure of education, not in critiquing, reforming, or subverting it.

The teacher education program of our university seeks to provide teacher candidates with a set of skills and tools they will implement in their careers as K–12 educators. In that aspect it seems to be more of a trade school than a professional program. The university, on the other hand, is "A Place of Mind" [4] rather than practice. The department in which I am a candidate is a place of rich intellectual discovery and knowledge production. But the system of determining merit and promotion treats teaching as a less important form of knowledge production and distribution than publications and successful attainment of research grants. Faculty members are lauded and their careers advance when they produce publications and successful grant applications and other achievements related to research – not so much when they teach undergraduate classes, supervise graduate students, or organize department events and workshops.

The university is a research-intensive institution. Research is conducted in the field by observing, interviewing, and sometimes participating in social movements or community groups. Research also, of course, takes place in laboratories, libraries, and archival vaults. Knowledge is then produced and disseminated[5] through peer-reviewed publications, books, and lectures. Teaching as a research methodology and form of knowledge production, germination,[6] and cultivation does not fit into authorized forms of knowledge production. Programs or courses designed to develop pedagogical theories and improve teaching practice seem superfluous to the main purpose of the big "U" university.

The devaluation of teaching practice and pedagogical and andragogical theory is often subtle. It is evidenced by the slender preparation and mentorship support offered to PhD candidates employed as GTAs. Preparation of PhD candidates to provide instruction in the teacher education program consists chiefly of a 24-hour instructional skills workshop and mentorship or supervision by a tenured faculty member. Graduate students from across the university are trained to facilitate these workshops. The workshops are not program-

4 "A Place of Mind" is this university's motto.

5 I'm not fond of this word *disseminate* – "to scatter or sow seed" (http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/disseminate). Of course my objection is the sexist assumptions at the root of the word. But I chose it here deliberately because that is what the research-intensive university does: scatter seed, not always heeding where the seed might land nor tending to the soil and other conditions so it may take root and grow.

6 Teaching, on the other hand, *germinates* knowledge and understanding (or it could).

specific; rather, they provide instruction, practice, and support to new and experienced teachers on teaching skills and techniques. New GTAs in the teacher education program are also invited to monthly 90-minute GTA workshops that address different aspects of teaching teachers. In addition to these supports, GTAs sometimes carve out the time to meet together to talk about teaching experiences and trade ideas and techniques. In my experience, faculty mentorship support has been inconsistent. I was fortunate to have as a mentor a professor passionate about teaching, and I've developed relationships with other faculty who are generous to me and have offered some helpful guidance. Some of my colleagues have not been so lucky. Competent, supportive, and challenging mentorship should never be a matter of luck, but in the absence of a unifying vision of the purposes of education and teacher training, inconsistency is inevitable.

In all, GTAs are undersupported by the university infrastructure. This is not the fault of the faculty or the teacher education office; it is a systemic problem inherent in the structure of the institution that privileges research and publication (and, er, *dissemination*) over teaching and andragogy throughout the university. This tension is at least two-way, as well. Teacher candidates want practical skills – the *what* and *how* of teaching – and often have little patience for the theory or political analysis – the *why* of teaching. Teacher education programs still do not adequately address the problem of connecting theory and practice in such a way that teachers can handle the problems of teaching through theory-guided action (Korthagen, Loughran, & Russell, 2006, p. 1021).

One GTA's Experience

I am a PhD candidate with years of experience in the wider field of adult education, including front-line social service and feminist organizations. I have had opportunities to provide informal learning environments and programs to adults, but I have never been a school teacher. In my experience, public school teachers are wary of people like me – teacher educators who have little or no experience in K–12 classrooms. We do not understand the challenges they face in relation to education ministry policies, school administration and parental demands, and classroom management issues (to name a few). We may have a theoretical understanding of how the system works, but we don't have the practical experience. I am acutely aware of my limitations in this regard and am somewhat apologetic about my lack of experience with the very practice in which I am offering instruction.

