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ABSTRACT

This study emerged from my dissatisfaction with the realist perspectives that seem to dominate research in teacher education and research pertaining to the Professional Development School model (PDS). It is the result of an attempt to move beyond my own critical realist tendencies as researcher to make more of the data and the stories of the research. Therefore, I utilized a hybrid analytic framework using the tools of poststructuralist and psychoanalytic analysis in a (post)critical turn and asked questions that highlighted other ways of thinking and being in PDS (Lather, in press). It is an attempt to ask the ‘too difficult to know’ questions about PDS and teacher education (Britzman, 1998). As such, I have studied the usefulness of Popkewitz’s (1998a) conceptualization of the social and educational sciences as the embodiment of a redemptive culture in relation to PDS. By historicizing PDS I have worked to highlight not only the populist foundational assumptions of the model but also attempted to trouble both the realist and critical discussions that pervade the literature.

Using poststructural and psychoanalytic tools I have studied the Professional Development School model and found that by looking awry at PDS one might see spaces
and places for alternative conceptualizations of this discursive model (Zizek in McCoy, 1995). I conclude that PDS is in consolable (Britzman, 1998). This conclusion reflects a (post)critical turn as I attempt to work beyond my critical realist tendencies as a researcher and look for a more complicated understanding of PDS. Ultimately, historicizing the populist foundational assumptions of PDS and considering the PDS as part of the redemptive culture led me to a space that troubled yet affirmed my own desires within the project. As Spivak (1993) suggests: 'I have found what I cannot think without’ as a teacher educator: humanist and populist assumptions such as empowerment, mastery, progress, and collaboration.

I wondered and wandered into wild thoughts to rethink and reframe my study of PDS. I have looked at PDS as an object of desire (Britzman, 1998; Pitt, 1998), a floating signifier (Anderson, 1998), and a dereferentialized term in the ruins of the University (Readings, 1996). Ultimately, I have moved into the realm of 'as if' in this project and strongly believe that the poststructural/psychoanalytic (post)critical turn is an exciting and useful place to explore in the study of teacher education.
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PREFACE

So the story goes.... originally I had planned to conduct a postmodern ethnography of a cohort of the social studies education Professional Development School network (PDS). I was interested in the ways in which power circulated and the culture of the PDS was legitimated and the usefulness of Popkewitz's (1998) conceptualization of the culture of redemption as a framework for understanding:

The social and educational sciences have embodied a redemptive culture; that is, science is to save and rescue the child and society. The rhetorical constructions of the pedagogical sciences and policy studies suggest that there is a necessary relation between the interpretation of educational realities, social and personal practice, and the predicted futures. The roles of science and the scientist are sanctioned in a way that was previously reserved for religious cosmologies of social and personal change (Popkewitz, 1998a, p. 2).

However, my attempts to gain entree (seemingly unproblematic in initial discussions with the University Professor in 'charge' of the SST PDS) encountered insurmountable problems. On mentioning my desire to conduct a foucauldian analysis of the PDS using the work of Thomas Popkewitz I met an icy stare and defensive posture. I was asked to elucidate 'clearly and simply' the theoretical underpinnings of my work and why I was interested in using the work of theorists that ultimately suggested that education 'failed' in its goals. This experience of oppositionality raised questions about
possibilities of doing critical research in the field of PDS and the call for control of the research by the gatekeepers. Who gets researched? Who has the power and cultural capital to control or hinder critical research efforts?

At this stage when I am asked if I am aim to 'improve' teacher education or professional development with my project I start to worry about successor regimes and radical oppositionality. I want to see my project as aiming to 'improve' (or contextualize) teacher education by historicizing the PDS model through a discourse analysis of the PDS texts and discussions with individuals involved in the multiple manifestations of the model in the College of Education to highlight their ways of being and experiences with/in the model. In this way I can approach a poststructuralist/psychoanalytic analysis of the PDS and suggest ways/spaces/places from which to work within and against the normalizing tendencies of any attempt at teacher education. I am investigating particular manifestations of PDS as educational reform in terms of legitimate knowledge and the travels of PDS culture. This study will utilize some aspects of postmodern ethnography (using a hybrid methodology and analytic framework) to blur the boundaries of data analysis and re/representation, and methodology. It aims to historicize and rethink PDS to enable a move beyond critical realist epistemological assumptions to a more complicated knowing that works within and against the assumptions that make it possible.
CHAPTER 1

REDEMPTION AND THE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SCHOOL:
COMPLICATING THE MODEL

Introduction

It is the humanist foundations of the modernist project shaping/framing teacher education reform that is the focus of what follows. This research project investigates the discourses surrounding the PDS model in the College of Education at the Ohio State University to highlight the legitimizing foundational assumptions that 'construct' the culture of the PDS and the way it travels. I also investigated the usefulness of what Popkewitz (1998a) has called the redemptive culture of social and educational science as a frame for understanding this culture. According to Popkewitz (1998a), the redemptive culture emerged from the populist goals for public education and the tensions between education for individual freedom and social administration.

The Professional Development School (PDS) model arose from the reform agenda of the Holme’s Group (1986-1995). It has triggered a plethora of unique cultures that highlight the limits of universalist assumptions and representations within colleges of education across the country. Successes and failures of the model have been well
documented but critical research approaching the manifestation of the effects of power, the epistemological assumptions that frame the model and the textual discourses surrounding it have been lacking. Fullan et al (1998) highlight the stalling of the reform effort as mired in the institutionalization of education and the resistance to change at this level. Yet, there is little analysis of the foundations of the reform effort and the assumptions that mire it in these very institutions. This study wonders about the 'stalling' of the PDS model as a call for an investigation of the foundational assumptions that frame the model.

This project has also grown from the critical realist perspective that I have worked from for the majority of my career. My suspicions and questions about PDS were often seen as intrusive and dangerous by those on the 'inside' of PDS. For example, I outlined in the preface a brief scenario discussing the evolution of the study from a critical realist ethnography of a particular PDS cohort to a more textual study that attempts the move into the (post)critical of poststructural and psychoanalytic wonderings. This was the result of 'gatekeeping' and stakeholder protection of the 'fragile' sites of PDS. Therefore, I had to rethink my desires and my research questions. This project is the embodiment of my attempts to struggle within and against my critical realist tendencies as presented in my first two research questions. The final questions frame my move to trouble my own desire for 'knowing' against a backdrop of wonderings and wanderings around/within/across PDS as an institutional development. This study encouraged me to create a space to rethink PDS outside of realist or critical realist discussions about 'being' in PDS. I also felt the need to always already remain aware of the humanist and populist foundations of
the field (and my own metaphysical analyses) even as I aim to disrupt it from within. I
cannot disrupt the foundational assumptions without awareness of the ways in which the
foundations make possible such a project. The struggle to work within and against my
critical realist tendencies has led me to entertain difficult to understand concepts and ideas
in an effort to inform the field.

The Big Picture

In the late 1980's a crisis occurred (was recognized) in research in the social
sciences. It was triggered by an increasing awareness of the shortcomings of universalist
assumptions underpinning the creation of knowledge in the related disciplines.
Highlighted throughout this time and since has been a growing disenchantment with realist
ontologies and essentialist notions of identity, representation and location. The demise of
empiricism and the call for an end to uninterrogated objectivity have resounded in the halls
of the ivory tower in areas such as anthropology and sociology for some time. Such
disruptions were actually preceded by a focus on issues of power and knowledge in
feminist theory (Erickson, 1992; Smith, 1993; Lincoln, 1998) highlighting the tensions of
the postmodern moment in social and educational research.

These tensions and the increasing need for tolerance of ambiguity make way for
some exciting possibilities for teacher education. Marcus and Fischer (1986) present the
crisis of representation in the human sciences as epitomized by Lyotard’s ‘incredulity
towards metanarratives’ and the process of problematizing facts as taken for granted
objective certainties (Marcus and Fischer, 1986, 8). The crisis of representation arises
from “the uncertainty about adequate means of describing social reality. In the United
States, it is an expression of the failure of post-World War II paradigms, or the unifying ideas of a remarkable number of fields, to account for conditions within American society, if not within Western societies globally, which seem to be in a state of profound transition” (Marcus and Fischer, 1986, p.9).

A suspension of belief and an interrogation of the center is called for in the social sciences, however, it would seem as if these questions have thus far failed to be addressed in teacher education reform. Efforts have been made by a number of outstanding scholars in recent times to disrupt the gendered, raced, and classed nature of the field but the totalizing tendencies of the dominant discourse continue to essentialize such discourses. For example, multicultural education is discussed below as one effort to disrupt assumptions of homogeneity in education:

If we examine the reasoning about ‘the successful’ teacher and child in the multicultural curriculum reforms, we can recognize that the ideas of ‘success’ embody a normativity about childhood, learning, and achievement that are not necessarily progressive but are the effects of power. These effects inscribe particular sets of norms and values about ‘reason’ and the ‘reasonable person’ who is then seen as successful. The norms are not those of the public rhetoric about inclusion but relate to rules of reasoning about ‘the educated subject’ to changes in culture and economy. These images of the subject are the effects of power rather than abstract principles of citizenship or social inclusion (Popkewitz, 1998b, p. 91).

This study will not directly address the realist ontologies of such marginalized areas as multicultural education and feminist pedagogy in teacher education. Rather, by deconstructing the epistemological assumptions that frame the PDS I challenge the field to work within and against the humanist foundations of the modernist project that shapes
By historicizing the manifestations of the PDS model as a discursive practice, I hope to disrupt the notions of neutrality that surround it. The only way to an accurate view and confident knowledge of the world is through a sophisticated epistemology that takes full account of intractable contradiction, paradox, irony, and uncertainty in the explanation of human activities. This seems to be the spirit of the developing responses across disciplines to what we described as a contemporary crisis of representation (Marcus and Fischer, 1986, p. 15).

Marcus and Fisher (1986) call for a more sophisticated epistemology in research endeavors, however, troubling this call for a "more accurate view and confident knowledge of the world," they suggest an important question for teacher education. How can this 'crisis' of representation move the field into the 21st century? Can we create spaces from which to disrupt essentialist notions of cultural diversity, gender, and class? How may we interrupt the institutionalization and the normalization of individuals in academic discourses, in this case the foundational assumptions of the Professional Development School model?

**Specific Questions**

The Professional Development School Policy Advisory Committee in the College of Education at Mid West State University (MWSU, pseudonym) first met in 1990. The committee had wide representation from both school districts and the university community. Particular attention focused upon: issues of site selection; the selection and preparation of Clinical Faculty; the coordination of continuing placements; collaborative research; and, external relations. Since that time the development of this model of teacher education has been the main agenda for the administration of the College of Education at
MWSU and recent publications have described the historical developments in detail (Cramer, Shinew, and Zimpher, unpublished paper; Johnston et al, 1998).

This study troubles the foundational/framing epistemological assumptions of the PDS model, from the manifestation of reform rhetoric to the re/representation of a redemptive culture in social and educational scientific research. Lather (1996) uses ‘trouble’ as a move “to problematize or deconstruct a commonsense meaning, in this case, the assumed innocence of transparent theories of language” (p.543). In an attempt to move beyond/around/across/within the critical realist framework presented in my initial research questions I have positioned the final two research questions to address my wonderings about PDS from a poststructuralist, psychoanalytic, and (post)critical perspective (Lather, in press).

The ‘(post)critical’ move is to address the ‘stuck place’ or aporia of this study as I struggle with my tendency towards the critical realist interpretation in my own work on PDS and in the field in general (Lather, in press). I have found the (post)critical move a useful tool in foregrounding and problematizing analytical spaces whilst placing under suspicion the desire for the ‘real’ or fully present subject (Lather, In Press). Thus I raise the question of ‘as if’ in thinking about PDS and attempt a discussion toward alternative ways of thinking about these structures. From realist populist assumptions to interrupted and tension-filled discussions of desire and floating signifiers, this study wonders and dreams about the im/possibility of ‘fully knowing’ in any attempt at educational reform/teacher education model. It also attempts to blur the boundaries between chapters in a dissertation by working within and against a traditional format. The literature review
is also textual analysis; methodology is data analysis; and the conclusions are both methodological and analytical to highlight the centrality of epistemology to any research project.

The project evolved (grounded theorizing) through discussions and literature reviews to an analysis of three levels - local, institutional, and societal. Thus the questions that frame the project begin with the 'big picture', lead to an individual/local questioning of 'knowing' in teacher education reform, and finally, I wonder about the ethics and politics of this kind of research. All four questions are fundamentally connected.

My questions are:

1. What are the foundational assumptions that frame the manifestations of the PDS model at MSWU? This is an attempt to historicize the reform rhetoric and the traveling of legitimate knowledge within this culture.

2. How useful is the notion of the redemptive culture of the social and educational sciences presented by Popkewitz (1998a) in understanding the PDS at MWSU?

3. What other ways of looking at the PDS may be useful in rethinking the epistemological assumptions that regulate PDS toward a more fluid knowing and being in teacher education reform models? Is it an object of desire (Britzman, 1998; Pitt, 1998)? A floating signifier (Anderson, 1998)? A dereferentialized concept (Readings, 1996)?
4. What are the politics and ethics of using a theoretical standpoint that studies discourse in a critical way and how may I move beyond the critical to a (post)critical space of 'as if'?

This project, however, is not a rejection of the foundations of the modernist project as represented in the educational reform model of the PDS. Rather it is an attempt to trouble and complicate the assumed neutrality of the model by historicizing and investigating the foundations that ultimately make this project possible. Therefore, I am embedded/situated/positioned within the very project I aim to complicate.

Theoretical Grounding

*Foundational Humanist Assumptions*. Throughout this project the foundational humanist assumptions of educational and social scientific research have emerged as a skeletal organizational framework. The grounded discourse analysis of interviews, official documents, educational reform literature, and critical research texts have repeatedly referred to terms such as: perfectibility, progress, realist ontologies, humanist and populist rhetoric, democratic ideals of autonomy, empowerment and emancipation, and, agents of redemption. These terms will be used as a framework for the data analysis to both highlight the foundational assumptions of PDS and also investigate the usefulness of Popkewitz’s (1998a) conceptualization of the culture of redemption in the professional development school.

Lincoln (1998) describes the 'modernist knowledge project' of social scientific research and educational reform as driven by John Stuart Mill’s belief that humans were
perfectible and knowledge be used to achieve useful and productive ends (p.14).

However, foundational assumptions in the modernist knowledge project in the social and educational sciences discussed by Lincoln (1998) must be taken one step further to reveal the inscription of progress as a central tenet (Popkewitz and Brennan, 1998).

Popkewitz's (1998a) discussion is based upon a foucauldian analysis of the social and educational sciences. Foucault worked to reveal the regimes of truth and power within institutions and the ways in which the subject was constituted in power relations (Popkewitz and Brennan, 1998). Using a genealogical approach that historicized the discourses legitimizing knowledge, he highlighted the ways in which individuals are regulated and self-regulate through state apparatuses and the economies of power as inherent to the total institutions of education, the military and hospitals (Foucault, 1977). His work moves the discussion beyond the scope of Lincoln’s (1998) social constructivism towards questions of power. Foucault outlines a poststructuralist sort of redemption in that there are positive and negative attributes of power and possibilities for working within and against the normalizing tendencies of institutions. For example, school disciplines may be seen as a technology of power “succeeded in making children’s bodies the object of highly complex systems of manipulation and conditioning” (Foucault, 1980, p.125). So by studying the construction of knowledge/power in PDS, I wonder if PDS may be seen as the object of desire in teacher education?

Spanos (1993) also uses genealogy to discuss the theory and institutional practices that surveil the production of knowledge. He used the new Core Curriculum at Harvard in 1978 as a focus for the discussion. He concludes that by decentering the ‘core’ (or
canon) a critique and deconstruction of the socially constituted, historically produced canon may be revealed and provide a space for change (Spanos, 1993). This change, according to Readings (1996) should not be considered a consensual space but a shifting and flexible structure that allows for open-endedness and multiple subjectivities.

My study focuses on the ‘center’ of the Professional Development School model manifested in a large mid-western research institution as socially constituted and historically produced through a critical analysis of the surrounding discourses from societal to institutional and local. According to Foucault (1977), the total institution aims to make docile bodies of the inmates to create an efficient machine. This directly challenges the notion that schools (or universities) can ‘create’ empowered and emancipated citizens. In any discussion of educational discourse in teacher education addressing the ways in which it is shaped and regulated by the technologies of power, such as the assumption of freedom through knowledge, increases awareness and might enable working within and against the economy of power to provide spaces for creating new relations and a more inclusive education process (Popkewitz, 1998a).

A ‘crisis’ of representation in the social sciences opens the way for the disruption of universalist assumptions of teacher and student, citizenship and democracy that underpin the dominant discourses in teacher education. The foundational goals of the social sciences arose from the political and administrative agendas of the early twentieth century American society (Popkewitz, 1991). However, this study suggests that we should sustain rigorous questioning of the ‘truth’ embodied in educational work and
Finally, as long as the sciences of education are concerned with governing the soul and inscribe a textual notion of progress, those sciences function as principles of the social administration no matter what populist rhetoric is deployed. Making the forms of reasoning and rules for 'telling the truth' potentially contingent, historical, and susceptible to critique is a political practice to dislodge the ordering principles, and thereby to create a greater range of possibility for the subject to act (Popkewitz, 1998a, p. 25).

To address the specific needs of teacher education, Popkewitz (1998b) asks us to move beyond the crisis in the social and human sciences discussed at the outset of this dissertation. However, an initial recognition of the 'crisis' must first occur in teacher education, specifically the PDS, if the field is to reflect upon the implicit and unarticulated assumptions that frame the modernist knowledge project and thus 'create' the redemptive culture of education that tends "to treat knowledge as logical systems of unambiguous content for children to learn" (p. 96). Then we can rethink the function of legitimate knowledge by studying the discursive practices of educational reform.

This analysis aims to create spaces, places and suggestions for the re-conceptualization of the field through an understanding of how discourses and governing practices (Foucault's governmentalities) are produced within a populist rhetoric of redemption that is not necessarily liberatory (Foucault, 1991). For example, the 'citizen' is constructed as one with correct dispositions and the inclination to act as a self-governing, self-disciplined individual (Popkewitz, 1998b).
My questions pertain to the foundational theoretical assumptions of the field, especially the discourses surrounding social education, educational reform and teacher education (Apple, 1996; Stanley, 1992; Lincoln, 1998; Popkewitz, 1998a). Teacher education, as represented in this study by the PDS model, brings together these areas and is a central site for this rethinking of knowledge and power in higher education. It is a vital place from which to interrogate the exclusivity of hegemonic discourses (Popkewitz, 1998a; Lincoln, 1998). “Higher education is the only organization we have which is dedicated first and foremost to the generation of new knowledge, and the reconsideration, reconstruction, revision, and reshaping of received knowledge” (Lincoln, 1998, p. 12), whilst teacher education is seen as a redemptive project that provides opportunities to create more egalitarian schools and social transformation in general (Goodman, 1995). Freedom through knowledge, emancipation and empowerment, progress, perfectibility, democratic ideals of autonomy, teachers as agents of redemptions: how do these assumptions play out in the ‘culture’ of the PDS’s?

There is a need for increased interrogation of the foundational assumptions of the field. Troubling the normalizing practices of pedagogy and curriculum development through a study of PDS makes possible the demonstration/illustration of the tensions that exist between social administration and freedom in liberal democracies (Popkewitz, 1998b). A Foucauldian analysis of the practices that govern the souls of teacher and students is one way of highlighting the ways universalist assumptions reify an exclusive notion of a ‘good citizen’ or ‘good teacher’ (Foucault, 1977; Popkewitz, 1998b). It also allows us to move beyond critical perspectives which encourage an increasing awareness
of the technologies of power (the way power circulates) in the creation and production of official (legitimate) knowledges and subjects. I have found this move useful to continue my struggle as researcher and teacher with critical realist assumptions that frame the social and human science modernist project, and to increase my awareness of the danger of colonizing through such moves. “Thus, even when oppositional and ‘critical’ knowledge was sought, certain continuities with colonialism were masked behind new ideological stances” (Popkewitz, 1998b, p.85).

The Redemptive Culture of the Social and Educational Sciences. These structures and traditions have been described as indicative of a social epistemology by Popkewitz (1991) and reflect historically formed patterns of knowledge, power and institutions (p.13). According to Popkewitz (1991), educational reform may be seen as the result of particular ideologies of individualism and professional practice.

In later work Popkewitz (1998a) addressed the historical foundations of the social and educational sciences and describes the redemptive culture that arose from populist goals which inscribed democratic ideals within the study of the social sciences. Autonomy, empowerment and emancipation were promised - yet the institutional processes normalized and regulated individuals to produce docile bodies instead. This occurred through self-regulation and surveillance that was concealed in relations of power shaped with/in democratic project (Popkewitz, 1998a; Foucault, 1977). The development of the social sciences, according to Popkewitz (1998a) paralleled state bureaucracy. “The social sciences provided the disciplinary knowledge that linked new civil institutions with the liberal democratic political rationalities of the state. The construction of freedom
became a problem of the social administration of the autonomous, self-motivated citizen” (Popkewitz, 1998a, p. 3).

By highlighting the culture of redemption that emerged within the social sciences, Popkewitz (1998a) suggests that it is possible to work within and against the governing practices that disqualify certain groups from participation thus interrupting the normalizing tendencies of the total institution of education.

The idea that the state could administer human freedom involved social planning. The new citizen - or 'new man,' a term that circulated into the early 20th century - connected the scope and aspirations of public powers with the personal and subjective capacities of individuals. New institutions of health, employment, and education tied the new social welfare goals of the state with a particular form of scientific expertise that was to organize subjectivities. That is, the way in which individuals personally experienced and understood the self and the world related to social practices and power relations which constituted the order through which meaning was structured (see, e.g., Scott, 1991). A complex apparatus of institutions, for example, targeted the child, the family, the worker, and the new citizen. Policy and science were to produce a mentality by which the new citizen or individual acted and participated in what Michel Foucault (1979b) called 'govern mentality' (Popkewitz, 1998a, p. 4).

Even the pragmatism of John Dewey when seen in this light is indicative of the universal modernist project to create productive and worthwhile citizens through populist rhetoric that inscribed specific 'dominant' rules of participation (Lincoln, 1998; Popkewitz, 1991; Popkewitz, 1998b). Thus, the redemptive culture of populist rhetoric in teacher education governed the souls of individual students and teachers to work for the 'greater' good within certain boundaries:

While the current rhetoric is about giving voice to excluded groups and therefore being democratic and emancipatory, this frequent call to reconstitute principles of participation and responsibility occurs through redemptive discourses that are to
discipline parents and the community in saving the child. That call for salvation entails discourses that construct particular sets of norms about the child, parent, and community that emerge from political rationalities about populations of targeted groups. It is not some ‘natural’ parent or community that participates, but groups defined through the ordering, normalizing, and dividing practices inscribed in the discourses of participation (Popkewitz, 1998a, p. 11).

I have used this concept of redemption as a lens through which to study the PDS model at Mid West State University to investigate its usefulness and ‘groundedness’ at the institutional level.

**Legitimizing Discourses in PDS.** This study attempts to historicize the discourse practices that construct the concept of ‘professionalization’ and validate the ‘professional’ in PDS. I have attempted to connect the foundational assumptions of PDS with a more situated and complicated knowing of the development of the professional and legitimate (expert) knowledge.

If we think historically about the professional knowledge in teaching, there are three dimensions of historical interest here. They are (a) a view of progress in which change in society and the individual can be brought about through rational planning and social engineering; (b) a notion of the expert knowledge to provide that guidance; and (c), a populism, that is, a view that the expert is in service of the democratic ideal (Popkewitz, 1996, p. 122).

David Labaree (1996; 1995; 1992) has outlined a number of issues in this area including: the way the discourse practices of the Holmes Group works to codify, develop and implement professional knowledge; and, the desire for the masculinization of the profession through the development of an objective, common body of knowledge based on the ‘superiority’ of scientific claims in a move away from the historically feminized profession (Labaree, 1992). This ‘expert knowledge’, according to Labaree (1992) is a
framework that positions technical knowledge as superior to political knowledge and validates this through the ‘science’ of teaching. However, Labaree (1992) concludes, this is an intellectually reduced notion of practice.