However, it is also true that those of us whose work and life experiences of education have been at arm's length from the K–12 education system have much to contribute given our broad range of experiences and perceptions. Over the past 20 years I have met and worked with many people who have been damaged or abandoned by the education system. Since returning to graduate school I've encountered ideas that help me understand how these damages occur and put them into a larger context of neo-liberalism, colonialism, and capitalist patriarchy. Teaching in the teacher education program is an opportunity to deepen my understanding of these operations of domination and to investigate, with others, potentially liberating alternatives to the reproductive modes of education.

Many teacher candidates are returning to school after pursuing careers in a variety of fields not necessarily related to education. We have a lot to offer each other. I suggest, however, that we are set up in somewhat tense, if not downright adversarial, relations before we meet in the classroom.

Theoretical Considerations

I use as my theoretical base Pierre Bourdieu's analysis of the education system as a reproductive institution that operates to reward and promote the values, dispositions, and behaviours of the middle and upper classes (Bourdieu, 1984). One consequence of this process of political and class reproduction is to reify a mistaken conception of human potential depending on social placement. The education system, in Bourdieu's analysis, serves in large measure to promote "a kind of chauvinism that converts privation into choice" (Bourdieu, 2000 p. 235). Paulo Freire's conceptualization of teaching as a practice of freedom (Freire, 1968/2000) helps build a conceptual bridge between a critical analysis of the reproductive function of schooling and the potential for transformative education toward shared freedom. I'm very fond of Jonathon Kozol's *The Night Is Dark and I Am Far from Home* (1975/1990), which owes a debt to Freire. Though it is an inquiry into the values and goals of America's schools, and long out of print, it is provocative and relevant for Canadian teacher education. I also draw upon research and analysis about teacher education programs in major research-intensive universities that offer some resolutions to the tensions described in this paper (Korthagen, Loughran, & Russell, 2006).

A pivotal concept is the idea of fear of freedom (Freire, 1968/2000) and how we display this fear. I argue that the tension between teacher candidates and GTAs is founded in such a fear. We crave security, but teaching is not secure, and the practice of freedom comes with risk. Sometimes people mask this fear by presenting themselves as defenders of freedom (Freire, 1968/2000, p. 18). How can an emerging scholar and GTA anticipate, name, and deal with this fear (in herself and in her students)?

Ideally, in the university's teacher education program, we meet together to learn theories that will improve our teaching practice. Here the praxis of teaching teacher candidates is a form of facilitated and reciprocal learning and knowledge production. We bring to the classroom our memories, experiences, taken-for-granted dispositions, curiosity, and fears. As Kathleen Weiler (2001) said:

> Both the symbolic violence of commercial culture and the structural and institutional violence of untrammeled [patriarchy and] capitalism shape the discourses through which men and women construct themselves and lead to inevitable tensions and conflicts in classrooms in which different "voices" and experiences are called forth. (p. 71)

Within this context of structural inequity, symbolic violence, and conflict, however, are aspects of shared history, experience, and understanding within which we may develop a kind of epistemic intimacy. I think, in general, we share more in common than not, and a classroom full of teachers is an ideal setting to reveal and strengthen those connections in order to practise freedom.

Sometimes We Are Us and They Are Them: Sometimes They Are Them and So Are We. Sometimes, Too, They Are Us and We Are Us. But Sometimes, They Are ALL Us – and Only I Am Them

Education is promoted as a means for the oppressed to gain some traction on their way to liberation. Malala Yousafzsai is the most recent high-profile activist celebrated for her tenacious advocacy for access to education for girls and women. Though a Western education is assumed to be liberating for women, girls often enter high school expecting to be sexually harassed – which indicates, of course, that boys have learned they are entitled to treat girls as sexual objects and subordinate ("Girls Accepting Sexual Harassment," 2008).[7] European settlers to North America effectively enslaved indigenous people using residential schools as a means not to offer education or connection, but to train Aboriginal children in servitude. Residential schools, promoted as "assimilation tactics" (bad enough, to be sure), served to enslave, contain, and disenfranchise the First People. African Americans rightly observed that the educational opportunities offered and standards expected of Black children after emancipation were drastically inferior to those of White children. The struggle of dominated classes to desegregate and gain equity in education is fundamental. But the institution of education, conversely, tends to reinforce and reproduce class inequality. Teachers can be agents of transformation or reproduction, and the choices they make in this regard are shaped by their social locations as well as the education they experience in their training to become teachers.

In this section, then, I seek to interrogate the tensions between "us" and "them" and theorize ways in which these tensions reveal a dialectal process. I argue that this dialectic is always an ongoing process in teaching, but the potential for collaborative learning is overlooked because of the ways we are all institutionalized in education. How can GTAs understand and engage with the contradictions and tensions simmering throughout the Faculty of Education? How can we reveal assumptions that our students hold about us, and that we hold about them, and what will we do with this information once it's revealed? How can we (GTAs) reveal our similarities and differences with/between teacher candidates and use this to strengthen alliances as teachers and learners? How can we teach in such a way that will excite and encourage teacher candidates as well as develop new knowledge and theoretical approaches to pedagogy that will inform all of our work?

I scrutinize some of these assumptions and the consequent dialectic of teaching teachers by describing what I experienced as our similarities and differences. I understand teaching as (at least potentially) a practice of freedom (Freire, 1968/2000) and hope to offer my students instruction that can open them to understanding their teaching practice in this way as well. My advisor pointed out last year that my work previous to graduate school put me in a position of facilitating learning situations with people who already had a shared worldview – training volunteers for work at a feminist rape crisis centre, facilitating groups for battered women or people who shared the experience of a psychiatric diagnosis and treatment. These groups all shared some fundamental agreements and theoretical understanding, and the purposes of the classes or workshops were, in large measure, to strengthen these agreements so we may engage in shared action. Students in the teacher

7 The article refers to one Toronto study, but the problem is widespread. In every class I've taught some of the female students disclose having been sexually assaulted or harassed by their peers in high school.

education program do not necessarily hold similar worldviews, and their purpose in coming together is not to join a political movement but to learn how to work within an already established institution. Reaching consensus on any number of pedagogical conundrums or social/political problems is beyond the scope of these classes – but ideally, I can open some doors and make spaces for people to both hear others and question some of their tightly held assumptions. This is difficult, messy work that requires a worldly understanding and practice of respect:

> Respect – a regard for the person from the distance, which the space of the world puts between us – it does not depend on qualities we admire or achievements – it requires that we view others as capable of action. Listening is embodied and messy. Our own social history and location in the world can influence how we hear and are heard. Social and economic power choose our company for us and also define what is considered harmony and dissent. (Bickford, 1996, p. 80)

The education system rewards and promotes the development of middle-class cultural capital, and becoming a teacher can be a way for people to make an "upward" class shift. It seems to me that a majority of the people in the teacher education courses I've taught are from working-class or "lower" middle-class backgrounds.[8] One activity I use at the beginning of class is called "The Class Layer Cake" (Jochild & Sherover-Marcuse, 2007). This exercise reveals systemic location according to class background, which students heretofore may have taken as natural or normal. It serves as a good foundation for discussion about taken-for-granted assumptions about our lives and the lives of the young people whom the teacher candidates will shortly be charged with educating. This exercise is quite powerful and unsettling. Sometimes people take the information it reveals about their relative class location as personal indictment of their values and worth. It's important to remind them that each of the questions in the exercise reveals *structural and political* influences and conditions, not individual talents, choices, or values.

A similarly revealing assignment has proven to be the teacher biography. For this assignment I ask students to write their life story using several benchmarks with which to scaffold their paper. I ask them to answer questions about their background, such as where they were born and raised; whether and what kind of relationship they had with their extended family; what their parents did for income; how they came to pursue a career as teachers; how long it took them to get their undergraduate degree; who their significant influences were; what they are passionate about. The insights they discover with these exercises serve as a fundamental base for further study and discussion about issues they'll encounter in their classrooms, including disability, sexism and sexist violence, racism, the effects of colonialism, and class inequality. The two exercises reveal many similarities and differences between us.

---

8 That is, their parents were labourers or "petty bourgeoisie" – small-business owners, quite a few teachers, or other what I call small "p" professionals – though a few in every class are from very wealthy or very impoverished families.