Rethinking PDS. Finally, I have used my final research questions in an attempt to rethink the PDS. This is important as an opportunity to move beyond discussions that merely historicize the reform model to ways of being that complicate and recognize the im/possibilities of educational reform. Britzman’s (1998) discussion of desire/s and conflict in education opens up a previously silenced/hidden/invisible part of knowing in education. By centering the researchers desire and agency within the interpretations of the data, I have utilized a psychoanalytic perspective in the hope of moving beyond the limits of a critical perspective. In this way I aim to avoid the authority of the researcher when asked—What is a ‘good’ or ‘bad’ PDS? Is PDS an improvement on other models of teacher education? What are the characteristics of a ‘good’ PDS?—by blurring the boundaries of analysis beyond simplistic conclusions. Moving from an investigation of the usefulness of the redemptive culture of the PDS I also aim to introduce other ways of understanding the model. Thus we may move to seeing PDS as a floating signifier thus highlighting the multiple manifestations and dereferentialized nature of the concept/model (Anderson, 1998; Reading, 1996). In short, this move towards a more complicated knowing of PDS may suggest ways of working within and against previously obscured power relations that make PDS possible.
Key Concepts

This section is a presentation of key concepts and terms that arise repeatedly in this study and require further explanation/definition.

Dereferentialized Terms/Ruins. Another attempt to think wildly about PDS used the work of Bill Readings (1996) who uses the historical space of the American Jeremiad to consider the changing role of the American university. The ‘ruins’ refer to the fundamental shift in the role of the University resulting in a place that is ‘ruined’ as a center for cultural development yet still a useful ‘ruin’ from which to work. One of my wild thoughts has been to see the PDS as a ruin and professional development (or the PDS project) as dereferentialized. This means that it may be seen as a simulacra, a discourse practice without specific referents. Readings explains using the terms ‘excellence’ and others below:

By this I mean to suggest that what is crucial about terms like ‘culture’ and ‘excellence’ (and even ‘University’ at times) is that they no longer have specific referents; they no longer refer to a specific set of things or ideas. In using the term ‘dereferentization,’ however, I do not want simply to introduce another bulky piece of jargon into our vocabulary; rather my design is to give a name to what I will argue is a crucial shift in thinking that has dramatic consequences for the University (Readings, 1996, p. 17).

Connected to the idea of ruins and dereferentialized terms, I have used simulacra as another useful concept. Lather (1991) describes it as a copy without an original, drawing on the Baudrillardian argument that there has been a shift from a culture of representations to a culture of simulacra. The use of the term ‘ruins’ in this study refers to the poststructuralist turn, described by Lather (in press), “in that embracing
epistemological insufficiency can generate practices of knowing that put[s] the rationalistic
and evidentiary structures of science under suspicion in order to address how science
betrays our investment in it” (p.3). Referring to PDS as ruins makes possible the
interrogation of the legitimizing humanist/populist foundations.

Floating Signifier. Gary Anderson (1998), in an attempt to deconstruct
‘participation’ in educational reform movements in the United States, used the framework
of a ‘Floating Signifier’ to address the nuanced tensions and contradictions in the
discourse practices surrounding it. I find this an exciting way of looking at professional
development, collaboration and voice but in this study I mainly wonder about the use of
this framework to look at the PDS differently. Anderson (1998) defines a floating signifier
as the practice of legitimation and contradiction:

In this sense, the term participation is what poststructuralists would call a floating
signifier which can as easily stand in for practices which are participatory as those
that are antithetical to participation (Laclau & Mouffe, 1985). One of the goals of
this article is precisely to problematize the linguistic slippage that occurs with
regard to the meaning of participation and the diverse agendas that are promoted

I found this very useful as I struggled within and against a critical perspective. I
use this idea to address the ways public spaces promote multiple discourses and the
postmodern suggestion that social reality is complex and as such should be interrupted
through such studies as I attempt here (Anderson, 1998).

Modernist Knowledge Project. In “From Understanding to Action: New
Imperatives, New Criteria, New Methods for Interpretive Researchers,” Yvonna Lincoln
(1998) talks of the move from attempts to fully know and describe the world that emerged
from the Enlightenment to a more complicated search for knowledge and understanding (knowledge project) in the postmodern moment. Ultimately, she is talking of the possibilities of interpretative research methods after the 'crisis' of representation described by Marcus and Fisher (1986). Therefore, the modernist knowledge project which framed positivist research efforts in educational research was founded on the assumption that cultures and subjects could be represented objectively and fully known through cultural descriptions that were generalizable. Lather (1996) describes 'modernity' as framed by assumptions of the whole, authentic self and a desire for originary moments that often resulted in salvation narratives. Therefore, Lincoln (1998) suggests that we question the generalizability that arose as a result of this historical moment and work toward more complicated and situated counter-hegemonic cultural representations.

_A 'New' Postmodern Ethnography._ "Questions of authenticity and voice are at the heart of claims to the 'real' in ethnography. Indeed, in the 'new' ethnography, that which comes after the crisis of representation (Marcus and Fisher, 1986), the authority of voice often privileged over other analyses" (Lather, 1998, p. 6). The 'new' postmodern ethnography is a move toward deauthorizing practices and uncooperative texts (Lather, 1998). This study has utilized the 'new' postmodern ethnography as a way to address my tendency towards a critical realist representation of data.

Thus I have presented a 'messy text' by using a variety of data presentation formats and included footnotes to provide a disruptive multiply layered analysis. Marcus (1994) and Van Maanen (1995) describe the 'new' postmodern ethnography as a 'messy' text that works to interrupt totalizing representations and highlights experimental writing.
practices to emphasize the role of ethnography as cultural critique. To be historically accurate, I have used the term 'new' postmodern ethnography to place 'new' under erasure in order to highlight the challenges to progressivist notions of cultural origins and the recognition of the shaping forces at play in cultural understandings. Issues of partial and fluid epistemological assumptions, the non-static and traveling nature of cultures, notions of salvation and redemption in the ethnographic project and the move beyond methodology as validity are entrenched in the 'new' postmodern ethnography.

**Populist/Humanist Notions.** David Labaree (1995) has defined populist rhetoric as the language of 'ordinary people' represented in general public forums as the 'voice' of the people. It is often described as 'crisis' talk of the public schools, for example. In this study, the populist rhetoric was described by Labaree (1995) as framing the Holmes Group discussions through the call for 'better' teachers and learning for 'everybody's children' in relatively simplistic language that often targets elites in government and in universities as failing in their roles to improve societal conditions.

This rhetoric also has roots in the humanist foundations of individual freedom, agency and progress that historically 'produced' public education in this country. Humanism, according to St. Pierre and Pillow (in press), is a theme that historically assumes: language is transparent; there is a stable, coherent self; science and philosophy can provide objective reliable and universal foundations for knowledge; freedom is the result of obedience to the laws of reason.

**Postmodernism and Poststructuralism.** Lather (in press) describes postmodernism and poststructuralism as elusive and yet pervasive discourse practices in postpositivist
research and calls attention to the limits of earlier attempts to objectify and empiricise the way we know/experience 'reality'.

I use the terms poststructural, postmodern and, sometimes, even deconstruction interchangeably as the code name for the crisis of confidence in Western conceptual systems. Postmodern generally refers to the material and historical shifts of the global uprising of the marginalized, the revolution in communication technology, and the fissures of global multinational hyper-capitalism. Poststructuralism refers more narrowly to a sense of Enlightenment rationality, particularly the limits of consciousness and intentionality and the will to power inscribed in sense-making efforts which aspire to universal, totalizing explanatory frameworks. Deconstruction is both a method to interrupt binary logic through practices of reversal and displacement, and an anti-method that is more an ontological claim (Lather, in press, p.5).

In this study the poststructuralist perspective attends to the Foucaultian conceptualization of power/knowledge as discursive, legitimating, and thus calls for awareness of the ways we work within and yet against the discourse practices that make our work possible (Popkewitz, 1998a).

Professional Development Schools. The Professional Development School was a model for reform in teacher education developed by the Holmes Group (which has since evolved into the Holmes Partnership). The model is an attempt to make central collaboration and professional expertise in teacher education and it calls for the establishment of working relationships between schools and universities to educate preservice teachers in more practical settings. "Professional Development Schools, the analogue of medical education's teaching hospitals, would bring practicing teachers and administrators together with university faculty in partnerships that improve teaching and learning on the part of their respective students" (Holmes Group, 1986, p. 56). There are
many different PDSs based on this model but ultimately the preservice teacher is trained at both university and school sites by university professors and clinical educators (teachers from the schools) (Johnston et al, 1998).

*Psychoanalytic Moves and Objects of Desire.* The work of Deborah Britzman (1998) and Alice Pitt (1998) has been very useful in suggesting a move towards a complicated understanding of research and educational practices and away from a wish for heroism and rescue through research (Lather, 1998). This has been particularly useful for my work in rethinking the representation of PDS as a way to “unseat the authority of the humanist subject by insisting upon the notion of the unconscious” (Pitt, 1998, p.537).

Psychoanalytic theories complicate all of our stories of engagement with knowledge by insisting upon the role of the unconscious processes in the making of such stories. These complications reside within knowledge itself, and they circulate in the stories told to us, in our retellings of them as research stories, and in our readings of such retellings. They ask us to consider not only what we can know as we work with these four dynamics of meaning-making, but also our will and desire not to know can be exchanged, interpreted, and worked through (Pitt, 1998, p. 536).

Britzman (1998) uses a psychoanalytic approach to highlight interference and ‘difficult knowledge’ in education:

We will explore continually the question, status, and the directionality of interference. We will do so through the play of affect and its attachments, primarily focusing upon love and hate in learning, as we consider movements, mingling, and force of two simultaneous directions that are difficult to distinguish from one another even as they collapse into one another: the inside or the psychic, and the outside or the social (p. 2).
Research Design

Crisis of Representation. Scholars in anthropology have been talking about the changing culture of thought for nearly two decades now. Geertz (1983) and Clifford (1988) draw attention to the epistemological assumptions that frame our understanding of representation and being. According to Geertz (1983), “something is happening to the way we think about the way we think” (p. 20). And Clifford (1988) highlights the increasing difficulties of describing cultural diversity as inscribed in bounded and independent cultures, such as the PDS:

It is more than ever crucial for different peoples to form complex concrete images of one another, as well as of the relationships of knowledge and power that connect them; but no sovereign scientific method or ethical stance can guarantee the truth of such images. They are constituted— the critique of colonial modes of representation has shown at least this much— in specific historical relations of dominance and dialogue (Clifford, 1988, p. 23).

Complicating images of socio-cultural knowledge through an increasing awareness of multiple ways of knowing and being, and reconceptualizing space and time, is one way in which teacher education may gain from this crisis in the social sciences and move beyond the hegemonic realist perspective. The postmodern moment suggests the possibilities of many truths (knowledges) rather than one dominant omniscient ‘Truth’ of the modernist knowledge project (Lincoln, 1998). Lincoln presents a well-founded argument for the increasing awareness of social science educators and researchers regarding the demise of objectivity and generalizability. Whilst Lincoln has raised important points she is in danger of replicating relativism as she calls for multiplicity with little talk of the effects of power on ways of being and knowing. The technologies of
power inscribed within the modernist project can be highlighted in teacher education models (Popkewitz, 1998a; Foucault, 1977). To this end this project aims to stimulate a discussion of the modernist foundations of the field and the possibilities of the postmodern moment through an interrogation of the ‘redemptive culture’ of social science education in the new millennium, specifically the model of teacher education that developed at Mid West State University out of the ideas of the Holmes Partnership (Popkewitz, 1998).

Today, those engaged in producing theories and conducting research on social education have inherited structures and traditions that were formed in the 19th century during the Progressive Era of reforms and social engineering. The histories of educational institutions and professions from that era provide analogies to the processes now taking place and affecting the conduct of disciplined research about schooling. Despite the gigantic scale attained by educational institutions and professions that have grown out of progressive reforms aimed at achieving a stable and productive social order, long-promised social harmony and civil justice remain elusive goals. Educators in coming years will have to grapple with ethical and moral problems, as did their predecessors, in a world that is evidently less safe than the environments in which progressive reformers first made their optimistic claims (Apple and St.Maurice, 1991, p. 38).

"New" Postmodern Ethnography. This methodological practice of cultural representation is no longer inviolable. The totalizing assumptions that shaped ethnography as constructing impartial, objective accounts of static cultures and fascinating Others is under assault. Critiques of traditional ethnographic practices have highlighted the limits of representation and the historical implications for its role in colonial oppression (Visweswaran, 1994; Marcus and Fisher, 1986). Issues of subjectivity, gendered silences and partiality, implications of the colonizing mentality, to name a few, have been highlighted by a number of authors, according to Van Maanen (1995). "Just what is required of ethnography today is by no means clear, and among its producers and
consumers alike, restlessness is the norm” (Van Maanen, 1995, p.2). This project highlights some of these issues and entertains new ways of ‘thinking about’ ethnography.

This dissertation aims to exist with/in the tensions that are revealed as characteristic of ethnography as a methodological practice (Van Maanen, 1995; Marcus and Fischer, 1986; Geertz, 1983; Behar, 1995). It is interesting to note the realist assumptions framed as desire for authenticity and accuracy in the following call for different paradigms in ethnography (Marcus and Fischer, 1986). Ethnographic traditions have entrenched the techniques and results of ethnography and although the ‘field’ is stretching to embrace novel and alternative procedures there is a real danger of it remaining intact and unchallenged paradigmatically (Van Maanen, 1995). However, the calls for new ways of thinking and of doing ethnography are a reflection of a crumbling ideology (Clifford and Marcus, 1986) that has opened the field to exciting possibilities of existing within the tensions of cultural representation.

By creating spaces that trouble declarative or official historiographies I hope to address discursive power relations in the field that influence/shape the culture of PDS as it travels across schools and universities (Visweswaran, 1994). Throughout, the focus will be on the epistemological assumptions of knowing in a state of flux to move away from the more static cultural representations in historically ‘official’ accounts as described by Visweswaran (1994). Therefore, this dissertation will bring together literature surrounding current methodological debates surrounding ethnography as a method of cultural representation and will trouble the foundational realist assumptions of the method by highlighting the tensions that exist within. The realization that ethnography is a social
practice, a gathering of rhetorical truths and shaped by many subjectivities will be discussed (Van Maanen, 1995). In this light cultures are not seen as holistic, static, 'knowable' objects and the dichotomy of object/subject is blurred.

This dissertation will address and utilize the characteristics of the 'new' postmodern ethnography as highlighted in the literature. There are many characteristics, but for the purpose of this dissertation I will address: research on how culture travels; the blurring of validity and ethics in 'good' research; and, the epistemological assumptions of 'knowing in a state of flux'. Highlighting these characteristics is an effort to trouble the tendency towards a static, geographically bound culture inscribed in traditional ethnography (Visweswaran, 1994). The tensions of the economies of truth and the production of knowledge within a redemptive culture will provide space from which to address the relatively obscured power relations that circulate in this model of teacher education - the PDS.

**Politics and Ethics.** The sense of 'blurredness' of validity and ethics discussed in Chapter Three requires a high tolerance for ambiguity and uncertainty but it also fosters a feeling of redemptive possibility that inspires further thought and is consistent with the study's efforts to think about not only how to do my research but also who is framed with/in it and how are they framed?

Michelle Fine (1994) in “Working the Hyphens: Reinventing Self and Other in Qualitative Research” attempts to trouble the binary of Self/Other. Fine highlights the politics of location and working the hyphen as necessary foci of qualitative research. She interrupts the positivist assumptions that continue to frame so much of our research in
education by “unpacking notions of scientific neutrality, universal truths and researcher dispassion.” (71) The location of my work, a critical discourse analysis and a ‘new’ postmodern ethnographic study of the Mid West State University model of the Professional Development School is surrounded by important contextual social and politics realities or perspectives. I work as a graduate teaching assistant in the Social Studies/Global Education network of PDS sites. Therefore, I am known and many of my experiential knowings frame my own position as researcher and graduate student.

This will need to be addressed in my research as a position of self-reflexivity. I also think the concept of an ‘acceptable ethos’ for ethnographers is very important, including awareness of essentializing difference and the danger of appropriating Other’s stories. However, I am concerned that researchers searching for authenticity may assume an essence or ‘real’ experience in constructing the stories or case they are working with.

A poststructuralist lens enables us to consider teaching as personal/professional, curriculum as written/unwritten, and concepts such as teacher, student, practice, race, class and gender as social constructions that economize the power of the regime of truth. I hope to maintain and foster increasing personal awareness of the tendency of those in positions of power (teacher/researcher) to co-opt ‘others’ stories. This awareness speaks to all immersed in such issues and struggles. The romanticizing of the ‘other’ may also lead to the acceptance of the untroubled ‘authority’ of those with a RIGHT to speak - what does this mean? And, how can I maintain a balance between the tendency in teacher education research to valorize teachers’ voices whilst also historicizing the PDS as part of
curriculum reform? Foucault’s maxim that nothing is innocent and everything is suspicious has been a challenge to attend to throughout this project (Foucault, 1980).

A Sense of the Subjective Self

Throughout this project I have struggled with my own desires as researcher to ‘know’ more about PDS. This desire arose from a number of different places or life experiences. I have traveled within/across/against my own experiences as a preservice teacher in what may be called a ‘traditional’ program in Western Australia, to the Canadian prairies where I was an instructor in teacher education in Canada. I have worked within technical rationalist programs where a reduced notion of practice was reified as the ‘nuts and bolts’ approach to teaching and the political was relegated to the shadows. I have included a small narrative piece in Chapter Four entitled “Professional Angst” which attempts to frame my surprise and wondering about the teacher education model that was institutionalized at Mid West State University where I was completing my doctoral studies and also supervising preservice teachers in PDS. I was inside yet outside the PDS culture as a supervisor and as a doctoral student who was seen as researching ‘on’ not ‘with’ the PDS members.

Chapter Overview

The first chapter in this study outlines the research questions and its situatedness within the larger body of work in educational reform. This ‘big picture’ approach works to highlight the analysis of meta-level social epistemological assumptions (Popkewitz and Brennan, 1998) in order to trouble unarticulated foundational assumptions in teacher education reform, such as PDS.
The second chapter is a review of literature. A brief overview of the literature questioning the foundational assumptions of educational reform and rhetoric is used to begin the process of complication and analysis of the PDS model at MWSU. Then the redemptive culture of social and educational sciences (Popkewitz, 1998a) and the manifestations of power in education from a foucauldian perspective are described in detail. The realist tale of 'What is a PDS?' according to the Holmes reports that follows introduces the critical analysis of the Holmes reform rhetoric using the work of David Labaree. And finally, a brief discussion (seduction) of the ideas of Britzman (1998), Anderson (1999) and Readings (1996) provides a look at the silences and gaps in the official reform stories presented in the realist tales.

The third chapter is an outline of my hybrid methodology. The 'new' postmodern ethnography and critical discourse analysis will be outlined in detail. Included is an effort to rethink issues of ethics and validity. Immersion within the socio-historical texts of the PDS at MWSU provided a useful space from which to study using the critical discourse analysis to highlight the redemptive themes in the discourses surrounding the manifestations of the model.

Chapter Four is a formal presentation of the data. It includes excerpts and discussions of the texts surrounding the PDS from foundational documents, narrative descriptions, to interview transcripts. I use evidentiary warrants to support the emergent themes within the discourses and frame the project within the field of curriculum reform in teacher education and footnotes to disrupt and provide multiple levels of data analysis.
The final chapter is a discussion of the learnings from this project for the wider field of teacher education and specifically for the future of the PDS model. Also, postmodern ethnographic methodology and critical discourse analysis will be highlighted as both success and failure within the limits of representation in postpositivist research.

Appendices follow the text of this study and include consent forms, a copy of the official human subjects approval and the initial interview schedule.
CHAPTER 2

BLURRING THE BOUNDARIES

Introduction

This project focuses on the discourses that frame and legitimate the educational reform movement manifested in the Professional Development School model. It is a study of the foundations and assumptions that frame the PDS as part of the bigger picture of educational reform and focuses on the local/institutional manifestation of the model at Mid West State University. It aims to investigate the usefulness of Popkewitz’s (1998a) conceptualization of the redemptive culture of the educational and social sciences. Therefore, this literature review will attend to three main areas of discussion: (a) the redemptive culture; (b) the rhetoric of the Holmes Group as foundational to the PDS Model; and c) rethinking PDS.

Chapter Four employs a critical discourse analysis of texts (literature, dissertations, interviews, physical environment, etc.), premised on the poststructuralist notion that everything can be studied as text. To this end, Chapter Four provides a space for discussion of literature closely related to the specific site/s (location) under study (Mid West State).
The textual discussion in Chapter Four blurs the artificial boundaries of specific chapters in the traditional presentation of the dissertation (a false separation of literature and analysis, for example). This chapter is entitled "Blurring the Boundaries" to highlight the blurred nature of the literature review and critical discourse analysis in this study. Throughout the literature reviewed for this project the changing goal of ethnographic research suggests a move from the traditional emphasis of salvaging exotic cultures to more fluid cultural representations. I begin with this statement as a reminder that the methodology and the foundational literature are also intertwined and thus numerous themes overlap and blur the boundaries between the chapters. Further literature on the 'new' postmodern ethnography will be discussed in Chapter 3. In this chapter I aim to illuminate the big picture by looking at the realm of research in the social sciences to situate this project within the culture I am deconstructing. This journey will take us from redemption as a frame of investigation based on a poststructuralist analysis that historicizes educational reform to a discussion of the populist rhetoric of the Holmes Group.

A Postmodern Moment and a Poststructuralist Turn.

Stanley (1985), Lincoln (1998) and Popkewitz (1998a) have all outlined the realist ontological foundations that continue to shape efforts in the postmodern moment to rethink social education reform and research. The conclusion is that the search for consensus has failed, however, the discourses that continue to dominate the field reflect a realist ontology that aims to authenticate the 'good citizen' - "thus, there may be a de facto consensus on a rationale for social education, as conservative cultural transmission
to reify and reproduce the status quo of society and institutional arrangements” (Stanley, 1985, p. 348). Little seems to have changed in the intervening years as the critical pedagogues have continued to work from realist and arrogant assumptions that do little to disrupt the de facto consensus.

In *Curriculum for Utopia: Social Reconstructionism and Critical Pedagogy in the Postmodern Era*, Stanley (1992) continues his critical analysis and presents a radical positionality that although it ultimately fails to address the technologies of truth and power inherent in the discourse, does provide a space for discussion of the possibilities for postmodernism and poststructuralism in the field. It also provides very accessible definitions of the terms. For example, Stanley (1992) defines postmodernism as reflective “of a wider interpretive movement to reject or deconstruct claims that some objective foundation or ground exists for making definitive interpretations regarding human behavior, cultures, and societies” (p.152). Poststructuralism, according to Stanley, is more a way of thinking that interrogates the structuralist perspective of the 1950's and 1960's to highlight ways to work within and against the modernist project. The disruption of the critical perspective is highlighted by Stanley through the work of Elizabeth Ellsworth. However, he refuses to dismiss the critical perspective as inherently flawed. He also refers to the work of Henry Giroux to highlight the call from the left for emancipatory possibilities within any intellectual critique of social education. This constant call for the redemptive project in the field may be interrogated using counterhegemonic discourses which, according to Stanley, poststructuralism makes possible by highlighting the tensions within which we exist and work against.
What remains unclear in the debate within critical pedagogy is the relationship (or tension) between utopian thought, values, and pragmatic theory. In other words, while the postmodern and poststructuralist critique has led many radical educators to accept the problematic and contingent nature of all values - including those of radical democracy - there remains an inclination on the part of critical educators to employ such contingent values (e.g., emancipation, freedom, empowerment, democracy, justice, solidarity, etc.) as the basis of a utopian view to orient sociocultural formation (Stanley, 1992, p. 172).

Stanley (1992) concludes with the caveat that poststructuralism is anti-foundational and thus it helps to illuminate and radicalize the emancipatory potential of social education as a way to "understand the 'textuality' of the social world in which we live and to act to change that world. In this sense, poststructuralism is not merely a method at the disposal of any political movement (a nihilistic position) but a way of understanding the human condition that is essential to counterhegemonic praxis" (Stanley, 1992, p. 189).

However, the tensions of the emancipatory project include the normalizing tendencies of the mainstream culture. Blurring the transmission/transformation, according to Stanley, is one way of creating possibilities for a reconceptualized field that responded to the disruption of metanarratives within the crisis of the social and human sciences:

Such praxis involves the simultaneous transmission and transformation of our cultures, while also challenging the value of both processes in a world in which we can never fully grasp the dimensions of otherness. This is a critical pedagogy of neither/nor, oriented by a poststructuralist rejection of false dichotomies, awareness of the unknowable, understanding the limits of rationality, and an awareness of the dangers posed by both nihilism and the terrorism of closure or monologue. It is a pedagogy of hope in the face of the very formidable barriers to critical analysis (Stanley, 1992, p. 222).
What are the foundational assumptions beyond the realist ontologies of education for democracy? The critical perspective outlined briefly above fails to disrupt or destabilize the populist foundations that continue to exclude and silence the "voices" of marginalized social groups. "Thus, while we can applaud the new curriculum of inclusion as creating spaces for groups previously excluded, curriculum theory also needs to consider the inscription of norms that are embodied in the representational practices" (Popkewitz, 1998b, p. 98). Popkewitz's (1998a) analysis of the redemptive culture of the social and human sciences presents possibilities for analyzing the field using a foucauldian analysis that allows us to work within the historically and politically situated field and against the normalizing tendencies of the dominant discourse.

Redemption and the Social and Educational Sciences

The social sciences developed in a manner parallel to the state bureaucracy. The social sciences provided the disciplinary knowledge that linked new civil institutions with the liberal democratic political rationalities of the state. The construction of freedom became a problem of the social administration of the autonomous, self-motivated citizen (Popkewitz, 1998a, p. 3).

Thomas Popkewitz has researched and published a large volume of literature on the historical and political foundations of the social and educational sciences over the last few decades. This section will present a number of his ideas presented thematically, not chronologically. I have drawn themes from his work that attend to questions I ask in this study. I move back and forth from his earlier work on the social epistemology of education to the conceptualization of his theory of redemption, his analysis of the populist foundational assumptions of the work of Dewey and Vygotsky and their continued
influence, and finally his use of a foucauldian analysis to highlight the regulation of individuals in education.

According to Popkewitz, the influence of populism within scientific research has become manifest in assumptions that knowledge of the sciences can serve democratic ideals of autonomy, empowerment, and emancipation. Conversely, however, this populist rhetoric conceals unequal power relations in research and in the classrooms that ‘benefit’ from it (Popkewitz, 1998a). Technologies of power and the embodiment of the redemptive culture of social scientific research are discussed by Popkewitz (1998a) as in danger of reinscribing historical exclusions and obscuring power relations in research. These institutional processes normalized and regulated individuals to produce docile bodies instead, whilst concealing the relations of power that shaped the democratic project (Popkewitz, 1998a; Foucault, 1977). If research is not presented as ‘useful’(as serving prescribed democratic ‘ideals’) it is deemed worthless, and even anti-democratic, thus reinscribing the status quo. “My argument is that the particular ideas of progress and redemption inscribed in the social sciences are the effects of power which, when they go unnoticed in contemporary research and policy, may inter and enclose the possibility of change by reinscribing the very rules of reason and practice that need to be struggled against” (Popkewitz, 1998a, p.2-3).

The rationality and validity of traditional positivist research influenced the historical organization of the social sciences, and thus shaped the educational research, reform and pedagogical practices endorsed through state policy as an effect of power:
Research about childhood and about teaching are directed at governing the dispositions, sensitivities and capacities of the child. Along with the re-envisioned child is a re-envisioned new teacher who functions as a redemptive agent. The teacher brings progress to society through the social administration of the child. However, the redemption of the child is not the religious redemption that is guided by rational, scientific thought. In this sense, pedagogy and research govern the soul of the child to produce change and individual betterment (Popkewitz, 1998, p. 2).

**The Authority of Research.** This project will use a hybrid methodology that embodies the ‘new’ postmodern ethnography to work within and against the method’s historical tradition of salvation and cultural production (this will be examined further in chapter three). Popkewitz (1998a) highlights the quest for rational change and the inscription of the idea of progress as part of the Western way towards redemption. He goes on to say that educational research also governed the souls of the students and teachers whilst eliciting populist notions of social change and exclusive governing practices. “This culture of redemption normalizes certain cultural priorities in a manner that disqualifies some groups from participation. My argument about the state as a governing pattern is to provide a self-reflectivity that recognizes that such governing practices are always dangerous but not necessarily always bad.” (Popkewitz, 1998a, p. 3-4). However, he calls for an investigation into the influences and possibilities of this governing pattern for social scientific research - it is not ‘natural’ and the call for salvation of child, parent and teacher is defined through ordering and normalizing discourse practices of participation.

This work provides a space from which the assumed authority and superiority of social scientific researchers can be interrogated as functioning within principles of social
administration. Therefore, by “making the forms of reasoning and rules for ‘telling the
truth’ potentially contingent, historical, and susceptible to critique is a political practice to
dislodge the ordering principles, and thereby to create a greater range of possibility for the
subject to act” (Popkewitz, 1998a, p. 25).

The Culture of Redemption. By highlighting the culture of redemption that emerged within the social sciences, Popkewitz (1998a) suggests that it is possible to work within and against the governing practices that disqualify certain groups from participation thus interrupting the normalizing tendencies of the total institution of education. He outlines the historical production of the ‘state’ and the social relations that administered human freedom to produce the ‘new man’ of the early 20th century. He relates this administration to Foucault’s idea of governmentality as a complex relation of social practices and power relations which constructed meaning and subjective mentalities through social order (Popkewitz, 1998a).

The modernist knowledge project and the pragmatism of John Dewey can be seen in a new light as contributors to the idea that progress and individual perfectibility were possible:

In contemporary school reforms, these foundational assumptions are deeply embedded as doxa. Dominant and liberal educational reform discourses tend to instrumentally organize change as logical and sequential, although there has been some recognition of the pragmatic qualities of social life (see, e.g., Fullan with Stiegelbauer, 1991). Although the specific focus may change, the agents of redemption are the State and educational researchers, and the agents of change are teachers as ‘self’-motivated professionals (Popkewitz and Brennan, 1998, p. 7).
Foucault and Discourse. Popkewitz’s (1998a) discussion is based upon a foucauldian analysis of the social and educational sciences. Foucault was a French poststructuralist who worked to reveal the regimes of truth and the technologies of power that shape and are shaped by the subject/object relationships in discursive relationships (Popkewitz and Brennan, 1998).

Foucault (1977) directly challenges the notion that schools (or universities) can naturally or neutrally ‘create’ empowered and emancipated citizens. According to Foucault, régimes of truth that regulate and reinscribe the power relations of the institutions are discourses that function as a dominant ‘Truth’ and thus regulate the behavior and ideological assumptions of the institution:

Each society has its régime of truth, its ‘general politics’ of truth: that is, the types of discourse which it accepts and makes function as true; the mechanisms and instances which enable one to distinguish true and false statements, the means by which each is sanctioned; the techniques and procedures accorded value in the acquisition of truth; the status of those who are charged with saying what counts as true (Foucault, 1980, p. 131).

Truth and power circulate throughout the system. The populist goals of social studies education, for example, are immersed within this system. Dominant conceptions of citizenship prescribed by particularist notions of democratic participation have created a totalizing and exclusivist ideology that serves to silence cultural differences. “While the redemptive theme is rhetorically positioned in the name of democratic principles, the concrete strategies are concerned with the governing of the soul. This reconstitutes the historical relation of the register of social administration and the register of freedom that tied the state and social sciences at the turn of the century” (Popkewitz, 1998a, p. 15).
Feminist pedagogy and multicultural education, for example, are positions from which to disrupt the masculinist and racist tendencies of the field but they often continue to work against the power structures without realization of the always already nature of power within their own investments. There are no margins, nothing exists outside - there is no 'safe' apolitical space from which to disrupt the status quo (Foucault, 1980).

Foucault (1991) interrogated the 'governmentality' of the modern state and the administering of such dichotomies as freedom-civic competence and public-private and the self-regulation of modern institutions as 'transformative institutions' (Foucault, 1977, p.209). Governmentality is a useful concept when deconstructing the conditions by which the practices of collaboration and professional development schools in social studies education are constructed as technologies of the modernist project (Popkewitz and Brennan, 1998).

This may suggest some reasons why education, both schooling and university sectors, has become so central in the development of new forms of governmentality, exemplifying new strategies, tactics, and techniques of power to furnish what had become the major form of power relations defining institutions and individuals in Western societies. The institutions of formal education, schools and universities, have become central to the 'disciplining' in most if not all other fields (Popkewitz and Brennan, 1998, p. 22).

Popkewitz and Brennan (1998) suggest that social education can prepare for the new millennium by exploring the productive notion of power in order to re-conceptualize socialization in teaching and teacher education. The concept of social epistemology creates a space from which to work to problematize theory and thus reveal the social formations that reinscribe the dominant paradigm (p.28). A crisis of representation in the
social sciences opens the way for the disruption of universalist assumptions of teacher and student, citizenship and democracy that underpin the dominant discourse in social studies education. The foundational goals of the social sciences arose from the political and administrative agendas of the early twentieth century American society and the relation of schooling to the state (Popkewitz, 1991, p. 102).

One way to sustain rigorous questioning of the truth embodied in educational work and research is to articulate and disrupt the ‘natural’ (neutral) foundations of the dominant discourses (Popkewitz and Brennan, 1998). Truth, according to Foucault, is played out in the three dimensional space of knowledge, subjectivity and power (Simola, Heikkinen, and Silvonen, 1998). This is an important point to consider when studying the dominant discourses in teacher education as the ‘truth’ of the discipline can be deconstructed as might the ways in which the ‘subject’/the ‘good’ citizen/ the ‘good’ student is constituted and constitutes him/herself. An investigation of the production of ‘truth’ and the ‘subject’ reveals the ways in which the field has excluded and silenced marginal discourses.

The literature highlights the need as educational researchers and reformers to recognize and exist within the tensions of the modernist knowledge project/redemptive project that has shaped the dominant discourse of the field. This analysis aims to create spaces, places and suggestions for the re-conceptualization of the field through an understanding of how discourses and governing practices (Foucault’s governmentalities) are produced within a populist rhetoric of redemption that is not necessarily liberatory.

Curriculum as a governing practice becomes almost self-evident as we think of the ‘making’ of the proper citizen. This citizen is one who has the correct dispositions, sensitivities and awareness to act as a self-governing individual in the
new political, cultural and economic contexts. Current reforms that focus on 'constructivist pedagogy' and teacher education reforms that considered the 'beliefs' and dispositions' of the teacher are the secularization of the confessional systems of self discipline and control (Popkewitz, 1998b, p.89).

The normalizing practices of pedagogy and curriculum development can be studied in social education to address the tensions that exist between social administration and freedom in liberal democracies (Popkewitz, 1998b). A Foucauldian analysis of the practices that govern the souls of teacher and students is one way of disrupting the universalist assumptions that reify an exclusive notion of a 'good citizen' (Foucault, 1977; Popkewitz, 1998b). This work allows us to move beyond critical perspectives as presented in the work of Michael Apple which encourage an increasing awareness of the technologies of power in the creation and production of official knowledges and subject. By moving into the (post)critical space I attempt to trouble the critical realist perspective above (Lather, in press).

*The Professionalization (Regulation) of the Field.* My focus is the foundational theoretical assumptions of the field, especially the discourse surrounding teacher education (Apple, 1996; Stanley, 1992; Lincoln, 1998; Popkewitz, 1998a). This site is contested terrain and according to Popkewitz and Simola (1996), historically the social institution has become concerned with the production of knowledge submerged within universal and secularized moral values in the modern era. This 'modernization' of the governing practices of professionalization also related to the systems of knowledge that produced the 'good' (self-governed and autonomous) citizen.
The taken-for-granted assumptions behind turn-of-the-century discourses about childhood, the state and schooling came from social engineering. It was assumed that proper planning would produce the New Citizen/ ‘New Man’ [sic] who could perform competently in the new social, economic, political and cultural contexts. The ‘New Man’ would be self-disciplined, self-motivated and ‘reasonable’ as a productive member of the new collective social projects of the day” (Popkewitz and Simola, 1996, p. 14).

This is supported by Foucault’s idea of governmentality (as discussed earlier) and expresses a new relationship between the state governing practices and the individual and the tensions between social administration and individual freedom. Self regulation becomes the normalized expectation of the ‘good’ and productive citizen - and by extension the ‘good’ professional. The move towards professionalization through the educational reforms, such as the PDS, are then understood as the effects of power. In this case, the productive power (e.g., productive characteristics of labor) of professional knowledge generates the binaries of knowledge/not-knowledge, successful/unsuccessful, reasonable/unreasonable and professional/unprofessional. “It constructs boundaries that order and divide individuals through the inscription of norms about what is good and bad, what counts as true and false, and about the injunctions imposed on the person in thinking, talking, acting and speaking about the world” (Popkewitz and Simola, 1996, p. 18). This discourse of professionalization monopolizes and excludes as it territorializes the expert knowledge as technical rather than political.

The American Jeremiad. He goes on to define this move towards a particular rhetorical form as the “American Jeremiad” that brought together intellectual critique with the assertions of social progress, taking the form the Puritanical sermons to define the
social science discourses. In this rhetorical move the priority was given to intellectual work for the aim of progress and 'research' was offered as the best possible 'practical' advice for the teacher (Popkewitz, 1996). The "American Jeremiad", Popkewitz (1996) goes on to say, represented an American populism that was evidenced in the public (and almost evangelical) discussions about school reform in the late 19th century. "The expert was expected to serve the democratic ideal. The discourse of professional reforms, however, did not eliminate governing, but instead re-constituted the regulatory patterns through the rules and standards of problem-solving sanctioned" (Popkewitz, 1996, p. 128). Thus salvation, or redemption, was inscribed with a view of agency that incorporated the ideal of social progress and the expert as decoder of the 'truth'. Expert knowledge was deployed through a form of populism and the construction of an 'active agent' in contemporary discourses and it continued to inscribe the governmentality of the subject (Popkewitz, 1996).

The 'professional' located in current discourses of education involves mapping, classifications, documenting, and interpreting changes in the administration of individuals in their collective existence. The new responsibilities of the expert can be understood in the construction of new territories of management. The altered relations of life and social movements produce subtle changes in the competencies associated with the citizen—the skills, attitudes and attributes of the individual who participates in political arenas (Popkewitz, 1996, p. 142).

The study of reform as an institutional development is discussed in Popkewitz (1996). This ties in with the focus of this study that investigates social practice and subject relations as represented and representing discourse practices. Thus, linking the ideas of knowledge, institutions and power may interrupt assumptions of reason and
rationality and highlight these foundational understandings as socially constructed
epistemologies representative of social relations (Popkewitz, 1991, p. 31).

The efforts of the 1980's to reform schooling and professionalize teachers were
framed by a number of foundational organizational assumptions that further 'governed'
the teacher's soul (subjectivity). These assumptions included: issues of fragmentation of
knowledge; further specialization and the sequential organization of knowledge; and the
construction of possessive individualism and utilitarian thought that increased self-
regulation as it deskill teachers by decreasing teacher responsibility.

The anomalies inherent in these reports are further exacerbated in that the reform
efforts overlook the political and historical background of public schooling....The
Holmes Group and Carnegie reports support their arguments by drawing on an
idealized version of law and medicine. Altruistic ideals of professionals working
for social betterment are portrayed, an approach that ignores the complex political,
economic, and structural issues that underlie the cultural, social authority of
professions. Whatever important social services are associated with professions,
the publicly defined characteristics are myths that legitimate existing authority
rather than illuminate the workings and contributions of the professions

The educational reforms reflect a nationalistic, millennial vision assuming
possessive individualism and efficiency of the market. Social administration was the
foundational concept of schooling at the turn-of-the-century that aimed to rescue the child
to become a self-disciplined productive citizen (Popkewitz, 1998b). According to
Popkewitz (1998b) in his analysis of constructivist pedagogy, educational reform efforts
are still founded on the modernist theories of people like Dewey and Vygotsky linking the
belief in scientific rationality with the potential of reason to produce social progress.
Ultimately this was a form of governmentality and the contemporary conceptualizations of
pedagogy and teacher education reforms are still attempting to govern/rescue the souls of children and teachers at a time when individuality is less stable. "The professional teacher is self-governing and has greater local responsibility in implementing the curriculum decisions - a normativity also found in the structuring of the new constructivist teacher that, as discussed earlier, cites Dewey and Vygotsky as sources of its vision" (Popkewitz, 1998b, p. 553). This is neither good nor bad, just not to be taken as natural or unproblematically in any discussion about the social construction of knowledge.

Reform Rhetoric

The Holmes Group. This section will present a very brief summary of the reports of the Holmes Group as an important foundational document for the PDS model at Mid West State University. Following this realist tale (Van Maanen, 1995) will be a critical analysis of the discourse using the work of David Labaree, and finally a deconstructive tale in Chapter Four situating the literature in a specific site/s.

The Holmes Group published three reports central to their reform effort in the decade of 1986-1995. They were: Tomorrow's Teachers (1986); Tomorrow's Schools (1990); and, Tomorrow's Schools of Education (1995). The reform agenda outlined in these publications focused on five main goals presented in the 1986 report. They were:

1. To make the education of teachers intellectually more solid;
2. To recognize differences in teachers' knowledge, skill, and commitment, in their education, certification, and work;
3. To create standards of entry to the profession—examinations and educational requirements—that are professionally relevant and intellectually defensible;
4. To connect our own institutions to schools;
5. To make schools better places for teachers to work, and to learn.

Throughout the three reports these foundational goals are repeated and expanded upon. It is important at this stage to note the emphasis on the professionalization of teachers and teacher educators from 'intellectually solid' educations to standards of entry into the profession. The agenda for improving the profession is outlined below:

Professional education prepares people for practical assignments: to teach, to heal, to design buildings, or to manage organizations. One therefore, cannot consider teacher education apart from the practical assignments that we call teaching, any more than one could consider medical education apart from the practice of medicine (Holmes Group, 1986, p. 6).

Practical considerations, collaborations, technical competence are some of the underlying assumptions that frame these documents. The Professional Development School was suggested to fill a lack in demonstration sites, for example:

Recognizing the interdependence of teaching and teacher education suggests a promising alternative to traditional sites for preparing prospective teachers. Professional Development Schools, the analogue of medical education's teaching hospitals, would bring practicing teachers and administrators together with university faculty in partnerships that improve teaching and learning on the part of their respective students. Such schools would largely overcome many of the problems associated with traditional academic and clinical pedagogical studies programs. They would provide superior opportunities for teachers and administrators to influence the development of their profession, and for university faculty to increase the professional relevance of their work, through (1) mutual deliberation on problems with student learning, and their possible solutions; (2) shared teaching in the university and the schools; (3) collaborative research on the problems of educational practice; and (4) cooperative supervision of prospective teachers and administrators (Holmes Group, 1986, P. 56).
PDS's were conceptualized as sites of exemplary practice, where research could be reviewed and incorporated into practice. This narrow definition of research and practice will be discussed later. However, the PDS model was presented as the place to develop, codify, and implement professional knowledge. This idea was developed further in the second report, Tomorrow’s Schools: Principles for the Design of Professional Development Schools (1990). The six organizing principles of the PDS model were outlined in this report as the focus for conversations about professional development: (1) teaching and learning for understanding; (2) creating a learning community; (3) teaching and learning for understanding for everybody’s children; (4) continuing learning by teachers, teacher educators and administrators; (5) thoughtful long term inquiry into teaching and learning; and (6) inventing a new institution (Holmes Group, 1990, p. 7).

Finally, in 1995, the last report of the Holmes Group, Tomorrow’s Schools of Education, was published that called for improved Schools of Education. “Much like the nation’s automobile industry, university-based education schools long took their markets for granted—in turn, giving insufficient attention to quality, costs, and innovation” (Holmes Group, 1995, p. 5). Schools of education were called to change, just as the auto industry had. Ultimately, the report called for restructuring of the institutions or the surrender of their franchise: “Society relies on education schools to help improve the schooling of children, but of what value are education schools if they prove unable to contribute significantly to enhancing the quality and social responsiveness of elementary and secondary education?” (Holmes Group, 1995, p. 6). The rhetoric contained in these
documents and similar calls for educational reform have been analyzed by many scholars. For the purpose of this project, the work of David Labaree is presented below.

*Scientific Rationalism and Technical Competence.* David Labaree (1992; 1996; 1995; 1997) has created a space from which to historicize the rhetoric of the professionalization reform movement from which the PDS model emerged. Throughout this work he has emphasized the scientific rationalist foundations for the reform movement that began with the Carnegie Task Force Report, *A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century,* and the first Holmes Group report, *Tomorrow’s Teachers.* The desire (or object of desire) for the validation of the profession through the development of the ‘science of teaching,’ according to Labaree, was central to the move. However, the adapted medical school model was mired in epistemological assumptions that increased the normalization of the profession and were based on the humanist foundations of public schooling in this country:

According to this view, the creation of a professional teaching force will enable us to pursue more effectively all of the major social goals that Americans have traditionally assigned to public schools: social efficiency (raising the standard of living via enhanced skill training); social mobility (increasing social opportunity for the underclass); and political equality (enhancing student’s ability to function in a democracy) (Labaree, 1992, p. 127).

Also embedded in this move towards professionalism was an emphasis on technical competence highlighted through the development of PDS’s. The gendered nature of the goals of the reform movements, according to Labaree (1992) highlight the desire for increased status as a move away from the stereotypical ‘female’ teacher role of nurturer
and caregiver, to the technical competence of a common body of professional knowledge founded on masculinist assumptions of the superiority of scientific claims.

Professionalization offers the teacher a way to escape identification with the unpaid and uncredentialed status of mother. The new professional teacher - especially a board-certified ‘lead’ or ‘career professional’ teacher - would be well paid and formally credentialed, with an education and a status within hailing distance of the high professions (Labaree, 1992, p. 132).

Call it physics envy (Lather, 1994), hard science, or high professions - the move was away from situated knowing to the development of a common scientifically based professional knowledge and masculinist technical competence. The notion of common professional knowledge and standards paradoxically presented in these reports and the following Holmes Group reports were founded on notions of teacher autonomy, empowerment and merit. “Apparently, thinking of teaching’s femaleness as unprofessional, the professionalizers seem to be trying to reshape the female schoolteacher in the image of the male physician” (Labaree, 1992, p. 133).

Labaree (1992) also discusses the development of a significant body of knowledge through research as a central goal of the Holmes Group. This development would make possible the validation of the profession through a formal rationalist specialized knowledge that is authoritative (scientific) and hierarchical (inaccessible to non-professionals and therefore counter-intuitive) and that could result in cultural legitimacy:

The burgeoning teaching effects (or ‘process-product’) literature provided an ideal expression of the modernist perspective, since it allowed researchers to develop formal principles for effective teaching that could serve as a prescriptive guide for both public policy and classroom practice. Out of this work emerged a scientifically grounded and law-like field of research that gave teacher educators the opportunity to establish professional credibility within the university
community and gave teachers a growing body of formal knowledge from which to base a future claim for professional status (Labaree, 1992, p. 142).

It is vital to note however, that the paradigmatic assumptions of the scientific rationalist move were founded in an increasingly shaky and outmoded positivist paradigm that was being successfully challenged in the ‘hard sciences’ (Harding, 1987). “Therefore, teacher educators may well be hitching their hopes to a research structure that is in the process of molting, which poses the possibility that they could be left behind clutching an empty shell” (Labaree, 1992, p. 146).

Throughout his work Labaree dichotomizes the goals of public education reform movements in the United States as either political (equity, equality, citizenship training) or market oriented (excellence, vocational training, individual status attainment). He presents the professionalization movement as an attempt to bridge the gap between equity and excellence. The dereferentialized nature of these terms, their humanist foundations and the resultant creation of an object of desire in teacher education will be further discussed later in this project.

According to Labaree (1992), the desire to improve teaching and schooling has actually led to the use of disciplinary power. Each Holmes report emphasizes different goals for ‘good’ teacher education. “The second Holmes Group report (1990) abandons the emphasis on scientific knowledge that characterized the first report in favor of a rhetoric of equality and collaboration as the basis for the proposed professional development schools” (Labaree, 1992, p. 144).
Clearly market influences are attended to in the Holmes Group’s agenda. This creates a tension with the progressivist notions of empowerment and excellence as it may be seen as enhancing “social inequality and educational hierarchy and thereby undermines the efforts to achieve progressivist ends” as it drives for a politics of expert and male-dominated status within a formal rationalist environment (Labaree, 1992, p. 145).

As a result, teacher educators at research universities have tended to look at schools through the lens of scientific rationality and to propose solutions for school problems that draw on their own technical skills. This approach tends to work to their benefit not because they are manipulative, but because they are caught in a genealogical web of power and knowledge that limits the way they customarily think and act about schooling. The scientistic logic of their own professionalization effort leads them to envision a rationalized structure of reform for teachers and students that plays out familiar themes of professionalism and technical skill (Labaree, 1992, p. 145-146).

It was a move to increase the status of teacher educators more than reform teaching or schooling (Labaree, 1992). The emergence of the PDS provided teacher educators with a direct authoritative, and influential role in the facilitation of the reform movement.

The teacher professionalization movement promotes a vision of scientifically generated knowledge that draws heavily on the movement’s roots in formal rationality. It portrays teaching as having an objective empirical basis and a rational structure. It argues that a professional teacher should have substantial mastery of the empirical literature on teaching methods and should be able to demonstrate the ability to conduct a rationally structured class that reflects the insights of this literature. To the extent that this effort is successful, the result would be to enhance the rationalization of classroom instruction. Teaching would become more standardized - that is, more technically proficient according to scientifically established criteria for professional practice (Labaree, 1992, p. 147).
This in turn increased the control and professional socialization of the field in response to market forces. The move focuses on ‘practice’ and the superiority of technical competence. Conversely this subverts focus from the political side of the profession/activity.