Similarities

1. In general, teacher candidates and GTAs had positive experiences of their own schooling. That is, we had good experiences of (K–12) schooling because, in some way, we fit – we were usually not poor, usually of the dominant culture in our classrooms, usually inexperienced with learning disabilities or other disabilities that might hinder our enjoyment of learning. Or, if we did have challenges, we had adults in our lives who offered us support and encouragement and paved the way to university.
2. Many of the GTAs in the teacher education program have also had some teacher training, if not experience as a teacher in a school system. Several of my colleagues are trained teachers, and some have taught in some capacity in the K–12 system in their home countries or in ESL/EFL programs. I began a teacher education program myself, many years ago. This brief experience provided me with some insight into the institution of education and political operations of public schooling.
3. Most of us (both GTAs and teacher candidates) are women and have been raised to adulthood in a sexist culture that both impedes our progress and tempers our resilience. Once we all get out into the real world with our degrees, however tough we have become, we see that most leadership roles in the schools are held by men – especially in secondary schools and, of course, universities.
4. Most of us are White of European descent and have been raised to adulthood in a racist culture that promotes a sense of entitlement and stokes our fear of the "other" (Aboriginal people, people of colour, and especially new immigrants). The education system, again, rewards the cultural capital of the European, as the North American schooling system is based on European models.
5. Most teacher candidates (not all, by any means) are fairly liberal in their politics. They may not be anti-capitalist, but they generally think welfare and universal health care, for example, are good for society. They are committed to equal access to quality education. In theory, they believe that all students should be treated equally. Because they/we are (nearly all) White, not poor, and university-educated, they are often ignorant of the race/class/gender oppression entrenched in the institution of education (and defensive of their own position/privilege). However, they are nowhere near as conservative as I'd anticipated from some of the things I'd heard from other teachers and graduate and post-graduate students. They are (to varying degrees) thoughtful and open to interrogating the fundamental oppressive attitudes inherent in the current neo-liberal political climate.

Differences

1. Most of the teacher candidates are working class or second-generation middle class. That is, their parents worked in waged jobs, did not have university degrees, and did not have access to economic or political capital or, in

Marxist terms, "the means of production." My own background is working class; though my father had a semi-professional job and owned his business, neither of my parents had a university degree or inherited access to political, cultural, or economic capital. On the other hand, it appears that most (not all) GTAs who are instructing teacher candidates are from middle- to upper-class backgrounds. Their parents (and often grandparents) were university-educated professionals and had access to various types of capital.

2. The teacher candidates are less grounded in theory overall than the PhD candidates teaching them. Their attitudes toward theory vary widely from interest and engagement to disinterest and resentment. But most are in the middle, and I suspect that some are a bit intimidated by some of it.

Understanding and discussing with students the similarities and differences between us can lead to a transformative dialogue about the institution of education (both the K–12 system and university) and our place in it. These discussions can reveal our assumptions and conceptions about each other and the education system, and the expectations we have for our work. Some of the tensions experienced by instructors in the teacher education program of a research-intensive university arise from the importance placed on publishing and research over teaching. Teaching, however, can also be understood as a research methodology and an effective means of both knowledge production and distribution.

Lasting Change Is Glacial in Its Advance

As Korthagen, Loughran, and Russell (2006) discuss, teacher education programs only tenuously link practice and theory and in general have little impact on the practices of student teachers. Teacher educator programs, in general, assume that information transmission – what Freire (1968/2000) called the banking model of education – is the main aim of teaching. The university in which I am a graduate student and GTA does not seem to stray far from this model. Promotional materials describe teaching as "a moral enterprise, and learning to teach a matter of developing dispositions … gaining content and pedagogical knowledge" (University of British Columbia Faculty of Education, 2013, p. 13), and the program itself as a learning community in which members are "committed to ongoing inquiry, critical reflection, and ongoing engagement with others" (p. 14). The implication is that the educational model of the teacher education program does not trouble the structures of the institution of education, and while collaborative and reflective experiential learning is promoted, education for social transformation is not.