From this perspective, the problem with promoting the rationalization of teaching is that it tends to hide the political content of instruction under the mask of a technical decision about the most effective means to promote unexamined political ends. Yet a good teacher should in fact examine these ends with a critical eye and should be open with students about the fundamentally political way in which these ends are chosen in and for schools. One potential danger of professionalization, therefore, is the way in which it pushes technical questions into the foreground and political questions into the background as either unscientific or unproblematic (Labaree, 1992, p. 148).

*Ed Schools.* He continues in this vein in “The Trouble with Ed Schools” (1996) where he presents a historical analysis of the market pressures and social structures that have made Ed Schools failures (and marginalized positions of power) within the university. Basically, numbers mean money in the public funded institutions, women make up the majority of the population, it is a working class population, and the target population/customers are children. The rhetoric (and epistemological assumptions) of the reform movement is classed, gendered, and aged. And the nature of knowledge is presented as historically soft, non-scientific, applied, and defined as an institutional area - not a discipline.

Then the agenda for reform movement altered:

In the group’s first report (*Tomorrow’s Schools*), they argued that the ed school should ground itself thoroughly in the prestige and the scientific knowledge-building of the university and then seek to export both to the schools. But in the third and most recent report (*Tomorrow’s Schools of Education*), they reversed
themselves by arguing that the ed school should turn its back on the academic life of the university and bury itself in the world of daily practice within the public school classroom. So in less that a decade, the deans shifted from a position of intellectual imperialism to one of anti-intellectual populism (Labaree, 1996, p. 42).

At this stage any attempt to blur theory and practice seemed forfeit to the demands of the market and the focus on anti-intellectual populism that founded the reform move. Although the Ed Schools, according to Labaree (1996), blurred these boundaries, they could only work on the borders, and thus draw more criticism than support as the university focused on theory and universal assumptions and the schools on practice and context.

Because of their location in the university and their identification with the schools, ed schools have had no real choice over the years but to keep working along the border, but this has meant that they have continued to draw unrelenting fire from both sides. Professors dismiss them as unscholarly and untheoretical while school people dismiss them as impractical and irrelevant (Labaree, 1996, p. 43).

The Professional Development Schools (PDS) and Populism. The focus on practice presented a more ‘authentic’ position for the Holmes Group plans in this final publication. The PDS became an even more central element of the movement and initial propositions in the first publication was reinforced in later discussions as the “center around which all other activities in Tomorrow’s Schools of Education (TSE’s) should revolve. An authoritative stance called for this solution to the failures of the ed schools and a position of power through reform emerged - put up or shut up, even calling for the closure of ed schools that failed to meet these suggested (prescribed) standards (Labaree, 1995).
The concept of PDS also changed with the paradoxically fluid manipulations of the Reform Movement through the increased dereferentialized /floating signification of the term, collaboration (Labaree, 1995; Readings, 1996; Anderson, 1999). It moved from initially being a place from which to transmit scientific rationalism into the semi-professional schools to “an almost mystical scene of collaboration, where emphasis was put on equality between the partners” (Labaree, 1995, p. 173). The PDS was presented as the ‘Great White Hope’ of the ed schools (or the caricature of ed schools and universities the reports presented). The vision also highlighted the desire for a democratic space in which collaboration between these partners in education (schools and universities) would restructure the social organization and institutionalization of education. This was a visible move to counter criticisms of the imperial or colonial attitudes of the reformers that failed to take into account the institutional differences and power structures of the partners themselves.

According to Labaree (1995) the final Holmes Group Report was dominated by the populist rhetoric that has dominated American political discourse in the 1980's and 1990's:

Populism, seen in its own terms, is the language of ordinary people who are excluded from the seats of institutional power. Presenting themselves as the voice of the people, populists rail against elites who have taken control of major institutions (government, business, education) and who have buffered these institutions from public pressures in order to bend them to the service of elite interests. From the populist perspective, university professors are a natural target (Labaree, 1995, p. 186).
Labaree argues that the rhetoric employed questioned the accumulated research and experience of education schools and took the position of an uninformed outsider in a simplistic approach to the issues at hand. This reinforces the need for this study which aims to highlight the populist assumptions that frame the PDS model:

For all of its ability to rally ordinary citizens against the partisans of privilege, populism brings with it severe limitations, all of which appear in the third Holme’s Group Report. By elevating common sense over expert knowledge, populism often promotes anti-intellectualism; by focusing on the power and privileges of elites rather than pursuing close analysis of institutional process, it often breeds paranoia and sweeping conspiracy theories; and by disdaining the need for complex understandings of how things work, it often produces a demand for simple-minded solutions (Labaree, 1995, p. 187).

The Holmes Group called for a narrowing of the organization of teacher education by concentrating their work around PDS’s. However, the costs of this reorganization are considerable. “This change would be counter-productive in two ways: It would cost much more than education schools could be expected to afford, both in terms of money and human resources; and it would bar education schools from carrying out some of the most valuable portions of their current research agenda” (Labaree, 1995, p. 191). The model of PDS authorized by the Holmes Group was resource heavy and exacting and was presented as the only acceptable subject and site for educational research. “This is presented not as optional, but as mandatory.” (Labaree, 1995, p.194). The call encouraged the funding of PDS’s to the detriment of other parts of the ed schools programs but it failed to address the privileging of the PDS’s over other schools in the public schools and allowed for little research about the reform efforts themselves.
The emphasis on practice over theory is also further evidence of the object of desire (practice) and the move towards an intellectually reduced notion of practice. "As the rest of the report makes clear, the defining characteristic of good theory is its closeness to practice, and a key purpose of the effort to redesign the education school around the PDS is to compel researchers to concentrate on such matters" (Labaree, 1995, p.196). This narrow vision of research and practice deprives both university and the schools. Labaree (1995) states his position as follows:

Ironically, recent challenges to American education have made the work of education schools even more complex, and yet in the face of this complexity the Holme’s Group report proposes simplistic and inflexible solutions: Turn schools of education into schools of teacher education, and change broad-based educational research into school-based R&D. It does not require a great deal of thought to come to the conclusion that neither of these outcomes is desirable (Labaree, 1995, p. 210).

Re/thinking/framing the PDS

This section is a moment of wild thought that has enabled me to move into fields of play (Richardson, 1997) to challenge my critical realist tendencies through moving into a whole different planet of discourse (Britzman, 1998). In this final section of the literature review I present some ‘other’ ways of thinking about education and educational reform. The work of Alice Pitt (1998) was very useful in providing a space from which to trouble my own interpretations. In her article “Qualifying Resistance: Some Comments on Methodological Dilemmas,” she outlines some methodological issues that arise when analysis from a psychoanalytic perspective provides a space from which to think about the
gap between the narration of experience and the interpretation of experience. Like Pitt (1998), I was drawn to the complications of the ‘stories’ surrounding PDS:

The problem is that psychoanalytic theories complicate all our stories of engagement with knowledge by insisting upon the role of unconscious processes in the making of such stories. These complications reside within knowledge itself, and they circulate in the stories told to us, in our retellings of them as research stories, and in our readings of such retellings (Pitt, 1998, p.536).

By centering the researchers desire and agency within the interpretations of the data, psychoanalytic views allow one to move beyond the limits of a critical perspective and confronts claims of representational voice in postpositivist research. Therefore, this perspective in the data analysis of this project maps onto the methodological implications of the ‘new’ postmodern ethnography and the call for a fluid epistemology and the limits of representation:

Freud, as we well know, spent his life going there, and he learned, among other things, that the unconscious is a destination that one never quite reaches. One’s arrival is always deferred and delayed, but not only because the unconscious is complicated and difficult to grasp with our meager tools. One never arrives because the unconscious is dynamic, forever creating itself anew from the bits and pieces of everyday life that remind us of wishes that are taboo and experiences that are too painful to confront head on (Pitt, 1998, p. 541).

This project asks some undesirable and difficult questions. As a result, I have encountered roadblocks and concerns from a multitude of sources. At all times I have attempted to address these concerns as issues of both ethics and power and present the following data as a moment in time, a photograph, a mere glimpse of the sum of the parts
of this story. "Thus, the analyst assumes that the stories people tell always say more than they mean and never mean exactly what they say," thus data exceeds representation (Pitt, 1998, p. 542).

**PDS as an Object of Desire.** Britzman (1998) takes the discussion of the foundations/possibilities of education one step further when she uses a psychoanalytic framework to deconstruct education, pedagogy and learning. In doing so she offers a space from which to suggest and dream education as the object of desire of 'school men.' She presents the foundational concepts of education as: change, progress, betterment and advancement. And, according to Britzman (1998), these concepts are tied to arguments over social engineering, nation building and economics and the institutionalization of education/schooling. Education wishes to be deliberate (conscious) by building the 'big' stage of education on the 'little' stage of individual development. The unconscious of education must be buried -

But the repressed returns in the form of symptoms. Unsatisfied, yet still in dialogue with the official stories of the schoolmen from Horace Mann to John Dewey, and with the popular news accounts of various moral panics between 1830-1914 that imagined the working class, the foreigners, and the rural populations as in need of containment, order, and Christian morality (Britzman, 1998, p. 54).

In a particularly artful presentation, Britzman (1998) suggests that pedagogy (curriculum/learning) has emerged as the new object of incitement in the field of education and the fields of the humanities and social sciences - all of which are preoccupied with the promises and dangers of pedagogy. How does this apply to the PDS? The PDS is the new incitement in the institutionalization of teacher education as it promises and threatens
the possibilities of the educational project. As an object of desire the PDS as presented in
the literature of the Holmes Group and the analysts of that move is constructed as the
‘proper’ way of doing teacher education:

When all of these fields are considered most generally, when education *writ large*
questions its relation to social justice with the suggestion that education can be
made from the proper teacher, the proper curriculum, or the proper pedagogy so
that learning will be no problem to the actors involved, we might note that for
there to be a learning there must be conflict within learning (Britzman, 1998, p. 5).

This project aims to complicate the model of PDS by historicizing it and
challenging the appearance of the neutral and natural progression of ideas. Britzman
(1998) allows that space to be concerned with the incognito, the unapparent, and the
contested. “In positing education as a question of interference (as opposed to an
engineered development), we have a very different epistemology and ontology of actions
and actors: one that insists that the inside of actors is as complicated as the outside, and
that this combination is the grounds of education” (p.6). Where is the capacity to tolerate
learning (or professional development) in the Holmes Group rhetoric of the PDS model?
The call for mastery is a push to control that sets in motion forms of anxiety that “render
unthinkable the chance to understand without recourse to mastery” (Britzman, 1998,
p.26).

Excellence, expertise and competence are the story of higher education “Even
though the manifest story of higher education is a story of reason and rationality, the latent
content is more contentious: justified wills continue to clash as new editions of old
learning conflicts are played out” (Britzman, 1998, p. 26). The author offers a ‘different
planet of discourse' to move beyond the paralysis of the analysis of subject/object. Any call for a cure of mastery is a failure. There is no redemptive or rescue fantasy out there. One loses the elusive subject in the question of redemption. “The paradox is that learning is provoked in the failure to learn” (Britzman, 1998, p. 31). The question instead is: “Can education be a place where thoughts not only are troubled but are troubled to explore how our thoughts get us in and out of trouble?” (Britzman, 1998, p. 32).

Just as reflective practice and critical thinking valorize mastery and the quest for rationality, so does the PDS promote the mastery of technical competence that ignores the im/possibilities of learning by reducing teaching to simplistic representations. Anything else is seen as irrelevancy, off-the-point, off-the-subject, and a waste of time (Britzman, 1998, p. 33).

Antinomy (the conflict or tensions) of education/learning mean that it is systematically incapable of closure. To dream an open world of transgression and pleasure would require that education question its own desire for, and implication in, knowledge (Britzman, 1998, p. 51). The dream of public education - or the dream of the Holmes Group - the object of desire - seems to be one of progress and mastery through PDS. It implies a ‘forgetting’ of the conflict it requires. According to Britzman (1998) transformation through educational reform is an effect of educational design (or a foucauldian technology of power):

We read of these efforts in our own time, when education is thought to place a nation at risk, when new identity categories deposit deviancy into the bodies of adolescents, when the histories of inequalities are viewed as interruptions to the
real business of curriculum, when the complications of lives lived are dismissed as irrelevant complaints. But from another vantage point, we also read how education makes the discontents (Britzman, 1998, p. 51).

The anxiety becomes ‘the curriculum’ as the trauma of education is its inability to come to terms with its own conflicted history. “There is then, in all of this life, a fundamental contradiction that makes the project of education inconsolable” (Britzman, 1998, p. 55).

How may we refigure the PDS as desire gone awry - by refusing the simple and moralistic romance of teacher education (Britzman, 1998; Lather, 1998; McCoy, 1995)? By being interested in the mistakes, the accidents, the detours and unintelligibilities of identities? Without guarantees, the “responsibility for fashioning new meanings, for making new projects, lies elsewhere: in the doing of dialogue, in the arguments over what can constitute authenticity, appropriation, and the limits of culture, in the bildungsroman [community/commonalities] of schooling” (Britzman, 1998, p. 60).

This project aims to listen to the stories of others and analyze the texts of the PDS model at Mid West State University in order to do more with the stories we already hold, to go beyond the literal. “If this can be the start, maybe it will begin with an ethical concern for studying what education cannot tolerate knowing, how education can surprise and surpass itself. Maybe then education can engage in that difficult study of its own unconscious, of what it cannot bear to know” (Britzman, 1998, p. 61). In the ruins of education and within the failed promise of the modernist project it may be helpful to look at PDS as a ruin that unsettles the myth of unitary subject of pedagogy (PDS).
“Education is a structure of authority even as it structures the very grounds of authority required for its own recognition” (Britzman, 1998, p. 80).

**PDS as a Floating Signifier.** In “Toward an Authentic Participation: Deconstructing the Discourses of Participatory Reforms in Education”, Gary Anderson (1998) highlights the messiness of calls for increased participation as educational reform in American schools. Using a poststructural analysis, he deconstructs the discursive practices that legitimate and regulate ‘participation’ as part of the technology of control by the dominant culture. “In the last decades of the 20th Century, a pervasive discourse of participation entered professional and lay discussions of education in the United States. A language of collaboration, empowerment, and voice is promoted by trade books, workshops, motivational speakers, academic scholarship, and university courses” (Anderson, 1998, p. 572).

This call for participation mirrors the call for ‘professional development’ manifested in the rhetoric of reform outlined above stemming from the Holme’s Group and the PDS model that was a result of this rhetoric. According to Anderson (1999), the discourse of participation runs deep in the American psyche (or populist culture). It is a floating signifier, in poststructuralist terms, which means that it is representative of a battle over competing discourses and regimes of truth. Is professional development a floating signifier? Looking at the PDS this way might help interrupt the
professional/unprofessional binary that frames it. At this stage I wish to present the possibility and leave it open to further analysis in Chapter Four.

*A Derridean Moment.* Using Derrida’s concept of doubling historicizes the writer and reader of text. By bringing together Derrida’s (1976) concept of doubling and Britzman’s (1998) psychoanalytic analysis of the im/possibilities of education I hope to highlight that I cannot separate my specific project from the historical project. “Reading should be aware of this project, even if, in the last analysis, it intends to expose the project’s failure” (p. 160). I am writing within the history of the field (Teacher Education, Curriculum Studies; Professional Development) even as I deconstruct it:

We know that these exchanges only take place by way of the language and the text, in the infrastructural sense that we now give to that word. And what we call production is necessarily a text, the system of a writing and of a reading which we know is ordered around its own blind spot. We know this is a priori, but only now with a knowledge that is not a knowledge at all (Derrida, 1976, p. 164).

How do such wild thoughts inform my project? By situating these moments as a field of play what might this mean for PDS?

*The Ruins of PDS - Professional Development as dereferentialized.* My final wild thought is using the work of Bill Readings (1996) to rethink PDS as a dereferentialized term housed within the ruins of the post-enlightenment university. The buildings that house the PDS model at Mid West State University may be seen as Greco-Roman ruins espousing the empty unity of excellence in this Post-Enlightenment institution, according to Readings (1996). “The simulation of ruins has to do with the Romantic aesthetic appreciation of the past, and their positioning beside concrete buildings of the new
University is indebted to a hermeneutic claim for knowledge as an interactive encounter with tradition. In either case, ruins are objects of subjective appropriation and mastery, whether epistemological or aesthetic” (p. 170).

This brings together many the notion of a ‘ruined’ modernist project and other ideas discussed in this literature review. I have presented and wondered about: the populist foundations of educational reform effort; suggestions of governmentality, regimes of truth and regulation; and, the redemptive culture of the social sciences. The centrality of terms like progress, mastery, technical competence, scientific rationalism, and empowerment have all been discussed within the rhetoric of reform. However, by ending this chapter with ways to rethink educational reform (such as an object of desire, or floating signifier), I lead into the re/representation of the data with this hope: “To dwell in the ruins of the University is to try to do what we can, while leaving space for what we cannot envisage to emerge” (Readings, 1996, p. 176).

Deferentialization opens up new spaces by suggesting that terms like culture, excellence and professional development have no specific referents. By losing the specificity of referents the term, professional development, may become the floating signifier as mentioned above. We may then mourn the loss of professional development as the opening of a space to rethink and re-engage in thoughts about teacher education models such as the PDS. In extension of this idea, the PDS becomes a simulacrum of the idea of teacher education. With this in mind, the following chapter is a collection and analysis of texts about methodology.
CHAPTER 3

COMPLICATING METHODOLOGY

‘Crisis’ Talk

In response to the tensions surrounding postpositivist research in education, I have attempted to trouble the realist assumptions that continue to permeate methodological discussions in the field. Such discussions reveal that the scientistic tendencies of issues of validity and design seem to reflect a desire for authentic cultural descriptions and voices from the field. As Lather (1998) states, “[the] argument is that the research of most use is that which addresses how knowledge remains possible given the end of the value free notion of science and the resultant troubling of confidence in the scientific project, a science ‘after truth’” (p.3).

By developing a hybrid methodology or bricolage (Denzin, 1994) approach in the research design for this project, I aim to disrupt the notions of neutrality that prescribe the ‘truth’ and validity of research. The over-arching methodological frame reflects the tensions of the ‘new’ postmodern ethnography (Van Maanen, 1995; Marcus and Fischer, 1986; Geertz, 1983; Behar, 1995) as a way of troubling definitive, static descriptions of
culture. Using a critical discourse analysis of individual interviews and public policy/archival documents I have framed both data collection and data analysis in this study within and against the discursive nature of the Professional Development School model.

**Redefining Ethnography**

There is a crisis in ethnography. The totalizing assumptions that shaped this practice as constructing impartial, objective accounts of static cultures and fascinating Others is under assault. Issues of subjectivity, gendered silences and partiality, implications of the colonizing mentality, to name a few, have been highlighted by a number of authors, according to Van Maanen (1995). This 'crisis' (which is more of a final realization of the limits of this methodological practice) has led a number of theorists to attempt to reclaim the 'field'. Clifford (1997; 1986), Marcus and Fischer (1986) and Kaplan (1996), among others, are trying to redeem the discipline, for ethnography is the defining practice of anthropology. They are seeking redemption not only of the practice, but of the discipline. It is interesting to note the realist assumptions framed as desire for authenticity and accuracy in the following call for different paradigms in ethnography:

The only way to an accurate view and confident knowledge of the world is through a sophisticated epistemology that takes full account of intractable contradiction, paradox, irony, and uncertainty in the explanation of human activities. This seems to be the spirit of the developing responses across disciplines to what we described as a contemporary crisis of representation (Marcus and Fischer, 1986, p. 15)

Entrenched ethnographic traditions continue to haunt although the 'field' is stretching to embrace novel and alternative procedures, hence there is a real danger of it
remaining intact and unchallenged paradigmatically (Van Maanen, 1995). However, the calls for new ways of thinking and of doing ethnography are a reflection of a crumbling ideology (Clifford and Marcus, 1986) that has opened the field to exciting possibilities of existing within the tensions of cultural representation. “My objective is to move away from a declarative or official historiography founded on transparent ‘realist’ narrative.” (Visweswaran, 1994, p. 61)

The crisis of representation has highlighted the limits of ethnographic realism and the absolutist totalizing tendencies of traditional ethnography. Ethnography is both a method and a product (Van Maanen, 1995). It has been utilized as a validating technique for ethnographic authority and cultural representation. Recent moves have problematized the taken-for-granted objectivities of this method (Marcus and Fischer, 1986).

New questions are being asked of ethnography. Experimental works are being composed. Many, if not most, of the representational techniques of realist (alternatively, classical) ethnography are now seen by many as dated, naive, and, in a certain light, both professionally and socially indefensible (Van Maanen, 1995, p. 12).

The realization that ethnography is a social practice (a gathering of rhetorical truths shaped by many subjectivities) frames this project (Van Maanen, 1995). In this light, cultures are not seen as holistic, static, ‘knowable’ objects and the dichotomy of object/subject is blurred. In this project, the discourses framing the PDS model at Mid West State University call for a ‘new’ way of looking at cultural description and a more complex understanding of the location of that description. The ‘new’ postmodern
ethnography is used here by utilizing a hybrid methodology that aims to complicate the analysis and re-representation of the findings of this study.

What is the 'new' postmodern ethnography? A number of respected anthropological and sociological scholars have sought to challenge the metanarratives that surround ethnographic representations. They believe that by questioning the ethnographic canonical assumptions of 'truth' and 'reality', traditional practices may be altered and a 'new' ethnography (postmodern ethnography) may arise. However, just what is this 'new' postmodern ethnography? According to Van Maanen (1995):

the point driven home in these re-presentations is that the group portrayed is anything but isolated, timeless, or beyond the reach of contemporary society. The wistful assumption of 'one place, one people, one culture' no longer holds the ethnographic imagination in check. This is made quite clear in what Marcus (1994) calls the 'messy texts' of a deterritorialized, open-ended, and 'new' ethnography that attempts to foster an idea of how lives around the globe may be contrasted yet still interconnected. Important messy texts do not lament the loss of the anthropological object but, in fact, invent a more complex object whose study can be as revelatory and as realistic as the old (Van Maanen, 1995, p.19).

Van Maanen's arguments, however, are in danger of reinscribing the status quo in ethnography as what he "continue[s] to look for is the close study of culture as lived by particular people, in particular places, doing particular things at particular times" (Van Maanen, 1995, p. 23). This is not blurring the realist ontological boundaries enough and contains little awareness of the partial and traveling nature of culture.

Marcus (1994), whom Van Maanen credits with the concept of the 'new' ethnography, goes one step further and describes 'messy texts as the postmodern representation of ethnography. The crisis of representation and incredulity towards
metanarratives, according to Marcus, has highlighted new ways of ‘doing’ ethnography from legitimating “new objects, new styles of research and writing, and a shift in the historic purpose of anthropological research toward its long-standing, but underdeveloped, project of cultural critique” (Marcus, 1994, p. 564). In terms of who coined ‘new’ ethnography, whilst Van Maanen (1995) attributes the term to Marcus (1994), Behar (1995) introduces Women Writing Culture by crediting Clifford (1986) with the idea. This is complicated further by Clifford’s use of the term to refer to the ‘new’ ethnography of the 1920’s in The Predicament of Culture in 1988. However, the concept has become representative of the multiple issues arising from the crisis in the practice of ethnography.

Postmodern ethnography is about living within the tensions of the ‘messiness’ of the social text. Ethnography in this light is seen as cultural translation and never fully assimilates difference and thus raises issues of just what is ‘good’ ethnographic research and the impossibilities of fully ‘knowing/knowable’ a subject. “The postmodern idea of radical or surplus difference counters the liberal concept with the idea that difference can never be fully consumed, conquered, or experienced, and thus any interpretive framework must remain partly unresolved in a more serious sense than is usually stipulated as ‘good manners’ in doing interpretive work” (Marcus, 1994, p. 566).

Visweswaran (1994) talks of Clifford’s work in highlighting the danger of putting all the epistemic weight on fieldwork in ethnography. She goes on to discuss the ruptured understandings evident in feminist ethnography as representative of the disjunctions and gendered misunderstandings of experimental, or ‘new’, ethnography long
before the current crisis in ethnography (Visweswaran, 1994, p 29-30). The notion of failure is most important in the new postmodern ethnography and Visweswaran presents the failure of feminist ethnography as central when one considers the fluid and partial nature of knowing the subject/other, that may trouble totalizing cultural accounts:

In this reconstituted feminist project, the practice of failure is pivotal [and] not surprisingly, this historical moment is also marked by the failure of an entire genre of description: ethnography....This notion of ethnographic and epistemic failure influences the practice of feminist fieldwork. For our failures are as much a part of the process of knowledge construction as are our oft-heralded ‘successes.’ Failure is not just a sign of epistemological crisis (for it is indeed also that), but also, I would argue, an epistemological construct. Failure signals a project that may no longer be attempted, or at least not on the same terms (Visweswaran, 1994, p.100).

Therefore, throughout the discussion and analysis that follows in Chapter Four a sub-textual analysis of the failure of ethnographic representation will continue to haunt the pages. If we are to reflect the dangers and difficulties of the critical realist assumptions that frame this method then we must revisit the notion of epistemological understanding and highlight the fluidity of knowing of the ‘new’ postmodern ethnography. The discourses surrounding the PDS model are fluid and traveling and any attempt to position them in the following chapter must attend to these issues.

Epistemology. A constant theme in the literature surrounding the ‘new’ postmodern ethnography is the partiality of knowing and the challenge to the totalizing tendencies of traditional ethnography as presenting a ‘fully knowable’ subject. Marcus and Fischer (1986) call for more sophisticated epistemologies and Geertz (1983) talks of the changing culture of thought. This raises conceptual questions about the construction
of craft procedures such as ethnography and it opens a world of multiple epistemologies. "The refiguration of social theory represents, or will if it continues, a sea change in our notion not so much of what knowledge is but of what it is we want to know" (Geertz, 1983, p.34).

There is a general call for epistemological debates within the practice of ethnography. "The development of ethnographic science cannot ultimately be understood in isolation from more general political-epistemological debates about writing and the representation of otherness." (Clifford, 1988, p.24) Writing, translation, multiple subjectivities and political constraints have given ethnographic authority to the writer and has resulted in the ethnographer as the being classically presented as the "purveyor of truth in the text" (Clifford, 1988, p. 25). Clifford goes into great detail about the 'new' ethnography of the 1920's that established such truths.

Classically, ethnography has involved a search for origins and the innovations of the 1920's validated an efficient ethnography that was based on scientific participant observation and employed a special relationship with the 'subject' as an absolute whilst transforming cultural ambiguities and diversities into an integrated portrait (Clifford, 1988, p.32-40). However, Clifford calls for a new way of reading and writing ethnography against the grain that "is not yet authoritative in those specific ways that are now politically and epistemologically under question" (Clifford, 1988, pp. 45, 53). His elucidation of the ethnography of the 1920's (the classical ethnography of Malinowski and Mead) includes the privileging of fieldwork. Fieldwork was seen as the distinguishing feature of anthropological ethnography and stays of at least one year were typical. Thus
dwelling became privileged over travel through the emphasis on the site or location and not on the movement to or from the sites studied. The transport of the ethnographer and the cultural representation were erased as the main focus was on participant observation that enables the holistic experience of all the seasons and festivities of the annual cycle within a contained geographic area (Clifford, 1988). "It is now widely understood that the old localizing strategies - by bounded community, by organic culture, by region, by center and periphery - may obscure as much as they reveal" (Clifford, 1997, p. 245).

**Location.** This epistemological turn also blurs the issues of location and site in ethnographic representation. Clifford (1997) developed this idea in his work on dwelling as opposed to travel in ethnography. "Fieldwork has always been a mix of institutionalized practices of dwelling and traveling. But in the disciplinary idealization of the 'field,' spatial practices of moving to and from, in and out, passing through, have tended to be subsumed by those of dwelling (rapport, initiation, familiarity)" (Clifford, 1997, p. 67-68). Clifford (1997) moves on to the concept of habitus as arising from feminist research that enables a move beyond spatial and chronological prescriptions and cautions us to be aware of concretizing travel and habitus embodied cultural experiences as ethnographers continue to search for cultural origins and authentic understanding are extremely important in the 'new' postmodern ethnography. Otherwise exclusivist paradigms will be maintained and the imposition of strict meanings within the search for authenticity will occur (p. 247).

The epistemology this implies cannot be reconciled with a notion of cumulative scientific progress, and the partiality at stake is stronger than the normal scientific dictates that we study problems piecemeal, that we must not overgeneralize, that
the best picture is built up by an accretion of rigorous evidence. Cultures are not 'scientific' objects (assuming such things exist, even in the natural sciences). Culture, and our views of 'it,' are produced historically, and are actively contested. There is no whole picture that can be 'filled in,' since the perception and filling of a gap lead to the awareness of other gaps (Clifford, 1986, p. 18).

Culture is not static. The situated, partial and contingent epistemological assumptions that this implies are vital as there is no historical location from which a "full comparative account could be produced" (Clifford, 1997, p. 11). There is no authentic site. Serres and Latour (1995) converse at length about science, culture and time in a state of flux that addresses the partial knowing of the 'new' postmodern ethnography. The traditional totalizing nature of realist epistemologies are highlighted:

We are accustomed to abstraction via concepts, to concepts from one area organizing the totality of everything. Which explains the smugness surrounding those who continually repeat 'the ontology of Being,' 'Ideas,' or 'categories,' with references to the 'knowing subject,' 'the analysis of language,' and so on - as though it were always a matter of constructing (or tearing down) a very solid edifice, whose peak or foundation would organize all stability (Serres with Latour, 1995, p. 112).

*Linearity.* Time and geographic locale as valorized in the ethnography of the 1920's inscribed a realist, static, and linear epistemological conceptualization. Serres and Latour (1995) discuss the nature of time and knowing as a mobile confluence of fluxes:

What I seek to form, to compose, to promote - I can't quite find the right word - is a *syrrhèse*, a confluence not a system, a mobile confluence of fluxes. Turbulences, overlapping cyclones and anticyclones, like on the weather map. Wisps of hay tied in knots. An assembly of relations. Clouds of angels passing. Once again, the flames' dance. The living body dances like that, and all life. Weakness and fragility mark the spot of their most precious secret. I seek to assist the birth of an infant (Serres with Latour, 1995, p. 122).
Traditional realist epistemological assumptions have failed to convey the multiplicities of knowing and being, of flux and chaotic time, within cultures. Serres and Latour (1995) use the creation of the ‘big science’ of the enlightenment as responsible for the violent assertion of power within the dominant paradigm. Serres resigned from scientific and military schools. “I was formed intellectually by science’s internal revolutions, and philosophically by the relationship - internal and external - between science and violence. The latter question has dominated everything up to this point - both my life and my studies.” (Serres with Latour, 1995, p. 18). Traditionally, science prescribed a static and fixed subject which, according to Serres, spawned static systems of knowing and histories of being even though they claimed to describe a process of becoming. He states: “It’s better to paint a sort of fluctuating picture of relations and rapports - like the percolating basin of a glacial river, unceasingly changing its bed and showing an admirable network of forks, some of which freeze or silt up, while others open up - or like a cloud of angels that passes, or the list of prepositions, or the dance of flames” (Serres with Latour, 1995, p. 105).

By conceiving of time and space as fluid, with fluctuating boundaries and edges, the ‘new’ postmodern ethnography may move beyond simplistic representations and respond to the ethnographic crisis. This epistemological transformation requires a ‘state of flux’ philosophy, such as described in the work of Michel Serres. Destabilizing and disrupting essentialist assumptions provides possibilities for other ways of knowing. Bringing together time and ‘networks of knowing’ challenges ethnographers to an increased awareness of the fluctuation and bifurcation of cultural understanding. In this
way progressivist notions of culture that have been immersed within linear time analyses are deconstructed and the search for an authentic ‘truth’ is interrupted:

We conceive of time as an irreversible line, whether interrupted or continuous, of acquisitions and inventions. We go from generalizations to discoveries, leaving behind us a trail of errors finally corrected - like a cloud of ink from a squid. “Whew! We’ve finally arrived at the truth.” It can never be demonstrated whether this idea of time is true or false (Serres with Latour, 1995, p. 48).

Once it is accepted that cultures are not static but fluid and the im/possibilities of fully knowing the subject are highlighted, cultural representation is complicated:

Time does not always flow according to a line... nor according to a plan but, rather, according to an extraordinarily complex mixture, as thought is reflected stopping points, ruptures, deep wells, chimneys of thunderous acceleration, rendings, gaps - all sown at random, at least in a visible disorder. Thus, the development of history truly resembles what chaos theory describes. Once you understand this, it’s not hard to accept the fact that time doesn’t always develop according to a line and thus things that are very close can exist in culture, but then line makes them appear very distant from one another. Or, on the other hand, that there are things that seem very close that, in fact, are very distant from one another (Serres with Latour, 1995, p. 57).

Therefore, the ‘new’ postmodern ethnography sees time as a chaotic percolation that raises the possibilities of multiple, fluctuating ways of knowing, in multiple locations (a discursive culture). And cultures become “an object, a circumstance, is thus polychronic, multitemporal, and reveals a time that is gathered together, with multiple pleats” (Serres with Latour, 1995, p. 60).

that framed scientific research perpetuated a sense of safety in distance and the creation of absolutes in cultural representations. It did not ask any questions on the relationship between science and violence, or science and imperialism, appropriation and colonialization. Serres and Latour (1995) stated that “everything was taking place as if the scientific Ivory Tower were inhabited by good children - naïve, hardworking, and meticulous, of good conscience and devoid of any political or military horizons. But weren’t they the contemporaries of the Manhattan Project, which prepared the bomb?” (Serres with Latour, 1995, p. 16).

*Investigating Discursive Practices.* The questions researched here highlight the ways we speak about educational reform and the PDS in particular. Therefore, this section will address the study of discourse as a form of consistency between method and research focus, as outlined by Lather (1996) below:

Critical appropriations of postmodernism focus on the regulatory and transgressive functions of discourses that articulate and organize our everyday experiences of the world. To both confirm and complicate received codes is to see how language is inextricably bound to the social and the ideological. This moves social inquiry to new grounds, the grounds of ‘discourse,’ where the ways we talk and write are situated within social practices, the historical conditions of meaning, the positions from which texts are both produced and received (Lather, 1996, p.360).

By focusing on the ways we know and speak about the Professional Development School model this project aims to both highlight and complicate the foundational assumptions that frame this model. Studying the discursive practices surrounding the institutionalization of this educational reform, we can probe the manifestations of the relations of the power of ‘truth’ as distinct from the forms of dominance. “A discursive
structure can be detected because of the systematicity of the ideas, opinions, concepts, ways of thinking and behaving which are formed within a particular context, and because of the effects of those ways of thinking and behaving " (Mills, 1997, p.17). The study of discourse practices in this project utilizes both a poststructural perspective and a postcolonial perspective to shift the focus away from the critical realist interpretation to a more complicated study of the formation of the subject/culture by looking at the way we live out our lives in this contested terrain of contradictory positions and symbolic exchanges (Lather, 1996).

Mills (1997) talks about the legitimization of knowledge and 'truth' as occurring from a position of dominance when she says, “Colonial power enables the production of knowledge, and it also maps out powerful positions from which to speak” (p.115). If we then further complicate this with the conceptualization of power as discursive and fluid, using the work of Foucault (1979) and Serres with Latour (1995), we may produce a 'text' that highlights the messy and dangerous construction of subject through the PDS model as discourses shapes our interpretation of text (Mills, 1997).

The Research Design

The ‘New’ Postmodern Ethnography. This ‘new’ postmodern ethnography utilizes a critical discourse analysis model of a variety of texts (documents, physical surroundings, interviews) that speak to the development and institutionalization of PDS’s at Mid West State University. This is the fluid locational framework within which I will develop a ‘new’ ethnographic representation. I interviewed six individuals involved in the development and implementation of the PDS model at Mid West State University (I
professor, 2 university administrators and 3 Clinical Educators). In the interviews and when analyzing the documents that were produced in these discussions I asked the participants to explore with me the ways in which the culture of the PDS travels and discursively legitimizes knowledge. I also asked them if they felt the PDS model was redemptive and we discussed the usefulness of Popkewitz's (1998a) historicizing of social and educational science reforms. I used the discourse analysis model created by Fairclough (1995) to look at the multiple layers of discourse and the ways in which competing discourses frame the production of power/knowledge in PDS. I also used interview techniques that reflected a postmodern ethnographic approach (Kvale, 1996) to lead to more open-ended discussions about PDS.

Therefore, the hybrid methodology of the overall research design reflects a 'new' postmodern ethnography as the result of the multiple interpretations of texts using critical discourse analysis which led to a description, interpretation and explanation of the texts surrounding the PDS reform effort. These texts include:

- foundational documents from the archives of the College of Education
- evaluation reports of PDS's at Mid West State University,
- other documents recommended by the participants, such as the work of David Labaree, Marilyn Johnston, and Ismat Abdal-Haqq.
- the transcripts of the interviews are also seen as text and have been analyzed using the CDA model to reveal the multiple layers of meaning and to historicize the 'culture' of the PDS in the modernist project of social and educational research.

(The individual documents are listed below).
Institutional Documents and literature from the field were used to provide a broad picture of the PDS model, rather than focus on a particular school (Professional Development School) or site. The divisions that are used to separate the discourses into levels or the documents into sections, such as, College policy documents and literature from the field, are artificial and are only used to provide structure in this chapter.

Two evaluative reports from the College of Education were included as institutional policy documents (listed below):

- "Follow-Up Study, Class of 1995-96: Baccalaureate and Master’s Degree Graduates in Teacher Education" (Bryant, 1998); and.


Each document presents facts and figures presented as neutral presentations of the PDSs and graduates of the teacher education programs at the Ohio State University. In the case of the Draft Evaluation, this document was particularly difficult to obtain and then finally when I did get a copy, it was incomplete. My use of this document was also a point of disagreement among participants regarding its usefulness and validity.

Texts were also drawn as a maximum variation sample from the literature. For example:

- "Professional Development Schools: Weighing the Evidence" (Abdal-Haqq, 1998). This text chosen as a guide to the literature and issues of the PDS model. Funded by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (her employer) this text is a
collection of supportive statements and 'evidence' valorizing the impact of the PDS model on teacher education. The text speaks to the 'revitalization' of teacher education reform as a response to the pragmatists fears of the failed role of education in America. One of the most useful features of the text is the attempt to define PDS from an authoritative stance and this feature will be deconstructed later on.

Two further examples of the literature of the 'field' were selected for two main reasons. Each 'text' was considered a valid sample as it was recommended or highlighted by participants or situated as an 'authoritative' text in the field of PDS. Thus, each text was grounded in the interview process as 'important' texts to study. They are:

- "The Rise and Stall of Teacher Education Reform" (Fullan, Galluzzo, Morris, and Watson, 1998);

Each text refers either to the reform movement as directly related to the Holmes' Group or the manifestations of the PDS model at Mid-west State.

I explored the ways in which the culture of the PDS travels and discursively legitimizes knowledge and situated the PDS within the field of Curriculum History/reform to enable the analysis of the goals and themes of the PDS (Popkewitz, 1998; Lincoln,
Throughout this study I utilized the discourse analysis model created by Fairclough (1995) and the work of Mills (1997).

Ultimately, I used a hybrid methodology of a postmodern ethnography and critical discourse analysis. I interviewed 5 participants individually. They were all involved in the PDS's, in a range of roles from professors, university administrators and teachers in the schools. In these interviews I engendered a discussion about just what is a Professional Development School (PDS). Also, I conducted a critical discourse analysis of documents both grounded in the interviews and also found in the archives of the College of Education toward evoking multiple layers of meaning that historicize the ‘culture/s’ of PDS in the modernist project of social and educational research. (See Appendix B - Interview Schedule).

Location of the Research - Contested Terrain and Travel. The issue of location as discussed earlier is one of contested terrain, multiple locations and knowing in a state of flux. The site of this study is multiple, and fluid through time and space. The PDS is an amorphous cultural mass in many ways and the various sites of the PDS’s are manifestations of the educational reform at the institutional level. This project is limited to a study of the meta-assumptions that frame this model. Therefore, although many of the participants have been members of the local PDS’s, this study is limited in time and scope to an investigation of the texts surrounding the institutionalization of PDS as an educational reform effort. The purpose of the study is to complicate assumptions of site, location, time, - to blur the boundedness of traditional ethnographic studies.
Clifford (1988; 1992; 1997), Kaplan (1996), Gilroy (1993), Pratt (1992), Dubois (1995) and Bhabha (1994) use a variety of terms to discuss the movement of cultures and the global and local forces that shape them and enhance the kinesthetic quality of culture. "‘Cultures’ do not hold still for their portraits - they are dynamic. Attempts to make them do so always involve simplification and exclusion, selection of a temporal focus, the construction of a partial self-other relationship, and the imposition or negotiation of a power relationship" (Clifford, 1986, p.10).

How does culture travel?

It does so through a postmodern vision of seemingly improbable juxtapositions, the global collapsed into and made an integral part of parallel, related local situations, rather than being something monolithic and external to them. This move toward comparison as juxtaposition firmly deterritorializes culture in ethnographic writing. It also stimulates accounts of cultures composed in a landscape for which there is as yet no developed theoretical conception (Marcus, 1994, p.566).

Clifford (1986; 1988; 1992; 1997) has been rather successful in his attempt to reshape the future of ethnographic practice as a focus on ‘traveling cultures’. He has attempted to carve out the discipline to order to dismiss the ‘poorer’ practices and redeem the pure and academic ‘travel’ practice. Although this is a rather political and problematic move it has supplied some very useful ideas. Motion, home and knowledge production are all part of Clifford’s conceptualization of travel:

Travel, as I use it, is an inclusive term embracing a range of more or less voluntarist practices of leaving ‘home’ to go to some ‘other’ place. This displacement takes place for the purpose of gain - material, spiritual, scientific. It involves obtaining knowledge and/or having an ‘experience’ (exciting, edifying,
pleasurable, estranging, broadening). The long history of travel that includes the spatial practices of 'fieldwork' is predominantly Western-dominated, strongly male, and upper-middle class (Clifford, 1997, p. 66).

Clifford (1997) challenges postmodern ethnographic representations to enhance the cultural performance of space and place. He presents a counter-hegemonic discourse that extends cultural boundaries and highlights the "transgressive intercultural frontiers of nations, peoples, locales. Stasis and purity are asserted - against historical forces of movement and contamination" (Clifford, 1997, p.7). This is very pertinent to this study as I have attempted to re-represent a number of interconnecting discourses that require a blurring of modernistic boundaries. Clifford (1997) is cognizant of the hegemonic forces at play and thus calls for an inherently partial analysis that works against the essentialist traditions of ethnography. As any term is apt to fail, so Clifford believes that 'travel' fails as a counter-authentic turn in cultural representation or translation as every focus excludes and no methodology or terminology is innocent. "It follows that there is no cure for the troubles of cultural politics in some old or new vision of consensus or universal values. There is only more translation." (Clifford, 1997, p. 13)

The following questions asked by Clifford (1997) have been most useful in the cultural understanding of this project:

Why not focus on any culture's farthest range of travel while also looking at its centers, its villages, its intensive fieldsites? How do groups negotiate themselves in external relationship, and how is a culture also a site of travel for others? How are spaces traversed from outside? To what extent is one group's core another's periphery? (Clifford, 1997, p. 25).
**Home.** Does the PDS have a home or many homes? Is there a 'parent' site? An original site? How does site become redefined through this study (through location or participants)? The methodology chosen for this project supports and extends the notions of blurred space, time and representation. It troubles the assumptions of 'home' and 'travel' by disturbing the dichotomous nature of location and self/other. Traditional ethnographic practices privilege dwelling over travel, according to Clifford (1997). In many ways conceptualizing home has been a challenge to the centering of fieldwork or travel as the successor of fieldwork in ethnography (Visweswaran, 1994; Dubois, 1995; Bhabha, 1994; Kaplan, 1996). Home (or dwelling in the case of Clifford, 1997) is not the new ethnography's center but, according to Visweswaran (1994) 'deterritorialization' and displacement is being valorized by some as a mode of being and an imaginative act.

Home, however, may be seen as a site of resistance within colonization:

Uncritically theorized notions of deterritorialization project too comprehensively a 'global homelessness' and displacement, trivializing the political particularities of the phenomenon and erasing the 'resolutely local' homesites necessary both for First World anthropologists to interrogate their own privilege and for less privileged subjects to claim home as a place of nurturance and protection. Is it a coincidence, then, that while many feminist theorists identify home as the site of theory, male critics write to eradicate it? (Visweswaran, 1994, p.111).

The concept of home is central to the analysis that follows in Chapter Four. Dubois (1995) describes the quest of anthropology as the mystical common experience of estrangement, homesickness, homelessness, and homeness - "there's the invisible core of what we do, the place we'll always have to come home to, no matter what" (Dubois, 1995, p. 306). In this light the quest for knowledge and cultural understanding is seen
blurred as always already travel and always already home. Bhabha (1994) presents the possibility of going ‘beyond’ establishing boundaries:

a bridge, where ‘presencing’ begins because it captures something of the estranging sense of the relocation of the home and the world - the unhomeliness - that is the condition of extra-territorial and cross-cultural initiations. To be unhomed is not to be homeless, nor can the ‘unhomely’ be easily accommodated in that familiar division of social life into private and public spheres (Bhabha, 1994, p. 9).

Bhabha (1994) and Ong (1995) use the concept of home also as a site for feminist resistance against the patriarchal and gendered nature of social reality by interrogating the domestic space as normalizing and the personal/public binary as regulatory. They move beyond the romantic notions by developing the concept of the unhomed to create a space for cultural difference. “The unhomely moment relates to the traumatic ambivalences of a personal, psychic history to the wider disjunctions of political existence” (Bhabha, 1994, p. 11).

Private and public, past and present, the psyche and the social develop an interstitial intimacy. It is an intimacy that questions binary divisions through which such spheres of social experience are often spatially opposed. These spheres of life are linked through an ‘in-between’ temporality that takes the measure of dwelling at home, while producing an image of the world of history (Bhabha, 1994, p. 13).

Therefore, the locations/sites/homes of the PDS reform effort at MWSU will be blurred and multiply situated. As such, the discursive practices that emerge from the textual analysis of PDS will continue to highlight the fluidity of knowing and the blurred nature of cultural description.

Participants and Peer nomination (Snowball effect). For my selection of participants I used a maximum variation sample to reach as many roles/positions as
possible in the variety of manifestations of the culture of the PDS’s at Mid West State University (Patton, 1990). The roles and positionalities of individuals involved in PDSs are multiple and varied. I attempted to include a wide range of the possible roles but ultimately made decisions that limited the ‘representation’ and inclusive nature of this study by choosing only university professors, university administrators and clinical educators. For example, although I was a university supervisor myself this study does not directly attend to the perspectives of University Supervisors, preservice teachers, or cooperating teachers.

Selection of participants was situated within my own ‘knowledge’ of the Mid West State PDSs and in some cases names were suggested by people familiar with my project as ‘experts’ or central figures on the development and implementation of the PDS model (e.g., a researcher/university professor; a university administrator). One participant self-nominated at a social event when we discussed my research questions and interests - he was also in a position of leadership within the College of Education. The participants in ‘the field’ were selected either from my own professional and personal relationships resulting from my work in the Social Studies and Global Education Professional Development School Network or suggested and contacted through my ‘university people’. In some ways the selection of the participants was a ‘snowball’ sample as individuals were suggested as ‘good’ people to interview for the study I had in mind.

Participants included experienced teachers involved in different PDS’s through Mid West State University (one secondary and one elementary), university administrators (one responsible for facilitation of the PDS’s and another was the director of a school
within the College of Education, noted with the participant’s permission), and a university professor with a research focus on PDS and a history of collaborative teacher education efforts. The gendered nature of the selection is worth noting - the elementary teacher and the university professor responsible for an elementary PDS were both female. The rest of the participants, administrators and secondary educators, were male. The artificial division of the ‘field’ and the ‘university’ was evidenced by the split of 3 ‘university people’ and 2 ‘field people’. This was a very important artificial dichotomy that led to rich and thick description in the analysis of roles, positions and locations of PDS.

In some ways you might say that the College of Education (COE) at the Mid West State University (MWSU) was also a participant and so I have used a pseudonym for this institution. I focused my research here for a number of reasons. Firstly, as a graduate student and graduate teaching assistant in this institution I was both inside and outside the PDS culture in my role as supervisor. In my role as outsider I came into the Social Studies and Global Education PDS Network that was already established and the role I filled was transitory compared to the other members of the group (e.g., university professor, field professors/clinical educators). The outsidersness of my role also seemed to make my interest in the PDS model more ‘suspicious’ and I was blocked in my original idea of an ethnographic study of a PDS cohort. This highlights the etic/emic issue in ethnographic research which has been a long running issue in anthropology. Basically, the issue addresses the tensions, advantages and disadvantages of both insider perspectives and outsider perspectives (Patton, 1990). I will talk more of this in chapter four. However, this highlighted the fragile nature of the PDS ‘culture/s’ but also reminded me
of the colonizing tendencies of the 'distant' ethnographer from traditional research practices. This continued to be a tension of the research as it was revised and implemented. It made me think about the blocking of critical research. Who gets researched?