Kozol (1990) wrote of the effective disconnection enacted in schools between subjects, age groups, thinking, and doing and the parallel disconnection between the teacher who teaches mostly African American children in an inner-city school but lives in a predominantly White suburb:

> The ghetto teacher, who lives outside the city, cares a lot about his young black pupils and senses a wave of strong compassion every day … compassion which does not "dissolve" – but loses strength, persistence, credibility each night – as he drives back … to the segregated suburb where he has his home. (p. 58)

Kozol indicated that he, too, leads a too-divided life and does not believe that teachers in such circumstances are corrupt at all. The point I see him making is that schools, the institution of education, professional training, and our *habitus*, or dispositions, which we take as natural, slot us into place. To see these divisions and confront the inequalities and our own complicity is deeply troubling. Often we refuse.

Some of the GTAs, sessional instructors, and faculty do attempt to teach in a way that encourages student teachers to reflect on the sources of their opinions and values – and whether their educational attainment has been gained at the expense of someone else. We investigate the effect our values and experiences can have on our practice as educators and interrogate what it means to potentially practise freedom. This kind of teaching, however, as yet has little institutional support from the university, and the changes necessary to sustain more innovative practices are slow to come about. It is important to be persistent, to stay in the discomfort together, and to continue to explore the potential that teaching has to engage in the dialectical process of education. Education must be more than a reproductive process wherein the dominated take up the tools and attitudes of the dominator.

In combination with an analysis of teacher candidates' practicum experiences, readings, discussion, and activities dealing with various issues in education, I hope that the gap between my lack of experience with and skepticism about the education system and teacher candidates' wariness of my lack of experience may be bridged by our shared belief in the liberatory potential of teaching. In my (brief) experience, both my students and I have found some ways to think about teaching and learning that can expand our horizons of expectations for our students and ourselves. I hope to continue to work toward further understanding these potentials as well as resolutions to some of the tensions between teacher education programs and the university.

References

Bickford, S. (1996). *The dissonance of democracy: Listening, conflict, and citizenship*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: A social critique of the judgment of taste* (R. Nice, Trans.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. (Original work published 1977)

Bourdieu, P. (2000). *Pascalian meditations* (R. Nice, Trans.). Stanford: Stanford University Press. (Original work published 1997)

Education International. (n.d.). *The gender bias of the teaching profession*. Retrieved from http://download.ei-ie.org/Docs/WebDepot/feature4%20-%20100413%20-%20teachers%20-%20final%20EN.pdf

Freire, P. (2000), *Pedagogy of the oppressed 30th anniversary edition* (M. Ramos, Trans.). New York: Continuum Publishing. (Original work published 1968)

Girls accepting sexual harassment as a fact of life: Report. (2008, February 22). *CityNews Toronto*. Retrieved from http://www.citynews.ca/2008/02/22/girls-accepting-sexual-assault-at-school-as-fact-of-life-reports/

Jochild, M., & Sherover-Marcuse, R. (2007, September 20). A primer on unlearning classism [Web log post]. Retrieved from http://maggiesmetawatershed.blogspot.ca/2007/09/primer-on-unlearning-classism.html

Korthagen, F., Loughran, J., & Russell, T. (2006). Developing fundamental principles for teacher education programs and practices. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 22*(8), 1020–1041.

Kozol, J. (1990). *The night is dark and I am far from home: A bold inquiry into the values and goals of America's schools* (2nd ed.). London: Simon & Schuster.

Pratt, D. (1998). *Five perspectives on teaching in adult and higher education*. Malabar, FL: Krieger Publishing.

Robinson, K. (2006, February). How schools kill creativity [Video file]. Retrieved from http://www.ted.com/talks/ken_robinson_says_schools_kill_creativity.html

Runte, R. (1995). Is teaching a profession? In G. Taylor & R. Runte (Eds.), *Thinking about teaching: An introduction* (pp. 288–299). Toronto: Harcourt Brace.

University of British Columbia Faculty of Education. (2013). *2013/14 UBC Teacher Education Program*, Vancouver: Author. Retrieved from http://issuu.com/ubcteachereducation/docs/ubcteachereducation-viewbook-2013-1/13?e=6659470/4524895

Weiler, K. (2001). *Feminist engagements: Reading, resisting and revisioning male theorists in education and cultural studies*. New York: Routledge.