And finally, the College of Education at Mid-West State University was a major player in the reform effort of the Holme's Group/Partnership. From my perspective it had become such an accepted, uninterrogated and 'invisible' agenda at the College that I was intrigued enough to focus on this for my dissertation.

**Counterpoint Discussions with Participants.** The initial interview with the participants was used to describe the participants experience and analysis of the PDS model. After transcribing the tapes, I analyzed the transcripts using the Critical Discourse Analysis model designed by Fairclough (1995) to draw out the epistemological assumptions that framed their discussions. The member check was used to provide a space for counter-point analysis (or grounded theorizing) by the participants reacting to my analysis of their data. In most cases this provided a rich source of data and written or verbal responses.

**Methods of Data Collection**

*Interviews.* I used open-ended unstructured interviews with an initial interview schedule which was adapted as the interviews progressed (see Appendix B). Questions and assumptions that were evident in the literature were discussed in the interviews. Sometimes this led to detailed discussions of the usefulness of certain theoretical standpoints (such as Popkewitz's work) but usually the responses were to general
questions of experience and elicited stories of 'being' within and against the PDS model at MWSU. Kvale (1996) states that the very virtue of qualitative interviews is their openness and that there are no standard techniques or rules (p.85). Therefore, the analysis of the interviews was shared with the participants and led to grounded, fluid, and discursive theorizing.

The seven stages of interviewing, according to Kvale (1996) are: thematizing; designing; interviewing; transcribing; analyzing; verifying; and reporting. This model was adapted to provide similar stages of development by: (1) highlighting the preparation of questions, (2) initial storytelling responses, and (3) final counterpoint discussions to inform the reporting of the data. At all stages of the interview process and analysis of the data, the participants were given rights and control of their data which will be discussed in more detail later. I adapted the model to include four stages of data collected: (1) the initial interview that was structured around themes from the literature and research questions; (2) transcribing and critical discourse analysis (CDA) of the transcripts; (3) the participants response to my initial CDA of their data (written, verbal, or email); (4) final interview/member check to bring the research to conclusions and closure for the participants and for myself.

*Document Collection.* Throughout the interviews I was handed a number of documents or documents were suggested to inform my project. This was an unobtrusive way to provide rich description of the values and beliefs of the participants and the PDS (Marshall and Rossman, 1995). Therefore, these documents have been 'grounded' by the participants. Also, I was searching through the archives of the COE and using literature
from the literature review to add to the analysis of PDS texts. “Archival data are the
routinely gathered records of a society, community, or organization” (Marshall and
Rossman, 1995). (These documents were listed earlier in this chapter). Throughout this
study ‘text’ has been broadly defined as explained in the next section. In this way, I
troubled the realist assumptions that the PDS was static, knowable and neutral.

Data Analysis

*Critical Discourse Analysis.* Critical Discourse analysis is a three-dimensional
framework arising from the work of Norman Fairclough (1995) that analyzes spoken and
written language texts, discourse practices (text production, distribution and
consumption), and discursive events as instances of socio-cultural practice (p. 2). It
enables the broad conceptualization of ‘text’:

A rather broader conception has become common within discourse analysis, where
a text may be either written or spoken discourse, so that, for example, the words
used in a conversation (or their written transcription) constitute a text. In cultural
analysis, by contrast, texts do not need to be linguistic at all; any cultural artefact -
a picture, a building, a piece of music - can be seen as a text (Fairclough, 1995,
p. 4).

Analysis of texts in this way provides insights into what is and what is not
included, what is taken as given (common sense). For Fairclough (1995) with his marxian
perspective, it is one way of analyzing the ideological content (underpinning assumptions)
of texts. Thus texts as social spaces are interrogated simultaneously as spaces of
cognition and representation of the world, and social interaction. “This multifunctionality
of language in texts can be used to operationalize theoretical claims about the socially
constitutive properties of discourse and text (Foucault, 1972, quoted in Fairclough, 1995,
The analysis of texts in critical discourse analysis should not be separated from the institutional and discourse practices within which the texts are embedded (Fairclough, 1995, p. 9).

The texts studied in this dissertation represent the manifestations of the Professional Development School model at Mid West State University. Interviews, reports, conference proceedings, dissertations, literature - an enormous amount of text is available. I conducted a critical discourse analysis of these texts to lead to a more troubled questioning of the foundational assumptions of the PDS model at the MSWU. I also interviewed individuals who have been involved in the development and implementation of the PDS model at MWSU using a maximum variation sample of university administrators, professors, and clinical educators. I included texts from the literature of the field of teacher education that provided insight into the usefulness of an analysis of the PDS model as part of the redemptive culture of social and educational reform as discussed in the work of Popkewitz (1998a). "Discourse practice ensures attention to the historicity of discursive events by showing both their continuity with the past (their dependence upon given orders of discourse) and their involvement in making history (their remaking of orders of discourse)" (Fairclough, 1995, p.11).

Critical discourse analysis is a method of social research that focuses on textual analysis, intertextual analysis, and sociocultural considerations from a critical perspective to study the ways in which social relations of power are produced. In doing so, it highlighted the language (discourse) in relation to discursive power relations and ideologies. "Power is conceptualized both in terms of asymmetries between participants in
discourse events, and in terms of unequal capacity to control how texts are produced, distributed and consumed (and hence the shapes of the texts) in particular sociocultural contexts" (Fairclough, 1995, p.1-2). This research method allowed the researched (participants/institution/society) to reveal previously obscured power relations that sustain particular discursive practices with ideological interests over alternative (including oppositional) practices. This in many cases led to the study of discourse practices representative of hegemonic influences. "Hegemony of leadership as well as domination across economic, political, cultural and ideological domains of a society" (Fairclough, 1995, p. 76). This research blurs insider/outsider and this method of analysis should be understood to create a constant tension within this project. I have worked within and against critical discourse analysis to address the normalizing tendencies of hegemonic discourse practices (of which I am a part).

The presentation of the data in Chapter four will be by themes arising from the CDA of a number of textual cultural artifacts including the interviews, grounded documents, archival documents and literature referring to the PDS model. I have analyzed the texts using a three level analysis and this will lead to the discussion of themes (or, in this study, discursive practices) that are the PDS at Mid West State University. The three levels are:

• Description of the text;
• Interpretation of Discourse Practice/s; and,
• Explanation of the situational, institutional and societal texts.
Fairclough (1995) adapted the work of Foucault to develop this conceptual framework to study individual, institutional and societal discourses. Foucault refers to the ordered set of discursive practices that are associated with a particular social domain of institution (p.12). This is paradigmatically consistent with the poststructural perspective that frames the study, as I have investigated the legitimizing discourses of the PDS at different spaces/places/levels:

I see discourse as a complex of three elements: social practice, discursal practice (text production, distribution and consumption), and text, and the analysis of a specific discourse calls for analysis in each of these dimensions and their interrelations. The hypothesis is that significant connections exist between features of texts, ways in which texts are put together and interpreted, and the nature of the social practice (Fairclough, 1995, p. 74).

Ultimately, this method enabled me to move from contextual discussions about reform in teacher education and experiential anecdotes to discussions of the epistemological assumptions framing the PDS model. However, according to Fairclough (1995) a CDA must aim for vigilance about the use of the results and whether the critique is helping to naturalize other equally but differently ideological practices (p.83).

Blurring Ethics and Validity

This section attempts to address the manner in which the positions of research/er blurs 'good research' (validity) and 'goodness in research' (ethics). As this project has focused on ways of rethinking cultural representation to foster more fluid and anti-essentialist discussions, the following question should be addressed:

Do you think that pure and simple scientific rationality is enough to make one lead a happy, responsible, and good life? What positive science, what logic, what formal abstraction can one bring to reflect on death, love, others, the
circumstances of history, violence, pain or suffering - in sum, on the old problem of evil? If culture is only useful for life's Sundays, for lining up in museums and applauding concerts, I will gladly leave it to the various cultural snobberies. No - the questions fomented since the dawn of time by what we call the humanities help rethinking those asked today, about and because of the sciences (Serres with Latour, 1995, p. 27-28).

Therefore, it is important to question the assumptions of validity and the way they can be re-thought to both blur and challenge issues of research ethics and accountability.

Science is still considered by many to be in a dominant position and this highlights the ways in which contemporary attempts of postmodern ethnographers to re-create ethnographic practice are steeped in positivist assumptions of cultural absolutes and holistic representations:

It's necessary to talk about the future of science, which, since the Age of Enlightenment, and ever more forcefully, recruits the best intellects, the most efficient technical and financial means. As a result, science finds itself in a dominant position, at the top of the heap, as we say, single-handedly preparing the future and in a position to occupy more and more territory. Powerful and isolated, it runs - or could run and make others run - grave risks. Why? Because it knows nothing about culture. As Aesop said about language, science has become by far the best and the worst of things (Serres with Latour, 1995, p. 86).

Therefore, any discussion of validity and ethics in research is being played out in the lingering shadows of a traditional empiricist theory of knowledge (Smith, 1993, p. 23). The scientism that results must be addressed in any discussion of a 'new' postmodern ethnography as the violence with which scientism asserts its position is oppressive and exclusivist. "No domain can have a monopoly on reason, except via abuse" (Serres with Latour, 1995, p. 128). The social construction of Others is also a violent act. To move beyond the moral position of rationality as universal and ethics as culturally relative is vital
Serres and Latour highlight the social construction of ‘ethics’ that legitimized the dominant culture of science and led to the “great problems of our era, since the dawn of Hiroshima” (p. 137). They call for the reinvention of social relations to produce a new philosophy, a new system of laws, and perhaps a new ethics of science. This is useful to consider here as the ethics of this research project have been addressed as context specific, not as cultural absolutes, whilst also addressing the broad ethical guidelines of research at MWSU (see Appendix A) (Glesne and Peshkin, 1992).

Methodology as Validity. Smith (1993) in *After the Demise of Empiricism: The Problem of Judging Social and Educational Inquiry* extends the discussion into the field of educational research. “At the core of the empiricist solution to the knowledge-versus-opinion problem stands the idea that human beings possess the capacity to depict the world as it is, uninfluenced by, or independent of, the social and communal thoughts and practices through which such depictions are obtained” (Smith, 1993, p. 5). Methodology was seen as the ‘way’ to accomplish validity and ensure rigorous scientific investigation. It was believed that a rigorous methodology could separate fact from value and thus avoid problems of subjectivity and was a way of distinguishing good research from bad research. A ‘methodology fetishism’ existed (Smith, 1993). Methodology was also seen as the separation of professional (public) knowledge facts from lay (personal) knowledge. Realist ontologies were supreme:

Methodology was central to the claim that professional research knowledge is not only different from the lay knowledge, it is superior. Ordinary people in their day-to-day lives deal most often with surface appearances or with how things ‘seem’.
Social and educational inquirers, precisely because of their special procedures, are able to penetrate through this level of how things seem to the level of how things really are (knowledge) (Smith, 1993, p. 7).

The status and authority of the scientific researcher or ethnographer was generally acknowledged (Clifford, 1988; Visweswaran, 1994; Pratt, 1992; Serres with Latour, 1995; Smith, 1993). However, the realization that knowledge production, and thus cultural description, depends on the multiple subjectivities (internal and external) of the researcher, and were “inescapable tied to issues of power” (Lather, 1994) struck at the core of traditional empiricist theories of knowledge. Therefore, methodology can no longer stand as the sole inviolable referent for the resolution of good from bad research (Smith, 1993, p. 9).

Smith (1993), however, seems to be calling for a more authentic cultural analysis and this is closely tied to the redemptive culture of social scientific research discussed in Chapter Two. Kvale (1995) calls for the demystification of validity criteria as the “understanding of knowledge as a map of an objective reality, and validity as the correspondence of the map with the reality mapped, is replaced by the social and linguistic construction of a perspectival reality where knowledge is validated through practice” (p. 19). Through the following discussion of issue of validity and ethics I will paraphrase the parallel criteria conceptualized by Guba and Lincoln (1989) and further complicated by Lincoln (1995) to highlight the connections within and against this post-critical, ‘new’ postmodern ethnographic study that attempts to blur validity and ethics.
Paradigmatic Validity. Using a poststructuralist lens in this work has amplified the critical analysis of issues of power and truth in research. As this project focuses on issues of discursive power relations and the epistemological assumptions of knowing in a state of flux it connects to the broader structures of social power, control and history that characterize critical postpositivist research, as discussed by Lather (1994). The data analysis also led to grounded document analysis and grounded theory building that respected the tensions of "both confrontation with and respect for the experiences of people in their daily lives and profound skepticism regarding appearances and "common sense"" (Lather, 1994, p. 107).

Reflexive Validity. Throughout this study I also worked to maintain an openness to counter-interpretation through the participants' counterpoint analysis of their data and the member check discussions around the conclusions of my own data analysis (Lather, 1994). In this way I blurred what it means to be 'valid' and 'ethical' in postpositivist research as the participants control their data and I focus on my role as researcher in the emergent project. The counterpoint discussions that framed the third stage of my interview data collection were a useful reminder to me that I needed to allow contradictory evidence to inform my "growing complexity of thought " about my own role in the research project and the study itself (Lather, 1994). This in particular was vital in challenging my tendency to want to 'save', transform or redeem the participants and teacher education in general through my research. It was also important at that stage (and throughout the study) to remind myself of the tensions created by my immersion within this redemptive culture of the social and educational sciences I was attempting to
deconstruct (Popkewitz, 1998a). This reflective turn highlighted the ways I was thinking against what we think we cannot think without (Spivak, 1993).

This project utilized certain a priori assumptions that framed the investigation into the humanist foundations of teacher education reform. My analytic framework is a hybrid mix of interpretive, critical, poststructural and psychoanalytic perspectives that enables me to address my research questions and interview discussions by highlighting my own assumptions and a priori analysis of the research 'problem/s'. The challenge has been to maintain that openness throughout all stages of the research process through constant reflexive self-analysis and questioning the analysis and conclusions that emerged. I was “vigorously self-aware” as described by Lather (1986) as a way of maintaining trustworthiness of data.

Once we recognize that just as there is no neutral education there is no neutral research, we no longer need apologize for unabashedly ideological research and its open commitment to using research to criticize and change the status quo. The development of data credibility checks to protect our research and theory construction from our enthusiasms, however, is essential in our efforts to create a self reflexive human science (Lather, 1986, p. 67)

The guidelines offered by Lather (1986) include triangulation of multiple data sources, multiple methods, and theoretical schemes. This project, using hybrid methodology, interviews and document analysis, is theoretically congruent with the research questions that focus on discursive practices of the Professional Development School Model. Also, as discussed above, systematized reflexivity is central in openly ideological research and I used this to remind myself of my a priori assumptions that framed the research project. Face validity was reflected in the counterpoint analysis by
the participants and the member checks to maintain the participants ownership and control of their data.

Although the work of Guba and Lincoln (1989) and Lincoln (1995) on trustworthiness seems to call for a linear and progressivist redefinition of validity criteria, their parallel concepts have been useful in this study a position from which to work within and against the assumptions of social and educational research.

Significance of the Study

This study brings together questions that frame and investigate the humanist notions of educational reform and the ways in which these notions frame the research process itself. It uses a 'new' postmodern ethnography that includes a hybrid methodology of interviews and critical discourse analysis to investigate the discourses of the Professional Development School. In this way, it also provides a space from which to consider the usefulness of Popkewitz's (1998a) theorizing about the humanist and populist foundational assumptions of educational research and educational reform efforts such as the PDS. It consistently blurs and challenges the assumptions that frame the research project and yet make it possible.

Therefore, throughout this project I was systematically reflexive about the colonizing tendency of the research methodology (Fairclough, 1995) and the position of privilege I was using as both insider and outsider in the PDS and as sole researcher. It is my hope that this project will lend itself to further discussions that both challenge assumptions of totalizing ethnographic representation and historicize the development of educational reform as mired in realist assumptions and 'neutral' humanist foundations.
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Limits of the Study

Discussing the limitations of this study are a useful place to conclude this chapter as I have been talking at length about ‘new’ ways of representing cultures, competing discourses and contested terrains. As discussed briefly in the section on participant selection, it has been very challenging to move from my original idea of doing an ethnography on a particular PDS to a more meta-level analysis of the ways of being in the PDS model in a large research institution. It is possible that individuals who ‘know’ PDS from the inside (University Professors, Clinical Educators, Cooperating Teachers, Preservice Teachers) may consider this study unrepresentative. In a way this possible disagreement serves to support the intentions of this project. It is a limited representation of PDS. It is a troubled and complicated discussion of the assumptions and framing goals of PDS. It is not intended to speak for all PDSs or for all individuals involved in PDS reform efforts. Indeed, this study only looks at one institutional site. The Mid-West State University was chosen because I was both insider and outsider of one of the PDSs situated within this institution. This was both an advantage and a disadvantage in analyzing the data and rethinking PDS.

This study has also worked to consider PDS as a historically produced reform effort and has not directly addressed the intentions or philosophical goals of the Holmes Group members. I have attempted to situate my discussion of PDS by referring to the documents that came out of the Holmes Group but this study is not a study of the Holmes Group and its members.
In the next chapter I have continued to rethink PDS by bringing my own wild thoughts to bear on the data. Grounded documents and thematic connections have been central in this work but as outlined in my ‘conversation’ with Maxine and Bob in the next chapter in a presentation of data entitled ‘Politics and Ethics’, I have framed my findings with other ways of thinking about PDS to respond to the complexity of the study.

**Chronology of the Study**

In a sense this study began in October, 1998 when I completed my proposal and applied for Human Subject approval, however, it was in my mind a long time before that as explained briefly in the first chapter. Here I present a brief chronology of the study. In November and December, 1998, I began gathering texts (non-interviews texts/public documents and literature) by searching through the COE archives and reading extensively on PDS and the PDSs at Mid West State University. I also began CDA of non-interview texts. In January, 1999, Human Subjects approval from Mid West State University and contacted individuals to invite them to participate. I began interviewing in January, also. In February, I continued interviewing and began transcribing/analyzing the data and in March I continued analyzing and interviewing. I also wrote chapters one, two and three at this time. At the same time I presented my initial transcripts and data analysis to participants and received counter-point analysis from them. In April I used the committee’s feedback on chapters one through three to inform my writing of chapters four and five, the data presentation/analysis and the conclusions of the study. In May I discussed my ideas for the final representation of data with participants and completed chapters four and five. The revised complete draft was completed in June, 1999.
CHAPTER 4

REDEMPTION AND DESIRE IN PDS

Introduction

The questions that frame this research project arose from an interest in the discourses surrounding the PDS model. However, it became quite clear as I delved further into the data, hidden beneath the focus questions concerning foundations and theoretical frames for understanding were issues of politics and ethics. I was constantly attempting to stand back and critique what I was immersed in. Not only that, I was becoming increasingly dogmatic. Thus this chapter has led me to a more nuanced approach to the topic. The first two questions of the project (repeated below) highlight the critical realist perspective of this work:

1. What are the foundational assumptions that frame the manifestations of the PDS model at MWSU? This is an attempt to historicize the reform rhetoric and the traveling of legitimate knowledge within this culture.
2. How useful is the notion of the Redemptive Culture of the Social and Educational Sciences presented by Popkewitz (1998a) in understanding the PDS at MWSU?

   In the course of writing up the data I began to shift toward other ways of looking at PDS as a way to interrupt and trouble my tendencies towards the ‘real’. I came to call this a poststructural/psychoanalytic turn using a (post)critical perspective (Lather, in press):

3. What other ways of looking at the PDS may be useful in rethinking the epistemological assumptions that regulate it to lead to a more fluid knowing and being in teacher education reform models? Is it an object of desire (Britzman, 1998; Pitt, 1998)? A floating Signifier (Anderson, 1998)? A dereferentialized concept (Readings, 1996)?

4. What are the politics and ethics of using a theoretical standpoint that studies discourse in a critical way and how may I move beyond the critical to the space of ‘as if’?

   The (post)critical move has enabled me to move within and against the dangers of the critical to imagine other ways of thinking about PDS. Using poststructural and psychoanalytic tools also enabled me to move beyond the stuck places of the critical realist perspective (Lather, in press). As you read this chapter you will notice the data
representation attempts to move the reader from a critical perspective to a space for reflection on poststructural and psychoanalytic interpretations. As Pitt (1998) states:

psychoanalytic understandings of story resonate with poststructural notions of the relationship between experience and its narration...Where poststructuralist theories invert the humanistic notion that we name our experience as we narrate it, psychoanalytic theories further unseat the authority of the humanist subject by insisting upon the notion of the unconscious. There is, both within the subject and its narrative desires, something that resists itself, something that escapes the consolations of rationality and intentionality (Pitt, 1998, p. 537).

The work of Deborah Britzman (1998) and Alice Pitt (1998) helped immensely as I attempted to work in a space that made PDS “inconsolable”, blurred conclusions about good or bad PDSs, and used the unconscious to study educational reform.

**Using Interview and Documents as Data**

Holloway and Jefferson (1997) describe the process of eliciting narrative through in-depth interviews. Their work presented a useful framework for the analysis of the interviews to bring forth a more complicated knowing that highlighted that the text was more than the sum of its parts. To this end I first read the interview transcripts for the emergence of discourse patterns and then used the framing questions of the research project to analyze and conceptualize (name) the patterns. It was in the final ‘stage’ of this analysis that I found the need to further trouble my own analysis, to move through the aporia of the critical realist (Lather, in press) by wandering/wondering through a psychoanalytic interpretation (Britzman, 1998; Pitt, 1998) that responded to the final questions of my project.
Therefore, I have analyzed an array of texts that are a maximum variation sample intended not to represent but to complicate the PDS model as it is manifested at a large mid-west teacher education research institution. Interviews, officials reports, and literature from the field have been subjected to a Critical Discourse Analysis (Fairclough, 1995). Thus, throughout this chapter I present excerpts from the interview data, researcher comments/analysis as data, and textual excerpts to highlight the im/possibilities (or the promise and the limits of representation) of research in this area. From the original texts (interview transcripts, literature and policy documents/evaluation reports) I have withdrawn excerpts that illustrate themes and discourse patterns that emerged through analysis. This immediately places the analysis as the framework for the emergent themes and in this way I hope to trouble any tendency toward authentic representations or uninterrupted voice. The Critical Discourse Analysis approach (Fairclough, 1995) encourages a move beyond coding towards analysis of the themes of transcripts and texts. Thus, I contextualized the texts by highlighting in my initial analysis the source, format and other descriptive details of the texts, then analyzed the layers of the texts from descriptive comments to interpretive analysis and finally explanatory possibilities. The excerpts you will see in this chapter are considered illustrative rather than representative of the issues and concerns I bring to bear on the texts. I intend to foreground my agenda throughout this discussion through the multiply layered analyses that will occur in the chapter through the use of footnotes and in-text commentary. For example, when I sent my initial descriptive analysis to the participants for their personal editing and counter-point discussion, I included their responses as data.
For example, in the interview with Bob, he highlighted that he felt Popkewitz’s idea was okay but did not explain the “whole story” (quoted from the initial interview transcript):

Bob: I thought it was fascinating. I have heard Popkewitz claims not to be a historian but he certainly was historical in that account and I would like to get an historian’s criticism of him. Because in a sense, I thought he may have oversimplified it. I think in reality, I think there is that aspect of it, but I’m not sure its all that dominant.

In our counter-point discussion, Bob was not satisfied with this re-presentation and found my a priori assumption problematic:

Bob: This does not capture my agreement with his notions in general.

And thus in the conversation on the ethics and politics of this project I re-presented Bob as saying:

Bob: Well, actually, I agree with Popkewitz although I wonder what a historian would say about his theory. I am just wondering about the ethics of the perspective you are using in your work.

Overall, the responses were supportive and positive. However, a number of ethical/political issues were raised by one of the participants. Thus I include in the ‘conversation’ among the individual participants comments and discussion on the ‘nature’ of my research in response to the comments offered to my initial analysis. For example, when Bob replied that he thought my use of seduction and desire problematic, I responded in the presentation of the data that this tension between Bob’s questions and my interpretation arose from my use of post-structural and psychoanalytic perspectives. Likewise, in response to my own initial question concerning the difficulties of post-critical
research in such a fragile setting, Maxine highlighted the fact that she also faces "disinterest and opposition" (Maxine) to her use of similar theories with the participants in her research. These responses and other text excerpts like them have added immensely to this project by encouraging me to create a space to rethink PDS outside of realist or critical realist discussions about 'being' in PDS.

First, I present brief portraits of the individual participants and move into a 'conversation' using experimental writing as a form of data re-presentation (Richardson, 1994) to describe the discourse patterns and themes that arose from the interviews as a description of the interview sample. Following this, a brief description of the 'texts' used for the analysis (interviews, policy documents, etc.) is presented. Then I discuss the three framing questions of the research and contextualize the data within themes/questions/issues/partial answers that arose consistently and often in response to these questions.

In the section immediately following this introduction I will introduce the reader to the texts used in this Critical Discourse Analysis. The brief biographies of the participants of this study describe the individual participants and their membership in PDS culture/s, either as university administrators and professors, or as clinical educators and field professors. Throughout the interviews a number of themes arose from the patterns of discourse and the poststructural/psychoanalytic interpretive frame. Overall, I received supportive comments about my work but as I work with the data I continue to worry about the 'new' and seemingly dogmatic assumptions (as seen in the critical realist tendency towards 'truth' and 'fully knowing') that may still be evident in this post-critical
effort. How can I address my own dogmatism and the investments of individual participants and the institution? What is the place of research that is blocked by gatekeepers?

**Biographical Portraits of the Participants.** Maxine Greenwood—In many ways Maxine is seen as the “PDS” Professor at a large Mid-west research institution (using the pseudonym Mid-West State University, for the purposes of this study). From the very beginning of the reform movement within the College she has been involved, supportive and yet critical of the PDS model. “It wasn’t particularly that I was attracted to the top-down initiative, but rather that my interests (i.e., collaborative research and working with schools) were supported and popular in the College” (Maxine). Over the years she has not only developed a PDS cohort and worked closely with the group, she has also researched and written extensively on the subject.

Bob Hawk—Bob is a school director in the College of Education at Mid-West State (noted with his permission). Throughout his career he has been involved in school-university collaborative efforts and now has a leadership role institutionally with responsibility for resources, although PDS resources have historically come from the Dean. He is also responsible for the faculty and the negotiation of the PDS's in one of the 'schools' (university department within the College of Education). “PDS's were set up more centrally initially (i.e., within the College of Education) than within each school - despite our concern that the schools should be more involved in the negotiations. Likewise, funding has varied from year to year depending upon the College Dean’s decision-making.” Bob displayed support and respect for my project and outlined his own
background in school-university collaboration to support this point. "Prior to coming to Mid West State and since being here, I had been involved in several projects that were PDS in character and most of my own engagements with schools was similar to the kinds of partnerships that they were pursuing - especially in terms of ethics."

Richard Smith—Richard is a high level administrator of PDS at Mid West State University. He initially became involved through his work as a principal of a mid-west elementary school and has participated from the ground up (or top down) in the implementation and facilitation of the PDS model at Mid West State University.

Vincent Jensen—Vincent is a secondary social studies teacher and has been working with a PDS for about 8 years. He is currently in a leadership role to rethink the PDS as institutional changes affect the future of the social studies group/s. He has also been involved in extension activities such as writing and traveling through his involvement in the PDS.

Janine Wright—Janine is an experienced teacher with almost 30 years in the classroom. "I opened the building and designed the early childhood program here and this is our 25th year here." She was involved from the beginning with an elementary PDS.

Using all of the texts available (interviews, documents, literature) this section will address the seemingly 'neutral' and natural foundations of the PDS model. For example, some of the initial themes that emerged from the interviews included: the desire and seduction of members of the PDS cultures by the university administration; the 'not-knowings' of the participants at their initial introduction to the PDS concept; the ways the PDS cultures travel between the university and the schools; the foundations of the concept
as represented by the Holmes Group; and the negotiations and tensions of 'living’ with PDS. In many ways they are a reflection of the interview schedule and my own a priori assumptions.

The Politics and Ethics of Research

I have always been interested in the ways people became involved in PDS and I wanted to know more about what they thought PDS was. However, it was the counterpoint discussions mentioned above that highlighted my immersion in this project and raised questions about the politics and ethics of my research project. I became quite interested in the questioning concerning my theoretical perspective that occurred on more than one occasion with one particular participant and also with some other members of the PDS community in general.

Bob: I am a bit concerned with what you are going to do with this decontextualized information, Lisa.

Lisa: (in shock) Why is that, Bob?

Bob: Well, it seems rather problematic that you are going to 'take' our words and put them into an organization that fits your theoretical a priori assumptions.

Lisa: I am really concerned that you raised that point. It is something that I have struggled with and continue to struggle with. I am going to address these concerns by raising the issue as a focus question but for me it really comes back to the idea that Popkewitz (1998a) discusses - that 'acceptable' research is supposed to improve the situation and that educational reform is seeking redemption through authentic voices and sites.
Bob: Well, actually, I agree with Popkewitz although I wonder what a historian would say about his theory. I am just wondering about the ethics of the perspective you are using in your work.

Maxine: Actually Bob, I have run into similar problems when I have used a poststructural feminist framework. I do use this lens but its not my only lens. Poststructural feminisms are not interesting to my school colleagues, or even to most of my university colleagues working in PDS.

Bob: Okay - but I have another concern. I did not use the terms desire or seduction in my interview yet I see that you are using them as a framing reference in your project.

Maxine: And although I said PDS was going to die.. I am a little uncomfortable with the Death stuff you have inferred.¹

Lisa: Well, I think it comes back to what issues of interpretation. This is a long running issue in anthropology, for example. It is usually termed the etic/emic issue which talks of the outsider/insider perspective on reality at the heart of ethnographic research, according to Patton (1990). Newer formulations include the ideas of Pitt (1998) which allows me to respond ethically to your concerns whilst remaining faithful to my own frame of understanding. Pitt (1998) suggests

¹ Maxine stated in the interview that she thought PDS would die in the near future due to a lack of resources and commitment from a new administration. Richard also talked of how the parents in schools had at times been the 'death' of PDS efforts. In Johnston et al (Draft 1999), it was stated that some PDSs had 'died' due to failure to meet all of the mandated requirements of the PDS Executive. Although I did not take this theme any further in this project - I wonder about the small deaths in educational reform and how that may speak to the PDS as an object of desire.
that the data says more than the words of the participants. In fact, this new way of addressing this long running issue highlights the idea that the data exceeds representation. So, throughout this study I highlight the blurring of the insider/outsider perspectives by addressing the a priori assumptions of my work and the use of a hybrid analytical framework. My ethical agenda is thus constructed for this specific project as Glesne and Peshkin (1992) highlight that there are no ethical absolutes, and that ethical agendas must be shaped in response to the situation at hand. I hope in doing so that I do not reduce your concerns - but rather I highlight them as valid and important. Does this work for you?

Maxine: Well,... I think so, as long as you clearly frame your analysis and situate yourself in this I am okay with it.

Lisa: Bob?

Bob: I think I still have concerns and I will be satisfied if the final product addresses my concerns.²

² At this stage I realized that the conversations I was having with Maxine and Bob were very different than the conversations I was having with the rest of the group. Was this because they were also 'researchers'? However, Janine was immersed in research issues also, as a doctoral student, and she asked for explanation but basically had no ethical concerns with my work. I wonder about the position of authority with the 'researcher' participants or is it more an issue of institutional investment in PDS? I think this needs to be discussed at some stage later on in this project.

By highlighting their concerns in this presentation of the data, I hope to respond ethically and yet remain faithful to my own frame that the data says more than the words of the participants. The data exceeds representation (Pitt, 1998, p. 542).
Questions of ethic and politics abound in this project. In the initial development of the project, as I stated at the outset, I was blocked physically and psychically. Not only did I find in my early efforts to gain entree that PDS cohorts were protected as 'fragile' environments for this kind of study, the institution in which I reside was named and critically analyzed using texts that precluded anonymity (see preface). And it wasn't just the sites, or individuals that were at risk. My theoretical perspective was also considered risky and dangerous (just as Maxine discussed above). Bob's response showed an awareness of the risks involved in being a participant in the dangerous theorizing embodied within/across this study. Britzman (1998) talks of the two-fold ethic of such work that scrutinizes itself and yet uses the authority of the very institution is aims to deconstruct. Further concerns arose through the use of such 'wild thoughts' and psychoanalysis that trouble the tendency in research for the 'good' of society and the 'betterment' of teacher education (in this instance):

Two problems are now apparent. One concerns the consequences of the educational imperative to settle meaning through its own insistence upon the proper definition, the correct answer, the stable reply, the passionless essay. What would education be like without its categorical imperatives? The other problem concerns the limits placed on learning when education addresses the superego as if it were synonymous to the law, or as if the superego were unaffected by its own history of love (Britzman, 1998, p. 43).

This is not to suggest that by addressing the ethical and political issues I have reached a consensus in this project. Rather, the remainder of this chapter uses an interrupted re-presentation to continue to highlight such issues but also to call into
question my desire as researcher to present a picture of consensus and the impossibilities of doing just that.

Foundations

To then bring us back to the initial questions of the project, I want to focus on the themes and tropes that arose from my data analysis by beginning with my first research question on the foundational assumptions of the PDS model. A number of themes and discourse patterns emerged in the early part of the interviews and the initial analysis of the other texts. This section is an illustration of the foundational assumptions of the PDS model as it occurred at a large research institution in the mid-west. For example, the top-down nature of the PDS initiative and the invitations to be involved outlined above highlight the desires of the ‘University’ and the participants to be involved in an ‘improvement’ or better way of doing teacher education. Who gets invited and who does not? This point speaks to the ‘origins’ of the concept and the call for collaboration from the position of authority and privilege within the University. As outlined in the Draft Evaluation Report (Loadman and Klecker, 1996), the PDS model and subsequent developments at PDS “were based on the Holmes Principles” (p. 2). The call for participation was a public document issued to the public schools in the surrounding districts.

The other texts also suggested the theme of a desire for ‘origins’ of the PDS model. The ‘origin’ of the PDS model, according to the participants, is the College of Education, sometimes even specifically stated as the Dean of the College. In most cases, as discussed in the conversation above, the participants had not heard of PDS or the
Holmes Group before the introduction by the Dean and the College. How does this figure in historicizing PDS? One example is my use the themes - “a not-knowing” and “seduction and desire” - to refer to the moment of introduction.

The next section will illustrate the foundational themes of the PDS model by presenting data excerpts and researcher discussion. The foundational assumptions of the PDS model drawn from the texts included: populist notions of the role of education and teacher education; a ‘natural’ and ‘neutral’ improvement (progress) in teacher education; the possibility of empowerment for all involved (agency); collaboration as work among and between equals (shared power and situated decision-making); and, emphasis on practical training and teacher socialization (professionalism).

*Populist Notions of the Role of Education.* Empowerment, improvement, collaboration, and ‘good’ practice where some of the recurring populist themes that emerged from the data. Labaree (1992), Stanley (1992), Lincoln (1998) and Popkewitz (1998a) highlight the foundations of education and reform efforts in this country as uninterrogated populist and modernist assumptions. Popkewitz (1998a) talks of the ‘American Jeremiad’ that represented the populist beliefs of the dominant culture. The following excerpts have been chosen as illustrative of the populist notions of the PDS model.

---

Maxine did highlight, however, that many of the university professors who ended up working in PDS had already been working with/in the schools with teachers on collaborative inquiry projects and also in efforts to improve teacher education.
Abdal-Haqq's (1998) "Professional Development Schools: Weighing the Evidence," presents both a critical and celebratory text on the PDS model. Abdal-Haqq is a program associate with the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) who published this book as part of a series on 'Critical Issues in Teacher Education.' Her work as a coordinator for the ERIC clearinghouse on Clinical Schools is important to note as her work is celebratory in style although she expresses professional concerns about issues of race, lack of focus on student learning and the exclusivity of PDS.

There was also a lot of 'crisis' talk in the texts. For example, Abdal-Haqq (1998) immediately situates the PDS as arising from fears that the education system was failing and the need for the dissemination of ideas and 'good' practice "from the 'best' PDS sites to the rest of the educational community (Abdal-Haqq, 1998, p. 2). PDS sites, according to Abdal-Haqq (1998) were to be "places to determine what works so that findings can be disseminated to other schools. As such, these schools are intended to play a pivotal role in restructuring public school" (Abdal-Haqq, 1998, p. 4).

Fullan et al (1998) also highlight the PDS model and educational reform effort as a response to the 'crisis' in education calling for 'quality' teachers working in 'professional' settings. And Johnston (1998) talks of the 'crisis as follows:

As at many universities, our reform initiatives grew out of the national critiques of teacher education (Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, 1986; National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983). Ten years after the first Holmes Group publication (1986), there is hardly an educational conference or teacher education institution that has not been touched or taken over by these and other critiques and recommendations, especially the recommendations for Professional Development Schools (PDSs) (Johnston et al., 1998, p.x).
Popkewitz (1998a) discusses ‘crisis’ as a response to the influence of Populism within scientific research which has become manifest in assumptions that knowledge of the sciences can serve democratic ideals of autonomy, empowerment, and emancipation. Teacher education is seen, according to Popkewitz (1998a), as a redemptive project that provides opportunities to create more egalitarian schools and social transformation in general (Goodman, 1995). The notion of professional and professionalization (Labaree 1992) are also central to this discussion. The social institution of the university, as shown in the texts studied, is concerned with the production of knowledge, the development of the ‘expert’ and populist liberal notions of education: “Although professional development schools are new institutions in certain respects, they do have antecedents. Elements of the PDS mission are reflected in the university laboratory or campus schools established under the influence of John Dewey” (Abdal-Haqq, 1998, p. 6).

Historically, this scientific rationalist foundation aimed to produce ‘better’ teachers and better schools. Indeed, the agenda of the administration of the College of Education was often described as a mandate for involvement and for improvement (for more on this see ‘Historicizing PDS’ below). The development of a common scientifically based professional knowledge was outlined clearly in the texts and founded on notions of teacher autonomy, empowerment and merit.

4 Note the use of the discourse of PDS as mission. Further analysis of this theme is presented in the section entitled “Redemption: Strands of Hope through Inquiry and Professional Development.” For example, I found it very useful to move from the idea of PDS as a ‘mission’ to the analysis of the strands of inquiry and professional development in the texts. These strands highlight the ways that in the desire for redemption through PDS (the mission of PDS) may be framed as traveling across/within/around the sites of the university and the schools.
The natural and neutral improvement (or progress) of teacher education is another populist notion represented in the texts. The connected concept of ‘revitalization’ arose repeatedly in the work of Abdal-Haqq (1998). Revitalization (and restructuring) was to be the result of the reform effort at both universities and schools. Indeed, PDS was presented as the ‘engine’ of reform:

Professional development schools (PDSs) emerged in the mid-1980’s as a potentially significant vehicle for advancing both the revitalization of teacher education and the reform of P-12 schooling. They were advocated in several influential reform reports and studies of the era (Carnegie Forum, 1986; Goodlad, 1990; Holmes Group, 1986) (Abdal-Haqq, 1998, p. 2).

Better education and better teaching for the benefit of the children, says Abdal-Haqq (1998), are made ‘possible’ through PDS although she calls the field to task for failing to evaluate the effects of the PDS model on student learning:

Therefore, PDSs play a pivotal role in redesigning and improving preservice and inservice teacher education(Darling-Hammond, 1994). Thus, the PDS becomes the institutional setting where the road to better teacher education and the road to better teaching intersect for the benefit of children (National Commission on Teaching, 1996) (Abdal-Haqq, 1998, p. 5).

The texts do not present the PDS model and the educational reform effort as totally successful, however. “I have come to believe that PDS is no panacea” (Chase and Merryfield, 1998, p. 143). Fullan et al (1998) discuss the ‘stalling’ of the reform effort as a result of the institutional framework. “The effort stalled (which is not to say terminated) when the colleges and schools of education had to think seriously about reforming themselves. They will change only when they really wish to, and not enough yet do” (Fullan et al, 1998, p. xiii).
But there is a consensus in the texts that the PDS model has been an improvement on the previous efforts to educate/professionalize/socialize teachers. “I have been a classroom teacher for more than 30 years and involved with student teachers for a long time. There is no question in my mind that our PDS Network has vastly improved the preparation of preservice teachers” (Chase and Merryfield, 1998, p. 138).

On this theme Johnston (1998) speaks to the adaptation of the Holmes ideas into the diverse PDSs at OSU:

We have developed PDSs in ways that do not conform with the standard Holmes Group recommendation for school-based sites. Our several PDSs grew out of the needs of those who created them and work in them, and there are significant differences between them. The ways collaboration was defined within our PDS projects have also varied considerably. Within this diversity, however, there are shared goals and assumptions that have had a significant impact on schools in the area and on the College of Education (p. x).

Although foundations are mentioned in other chapters, there was a clear emphasis at the beginning of the Johnston et al (1998) text on situating the model. Labaree (1992) states that the Holmes agenda was to increase the status of teacher educators more than reform teaching or schooling as PDSs provided teacher educators with a direct authoritative and influential role in the model.

Victory narratives are also a major part of the discourses surrounding PDS. In the texts studied the critical realist interpretations often highlighted the difficulties of ‘being’ in a PDS and talked of the positive aspects of the model. This insider perspective may be seen as highlighting the redemptive intentions of the PDS project:

Our PDSs have made a difference. Teacher education programs are stronger and more focused now, collaborative work with schools makes it possible to connect
theory and practice, inquiry pervades everything we do, and students come out of these programs with more professional attitudes and abilities that were apparent in earlier, more traditional programs. It is rare to find a PDS participant who does not wax eloquent about the benefits of PDS for teacher education, and also for professional development and school change. In our experience, PDSs do produce many of the things that advocates initially claimed they would (Johnston et al., 1998, p.xi).

A populist notion of agency (or change as a positive outcome of educational reform) is central here. Throughout the texts the possibilities for empowerment for all involved was central. “There is general consensus among education reformers that school restructuring is necessary if schools are to become more enabling and empowering. Effective teachers are seen as central to effective schools” (Abdal-Haqq, 1998, p. 4).

Johnston et al (1998) talk of the difficulties of covering this large and complex reform effort but present definite outcomes as: “teacher education is done differently now, professors and teachers teach differently, and the schools and universities have changed in significant ways” (p.ix). This summarizes the text as an attempt to present critical realist narratives that speak to the challenges, triumphs and difficulties of the PDS reform effort as an effective (if somewhat troubled) agent of change.

However, what work does the PDS tendency to valorize collaboration do? Does PDS valorize agency and change? Britzman (1998) suggests that such curative thoughts in education aim to banish doubt and ambivalence. For example, reflective practice, according to Britzman (1998) reduces corrective practice to a mastery project and critical
thinking valorizes the quest for rationality. Taking this one step further, I suggest PDS not only valorizes collaboration. It also reduces human agency to a governed mentality (Popkewitz, 1998a).

Collaboration is central to the notion of agency. Although the tensions and challenges of collaboration are presented in the texts, the underlying assumptions seem to be that collaboration as 'work among and between equals' is possible. In this instance, collaboration seems to be framed through shared power and situated decision-making, according to the texts studied.

Collaboration is a hallmark of professional development schools. They are partnerships that generally include one or more school districts, one or more colleges or universities, and, in some cases, one or more teachers' unions (Anderson, 1993). PDSs are context oriented and should reflect the geographic, ethnic, and economic diversity of the nation's student population (Holmes Group, 1990; Pasch & Pugach, 1990). PDSs are committed to the simultaneous renewal of both schools and teacher education (Goodlad, 1990) (Abdal-Haqq, 1998, p. 6).

Loadman and Klecker (1996) wrote that the undergirding theory of the Holmes proposal was that change "requires a holistic, long-term collaborative effort between public schools and schools of education for the purpose of improving both". The Draft Evaluation by Loadman and Klecker (1996) suggested a follow-up evaluation of the PDSs be completed specifically looking at the collaborative relationship between the university

---

5 This evaluation report is a College of Education funded document that I had a lot of trouble tracking down. It was mentioned in a number of interviews but I could not find a copy in the archives (although I was assured it was there). Well, after repeated attempts to find it I was finally given a copy (which may be one of the few that the College has) only to find that it was incomplete. This is not to say the College in any way failed in its promise to supply a copy. Rather, that the report writers had not completed the evaluation as requested and thus it was difficult to find.

124
and the schools, the roles of the public administrators, the professional development of

teachers, and student learning. Collaboration was one of the 10 identified common

elements across PDSs according to Loadman and Klecker (1996). Underlying this

attribute of the PDS model is the assumption that there is such a thing as ‘genuine

collaboration’. In contrast, in Johnston et al, (1998), the nature of the PDS as fluid and

constantly changing made it difficult for collaboration to occur.

What happens when key members of the group leave? New participants and new

leadership make it hard to sustain the collaborative goals established by previous

members. Continuity within projects has been challenging because both school-

and university-based participants come and go. If there is genuine collaboration, the

PDS ought to reflect the interests of the present group, and yet, if the present

group is continually changing there is the on-going and time-consuming need to

continually reconstruct goals and procedures. In some of the longer term projects, participants who have been in the PDS for some time, get tired of continually orienting and negotiating with new participants instead of continuing their own professional development. It feels to them like walking backwards to bring new participants along (Johnston, 1998, p. xxiv). [italics mine]

Another foundational assumption illustrated is practical training/teacher

socialization/ and professionalism (Labaree, 1992). The reduction of the theory/practice

Collaboration comes up constantly in the literature. Beyond descriptions of ‘real efforts’
to establish relationships between the university and the school, however, the realist interpretations seem to have silences about just what it is.

Maxine and Janine also talked of this in their interviews. The constantly changing population of the PDS was seen as making it more fluid, less easy to define and more difficult to collaborate. In the poem “Local Discourses: Not Quite Resistance” (below) Vincent talks about the feeling of powerlessness during a transition period in a PDS as similar to dealing with the IRS.
gap is referred to many times in the texts surrounding PDS. The ‘professionalization’ of teaching is a central assumption in the texts surrounding PDS. For example:

Professional development schools are characterized as having three complementary agendas: (1) to provide a context for rethinking and reinventing schools for the purpose of building and sustaining the best educational practices, (2) to contribute to the preservice education of teachers and induct them into the teaching profession, and (3) to provide for continuing development and professional growth of experienced in-service teachers (Loadman and Klecker, 1996, p. 7).

The theme of professional development is recurrent in the texts analyzed. It was pinpointed for evaluation by Loadman and Klecker (1996) and it was also one of the 10 identified common elements across the PDSs according to that report. Fullan et al (1998) outline the desire for professionalism as a central concern of the PDS model:

Has the word ‘professional’ become redundant? The central argument here was that, certainly in the field of education, the word professional had been perilously overused, and especially by unions and other advocates....Holmes, like the 1986 Carnegie Forum, argued instead for a more open, varied, flexible, and lifelong pattern of teacher development, and indeed of diversity of role. The blanket term ‘profession’ did not serve these purposes well. Has the word professional become redundant? No. (Fullan et al, 1998, p. x).

For example: "I learned that there was not a wide gulf between university prescription and classroom practice that some had suggested, at least not among this group" (Miller et al, 1998, p. 157.) And that the PDS allowed for the introduction of more ‘effective’ methodologies, e.g., to be part of a PDS you had to be more student-centered and ready to relinquish some control.

Chase and Merryfield (1998) talk about the aim of professionalization and socialization of student teachers and Cooperating Teachers as central to their PDS experience. "We wanted our preservice teachers to think of themselves as teachers instead of college students and trained ourselves to use the term preservice teachers. We decided to use the term ‘field professor’ for teachers who took on the new roles of designing programs and methods courses, team-teaching methods, mentoring the preservice teachers and researching the progress of the program and its participants" (p.128). Miller et al (1998) talk of PDSs as providing assistance for enabling teachings to engage in long and rewarding careers. For example: "In the PDS, I received support and encouragement from a network of professors and other teachers to expand my professional horizons" (p.153).
Throughout the text edited by Johnston et al (1998), professional development was the focus of the writings of both teachers and faculty. Long term professional growth, the development of new roles and opportunities, researching, writing and presenting about PDS, were some of the examples of professional development included in the text. For example: “Perhaps the most important lesson learned is how important it is that classroom teachers and university professors model the thinking, the teaching, and the learning of outstanding practitioners in social studies and global education” (Chase and Merryfield, 1998, p. 130).

The prestige of universities and teacher education programs is also tied to the notion of professionalism (Fullan et al, 1998, p. xii). As Johnston (1998) states, “a small group of deans saw the possibilities and formed the Holmes Group around a renewed sense of excellence required in their preparation programs, if teaching was ever to attain its rightful stature as a profession” (p.vi). As Johnston (1998) goes on to praise the work of the ‘heroes and heroines’ involved in this reform effort and highlights the ‘naive moment’ of invitation from the university to the schools when the ‘guests’ at the party did

10 The elite nature of the Holmes Group has been discussed in length in the literature and the texts analyzed for this project. However, if we believe ‘excellence’ to be dereferentialized as Readings (1996) suggests, what does the call for professional development mean? Professional development was a central theme in the texts studied. However, within the framework of PDS it was rarely defined or explained. I continue to wonder about the linguistic slippage of the term and how the practices that support professional development and are also antithetical to it under the auspices of PDS.
not really know what a PDS was nor what their role would be in the model. I call this a moment of ‘not knowing’ at the initial introduction of the PDS idea. This leads again to questions of authority and calls for other ways of thinking about PDS beyond the realist interpretations that ultimately fail to capture the elusive qualities surrounding the model.

**Historicizing PDS**

*Lisa:* I keep hearing words like 'encouraged', 'invited', even, 'mandated'. Was it a top-down seduction, then?

*Bob:* I would not use the term seduction. However, certain incentives were held out by the Dean using the autocratic institution to shape the resultant reform ideas. I was interested in asking the question: How are we influencing practice? Are we engaging our students together with teachers in pretty intense conversations around educational issues and making change?

*Richard:* Well, the Holmes Principles were also considered foundational. I was

---

11 And the ‘failures’ or silences of the program areas that could not get a PDS going and still have traditional placements are not discussed in Johnston et al (1998). The limitation is presented but not discussed. Is this a small ‘death’? The ‘death’ of PDS and the small deaths of specific attempts at forming PDSs recurred throughout the texts. I think it would be an useful extension of this study to wonder what it means to ‘die’ in educational reform. These ‘deaths’ may refer to the failed promise of redemption through PDS.

12 For example, Johnston (1998) introduced the edited volume as the stories of the “real settings” of education where parents, children, and families live in the communities. The text is about ‘getting it’ according to the authors. “The book is a realistic portrayal of our reform efforts” (p.xii).
particularly interested in them. I looked at the 6 Holmes Principles and you know they were OK (laugh). But the one that was particularly interesting to me as a Principal was the 6th one which talked about reforming schools and reforming Colleges of Education. So I was really interested in the reform piece of the Holmes principles.13

Lisa: So, who got involved in the beginning?

Richard: Superintendents and schools wanted to get in on the band-wagon. I think this happened because they saw this wonderful opportunity to be on the cutting edge. I was invited to a meeting at the Ackerman Center with Our Dean, and there were some principals and some faculty members, superintendents. The Dean laid out this Holmes Agenda as a way to improve Teacher Education and also reform schools at the same time. And of course, I had known about it because Maxine had been feeding me information. I’m sure that’s why I was there because of my association with Maxine and the work that we had done. The Dean laid out an agenda of how we could begin developing Professional Development Schools.

Loadman and Klecker (1996) also refer to this when they state that the PDS effort at OSU was based on the Holmes (1990) principles and the call for participation was initiated by the College of Education including the definition of PDS as outlined by the Dean. Johnston et al., (1998) call this both top-down and bottom-up reform as the pressure of the Dean to move in the direction of the Holmes Proposals shaped the invitations for participation in the PDS initiative, yet the final ‘shape’ of the PDSs was the result of local and situated influences.
Lisa: How did you feel about being invited to participate?  

Richard: Well, when the Dean actually asked me if I would be interested in co-chairing the PDS with her, I said I would be willing to work with her if I can help reform the College and at the same time she helped reform my school. And so she took that challenge and said that's the way it should be.

Lisa: Why were you so interested?

Richard: We as practitioners in the field were saying, “Now wait a minute, if you use criteria for us to be invited and included, we want some criteria for you.” We knew there were faculty that we had worked with in the past that we really didn’t want to work with (laugh) because they weren’t field-based kinds of people.

Lisa: Who got involved and how?

Richard: We sent out a call for participation for involvement in the Holmes Group Professional Development School project (it was pretty experimental at that time). Most of the people that answered these calls for participation (our school did along with several other schools that Maxine had worked with) were groups of schools that professors had already been working with. There weren’t any that

---

Throughout the 'stories' presented in Johnston et al (1998), the invitation to participate was presented as coming from the university to the school personnel, usually through previously existing relationships with university faculty. This was also highlighted as a tension in the Loadman and Klecker Report (1996) as some of the teachers at a meeting to discuss the PDS initiative felt manipulated for university purposes. However, this was not seen as a problem in the development of 'genuine' collaboration or professional development. Previous relationships had established trust and the initial development of the PDSs focused on addressing problems together as a team (Chase and Merryfield, 1998, p. 127).

Chase and Merryfield (1998) state: “The foundation of our work was laid in our early meetings through the development of mutual respect and trust, a growing commitment to creating a better way together, and a shared vision of our long term goals...” (p. 135).
just sprung up and said we want to do this. These were schools that faculty already had something going on.

Lisa: And what were the requirements for involvement?

Richard: The model was that there would be a field person and a faculty jointly co-ordinating the project. So the Dean asked me if I would co-chair the total PDS program. That’s how I got involved in that. We co-coordinated that and she was very active in that. She wasn’t just a figurehead. We really worked together and worked through all of the problems the schools were having.

Lisa: Everyone I talked to mentioned the Holmes Group as central to the foundation of the project. How were they involved at the College level?

Richard: I really don’t know because I really never had much to do with the governance of Holmes. Its not exactly representative of what the program is all about because its largely made up by faculty and Deans - and there are representatives from the unions, the AFT and the NEA and the American Association of School Administrators. So, there are those groups, but they are more the leadership in those groups rather than people like myself. I really did not have much to do with governance or policy. But anyway, each group involved a faculty person and school people. They had to complete a proposal and then the Holmes Policy Board which was made up of this sort of initial group with additional faculty and additional principals, superintendents, union leaders. We read the proposals and then decided who was ready to be a PDS project. There was an interim evaluation in the middle of the year and then there was a final
evaluation at the end of the year to see how the resources were used. We looked at whether you were meeting all 6 Holmes Principles and it was a really interesting process.\textsuperscript{15}

\textit{Vincent:} I felt initially there was a big focus on a kind of admission of failure from the University. You know, the divide between theory and practice. It was a recognition that both sides were valuable but it was kind of like there was no bridge between them in the old model. So this was an effort to address that. I think from the beginning it was presented as a model that was not only about teacher education but was about professional development for existing teachers.

\textit{Lisa:} Tell me more about the theory and practice gap and PDS.

\textit{Vincent:} OK, here is theory and here is practice [holding his hands far apart].\textsuperscript{16} We as teachers have something really important to offer in terms of the theoreticians who are educating the preservice teachers and they have something valuable to offer us in terms of the research that would instruct our practice. So I think it was always presented as a bridge between those two and as an opportunity for

---

\textsuperscript{15} According to Loadman and Klecker (1996) the evaluation of the proposals was guided by a committee of the Professional Development Board which would address "the predictable and unforeseen obstacles" that would occur as PDS was not clearly defined and there were few working models to use as guides. This executive group may be seen as a legislative authority or legitimization effort from the institution resulting in effects of power that normalized the PDS reform effort.

\textsuperscript{16} Labaree (1992) and Britzman (1998) talk of the valorization of practice in PDS settings. The failure of theory is seen as an opening for more ‘authentic’ learning through practice. However, Britzman (1998) uses the work of Siegfried Bernfield to illustrate her point: "If the consolation of theory cannot diminish the antinomy [conflict] between the teacher and the learner, neither can, for Bernfield, the resolution we call ‘practice’ (p.25).
outstanding teachers to help be involved in shaping the future of the profession.\textsuperscript{17}

\textit{Lisa}: So, how would you define the goals of the PDS model?

\textit{Vincent}: I guess I would say the goal of PDS is to provide a bridge between theory and practice in preservice education simultaneously providing improved preservice education for aspiring teachers and providing professional development for existing teachers. It’s about improving preservice education and it’s about giving teachers a chance to develop professionally. But how it is done is different and it’s based to some degree on the needs of the preservice teacher but its also based to some degree on the structure of the environment. For example, in an elementary school, you have a setting where a teacher can have all experiences with one teacher whereas in a high school it’s different because it is subject specific. So, there is just different constraints and different circumstances that affect it. There are also the personalities of the professors at the University who have different agendas and different philosophies and ideologies that drive them

\textsuperscript{17} The summary of the Interim Reports outlined by Loadman and Klecker (1996) highlight the need for more time, money and University support for the PDS efforts in the schools. Interestingly, the use of Holmes ‘language’ and vision was noted as central to one PDS but others had not adopted the language. The question was raised: Did that mean they had not adopted the vision, either? This issue draws attention to the tensions that exist in the discourse practices of the Holmes Group and PDS. The diffusion of the Holmes rhetoric in the PDSs may seen as a blurring or sharing of distinct yet related discourse practices. Similar blurring occurs when the PDSs and the COE Master of Education programs are discussed.
and that's why each one probably takes a different shape.\textsuperscript{18}

\textit{Lisa}: So, how does the College shape the situational constraints of PDS?

\textit{Vincent}: Well, I mean, look, the University, while initially touting how excited they were about how all of the PDS's were different, would hold that line for a point but then they weren't comfortable with how different they were. We had a lot of trouble establishing ourselves as a reputable legitimate PDS because we weren't a 'Site'.\textsuperscript{19}

(A summary and discussion of the findings will follow the next section).

The next conversation creates a space from which to begin to historicize the PDS model at this particular institution as a mandated reform effort. At this stage I will not

---

\textsuperscript{18} However, a number of texts mentioned the increasing institutionalization of the PDSs as positive as a legitimation process. "What started as rather autonomous and sometimes maverick PDS project are now fully institutionalized into certification programs with wider participation of university faculty. Almost all certification students in the college, with the notable exception of educational administration, now do their internships in PDS settings" (Johnston, 1998, p. xx).

Institutionalization was an intended outcome or goal for some PDSs: "We are still working on the compensation, rewards, and recognition that must be in place for institutionalization of a professional development school" (Chase and Merryfield, 1998, p.135)

\textsuperscript{19} Other tensions presented by Clinical Educators at the March 16, 1994 meeting included resistance to the top-down evaluation from the University, the feeling that they were being 'recruited' by the University as potential PhD students, and the lack of representation of Clinical Educators on the PDS Policy Board. The resulting program addressing these concerns was not outlined in Loadman and Klecker's (1996) Draft Report.

This issue of top-down negotiation also came out in Johnston et al (1998) as the funding of the PDSs was determined through an evaluative policy board at the College level and some early PDSs did not receive funding as they did not 'fit' the mandated model. This top-down mandate later loosened and accepted 'other ways of being' a PDS with subsequent recognition through funding and tuition waivers etc...
directly address the issues of tensions on the PDS although it will be an integral part of the discussion in the section on the fluidity or rethinking of PDS in the final section of this chapter.

*Invitations to a PDS Party: Or Are You Crazy?*

*Lisa:* What is your story of PDS? How did you get involved?

*Maxine:* When I first heard of the PDS idea in the College it felt to me like a window to do what I wanted to do, however, not necessarily to do what the Holme’s Group was about although that rhetoric was initially useful to say, “We’re going to do it differently. We are going to do it collaboratively. We are going to think particularly about what we do. And do you want to do this? And, if we are going to do this let’s do it together and create something that makes sense to us not to somebody else.” Initially it was a nice platform to work off of because it had lots of goodies attached to it for teachers and times and space and resources they don’t usually have. And it gave me time and resources that I wouldn’t have otherwise. So, I felt very exploitive (laugh).²⁰

*Lisa:* Exploitive not exploiter (laugh)?

*Maxine:* Well, actually it was a lot of work and you don’t get compensated for

---

²⁰ Desire and resistance as responses to the possibilities of redemption offered in the PDS initiative are common throughout the texts. In this case, Maxine is intrigued with the possibilities of ‘doing teacher education more effectively’ with teachers in schools. A variety of levels of desire are apparent in the texts, from institutional desire to be on the ‘cutting edge’, to schools desire to be involved to reform both universities and schools and to get such benefits as tuition waivers, and the desire of the teachers to have more ‘say’ in teacher education.
what you do and I have no idea the kind of time it would take to build those kind of relationships across that many schools with that many people. I had originally received some funding from the quin-centennial committee on Campus to run a collaborative project with some of the schools to develop curriculum that would take a critical look at this for elementary schools. So, I had about 40 teachers from 6 schools that were doing this project first. I knew PDS was coming and because I was interested in sites for my student teachers, I started to talk about reform and collaboration as the basis of this initiative. And a year later, proposals for PDS's came out from the College and we applied to be a PDS. So, its starts one way and it moves into being a PDS but with very little disruption because what we were doing was already what I envisioned or wanted to try in terms of teacher education.

Lisa: It also seems quite central to your scholarship, as well.

Maxine: Well, my story is that I've sort of stuck with it because I keep learning a lot and its been a very provocative place for me, for my teaching, for my research, for my work within the College. Its allowed me to do mostly what I want to do rather than what other people wanted me to do. And, so I've stuck with it out of that interest. And, I think a lot of it has to do with an intrigue with how universities who do one kind of thing or set of things, and schools where the interests and politics are different, how those two groups can work together in a way that makes sense around new kinds of goals for teachers in political contexts and current situations. You know, how do we educate teachers not just to learn
how to teach but to be aware of and critical of and ready to deal with the larger political context in which education is based.

Lisa: Bob, what’s your framework for involvement in PDS?

Bob: When the PDS concept was introduced in the College, I was not in an administrative role. In my view the concept was rather vague, indeed, more emerging than present. As you may not be aware, the arguments made for the PDS and MEd’s were made on route to saying that we were going to become more economically sound; that we were going to move into graduate education and all of the typical Holmes arguments. Which is now viewed as problematic. But this transition into a Master’s degree as a preparation for teachers was argued on the basis that it would give a return financially.

Richard: Actually, when I first heard about PDS I was a Principal in an elementary school. We had student teachers and participating teachers in the old undergraduate program and then the College of Education endorsed the Holmes agenda and voted to become a part of the Holmes Group. This was all unbeknownst to me - I had never even heard about the Holmes Group. We had a pretty rich history of working with the traditional student teaching program, so when Maxine Greenwood introduced herself and her work to myself and the staff there was a real interest. We thought PDS was a neat idea. Particularly since we had been involved in teacher education and had a lot of teachers from the College of Education.

Janine: Maxine was the one who introduced me to the concept of PDS, too.
Maxine came to us and made a presentation about a Professional Development School - we didn’t know anything about it. We looked at her and said “Are you crazy, Maxine?” and then different people started trying it out and more people got involved. People leave and people come in - it’s been very fluid.

Vincent: I was also invited to be involved by an MWSU faculty member. She invited me at that time to participate, I think probably the way people get invited to parties or to be friends with somebody. Somebody whose in charge of making sure a PDS happens, which is the university professor, says - “Who do I know who I think would be someone I would like to work with?”, and they all know teachers by virtue of having worked, and some of them know more teachers than others. When she first said “You know, I’d like you to be involved. I’ve got this group of Master teachers” (I don’t know, forming the Master Race -laugh- I don’t know what she meant). I guess I was just flattered that she had invited me to participate. I suppose at the beginning she talked to me about the fact that it was related to training new teachers. And I thought, you know, that sounds good. At the meeting it became more clear what we were talking about was basically collaboratively training teachers. I think every teacher in the group felt valued and felt a sense of responsibility to participate.

21 It was something new and exciting for those ‘invited’ into the conversation. The source of the invitations and the ‘origins’ of the reform movement have not been researched beyond critical realist issues of power and authority. Labaree’s work (1992), for example, talks of the rhetoric that frames the PDS but the data here highlights the fact that there was a ‘not knowing’ moment within this experience that could be translated into a dance of seduction with an initial desire to be involved in a ‘better’ type of teacher education.
Disruptive Thoughts. A number of important themes and ideas emerged in the previous re-presentations of data. At this stage I wish to briefly highlight their importance. Firstly, my attempts to historicize PDS led to different issues and tensions. I used the idea of an ‘invitation’ because it not only emerged from the data, but it was also an evocative idea from which to problematize the relatively uncomplicated discussions that often frame PDS. I used ‘invitation’ to frame my ethnographic moment of entry and also to double as the moment of mutual ‘not knowing’/‘seduction’ by participants and the institution itself within the initial presentation of the ideas and promise of PDS. Multiple reasons for responding to the initial invitation were given. For example, the interest of Maxine in fitting in her established collaborative projects with a mandated reform effort and Richard’s desire to reform schools and universities. The ‘invitational’ moment also brings to bear questions about who gets invited and the unwritten/invisible criteria for selection to this culture of reform. What makes a ‘good’ PDS teacher, professor, school site? This is an interesting place that suggests possibilities for further research as I will discuss in chapter 5.

The ‘origins’ of PDS were also touched upon and the levels of ‘origin’ include: the Holmes Group as divorced from the PDS practitioners (professors and teachers); the College of Education administration (the Deans); the professors call for participation from within established university/school collaborative projects; and the official call for participation from the College of Education. These multiplicities reflect the legitimization of PDS through the institution of the College of Education and the rhetoric of the Holmes Group.
Historicizing PDS also led to a discussion of the populist assumptions which framed the 'crisis' talk that in some ways 'created' or led to the reform effort of PDS. These assumptions have been outlined earlier in detail. Briefly, the populist assumptions discussed include: agency, progress, collaborative decision making and empowerment couched within a discourse of professionalism. The 'crisis' talk, according to Popkewitz (1998a) served democratic ideals of empowerment and emancipation and called for an 'improvement' in public education that was historically preceded by the work of John Dewey and the laboratory schools (Labaree, 1992; Popkewitz, 1998a; Abdal-Haqq, 1998).

Another way of looking at this is through the work of Britzman (1998) who talks of the curative thoughts that frame education and I connected this to the calls for revitalization, restructuring and reform.

Historicizing PDS as a technology of power also arose through the texts as PDS was seen as the 'engine' of reform in teacher education (Abdal-Haqq, 1998). The accompanying prestige of using the PDS model in teacher education programs led to what Fullan et al (1998), using the work of Gehrke (1991), called a 'trophy mentality'. PDS was seen as a symbol of cutting edge reform in teacher education. Distinct, yet related to this point, is the framing of professionalization as the solution (cure) for the ills of teacher education. This includes the development of the profession from an historically feminized profession to a more rigorous, masculinized profession (Labaree, 1992). Playing with the idea of professional development (and development of the profession) I also highlighted the goal of increased status for the institutions and the professionals involved in PDS.
through the ‘improvement’ of teacher education enhanced by the PDS model (Labaree, 1992; Johnston et al, 1998; Popkewitz, 1998a).

It was interesting to note the confessional moments in the texts studied that highlighted the tensions and challenges in ‘doing’ PDS. However, in many cases it seemed to me as if these tensions were glossed over in the name of educational reform and progress. Therefore, I am left wondering what it means to succeed or fail in PDS? The symbols of success seemed to be the establishment of collaborative relationships, research agendas (especially for the professors involved), and collaborative publications from within the PDSs. For example, I continue to wonder about what constitutes failure or death in PDS.

This brief summary of data that addressed research question one has attempted to historicize the agenda of PDS as a call for improvement, empowerment, and emancipation framed within populist assumptions of progress and agency.

Redemption: Strands of Hope through Inquiry and Professional Development

All of this talk of invitations and the professional responsibility of teachers to be involved in teacher education and of teacher educators to work collaboratively with the schools suggests more than an interest in improving teacher education. Therefore, when I began this project I became very interested in the work of Thomas Popkewitz (1998a) and his idea of the Redemptive Project of the social and educational sciences. This section will attempt to shed light on the usefulness of Popkewitz’s concept of redemption (strands of which have already revealed themselves in the earlier part of this chapter). Therefore, the narrative I use to re-present the data of this project below is important as I am fully
immersed in this explication. It is a first person reflective narrative (with footnotes interrupting the narrative). I created this narrative using notes and comments from my research journal and then re-framed it as a reflective piece to highlight the initial impetus for this study and my desire as a researcher to ‘know more’ about this model.

Professional Angst

I’ll never forget my first glimpse of OSU. I was overwhelmed. The place was enormous. I had no idea of the ‘importance’ of the place in the American Academy and especially in teacher education. However, I was soon introduced to the philosophy and conceptualization of the teacher education program. I recall hearing about the Holmes Group and wondering what all that was about. As a Graduate Teaching Assistant in the Social Studies and Global Education program, I was introduced as a ‘member’ of a Professional Development School in my role as University Supervisor. What occurred next I can only describe as professional angst and may have resulted in this very dissertation. I felt marginalized and an outsider in the PDS. My role had changed from teacher to supervisor and I was not in a position of power or control any more. After 10 years of teaching at secondary and tertiary levels I was hurt. Didn’t I have anything to offer? However, I was being paid to do my Ph.D. and this was my ‘job’. As I became more comfortable with my role in the PDS I began to see the positive aspects of the model, but I also continued to question it. It was constantly presented as the answer to the problems of the ‘traditional’ model. It was the focus of many of the conferences I attended on teacher education and social studies. As a supervisor I wondered about this trend. I have always tended towards the critical and this came out in my early work. I was using a critical position to dogmatize and much of my work at that time reflected my belief that I ‘knew’ better and that the valorization of the PDS model was problematic.

This project has been a constant struggle. I have been faced many times with my own dogmatism. Therefore, by moving the focus from the presumed usefulness of the redemptive culture idea to question its usefulness as an

---

22 It is interesting to note that in Johnston et al (1998) the chapters are written by university professors, university administrators, clinical educators (teachers) and field professors (teachers). There is very little reference to the role of the university supervisor and I have concluded that the ‘voices’ of the supervisors are silenced in this text. Although this study does not directly address this silence, I believe that a study of this group of people would provide fresh insight into PDS as a technology of power.
interpretive frame, I hoped to grow as a researcher in ways that will lead me to more exciting possibilities in my research. So, as I grew out of my professional angst and beyond assumptions of the usefulness of this theoretical frame I searched through my data looking for signs and phrases that encouraged an informed discussion on the topic of redemption. What I found was very interesting.

As a result of this reflection I began each interview by questioning the usefulness of the idea of the redemptive culture as presented by Popkewitz (1998a) and attempted to provide spaces for a discussion of this idea but in only two cases did the participants engage. Both participants were university professors familiar with the work of Thomas Popkewitz. From a position of authority they spoke briefly to his idea and there was agreement that it was very useful but certainly not the 'whole' truth about PDS or educational research in general. The school 'people' did not engage in a discussion about the usefulness of the idea but expressed general interest in this 'new' way of looking at PDS. What did this mean?

23 I had originally considered giving the Popkewitz (1998a) article to all of the participants to read but decided this would make it too central to the discussion and in a way colonize the participants even further with my a priori assumptions.

24 The responses of the 'university people' in the study to the initial questioning of Popkewitz's idea and the counter-point discussion after I had done my initial analysis was very interesting. I found myself somewhat intimidated by the responses of 'researchers' to my own research. Although I always received support and encouragement for taking a different approach to teacher education discourses - I also felt open to criticism for my theoretical position. This was an epiphany for me as I realized the fragility of research and the ethical issues of the critical perspective (as well as being reminded yet again of the vulnerability of my own position as student researcher immersed in the very project I was attempting to study). Finally, I want to highlight the flip-side of this situation - my marginalized and vulnerable position became a powerful place from which to think 'wildly' about PDS. This was an unexpected outcome of my need to theorize and question.
The analysis of the interview transcripts and the critical discourse analysis of the other texts provided more information. Two main themes of 'redemption' stuff came up: professional development to 'save' the teachers and teacher educators; and inquiry as the traveling culture of the University onto/within/into the schools. However, I needed to revisit Popkewitz's (1998a) idea to situate the data. He talks about the idea that science is to 'save' the child and 'rescue' the child and society. According to Popkewitz (1998a) the rhetorical constructions of educational research and reforms are a reflection of the 'educational realities' socially constructed through the sanctioned role of the scientist (a role previously reserved for religious transformative cosmologies). That is, the scientist/researcher/reformer/teacher educator/teacher, aims to 'save and rescue' the child through reform efforts such as the PDS model.

Generally, the theme of educational reform as 'saving' the teacher and thus saving the child was evident in all texts studied. Fullan et al (1998), Abdal-Haqq (1998) and Johnston et al (1998) all discuss the success of the Holmes Group in bringing reform in teacher education to national attention. The American Jeremiad is described by Popkewitz (1998a) as a coalition of intellectual critique couched within assertions of social progress reflecting populist ideals about school reform. Labaree (1995) also talks of the populist rhetoric that has shaped discourse on educational reform as seen in the Holmes Group work.

The most salient change since 1986 has without doubt been the installation of teacher education reform at or near the head of every agenda for educational regeneration: a hitherto neglected or subordinate theme has become dominant. Just as it has emerged as a commonplace that reform cannot be achieved without good teachers, so it has become axiomatic that good teachers need and deserve a
first-class preparation. After some real or alleged initial reticence, the pursuit and achievement of greater equity - and the concomitant development of a teaching force more reflective of the accelerating diversity of American society as a whole - has been inserted at the core of teacher education reform (Judge, in Fullan et al, 1998, p. vii).

To this end the PDS became both symbol and mandated requirement for inclusion in the reform movement (Fullan et al, 1998). There was almost a ‘trophy mentality’ of PDSs even though “many of our interviews suggested the gap between rhetoric and reality is wide” (p. 31).

The impact of PDSs, nevertheless, is readily apparent in the publications produced by PDS participants ..... This book and other writings and presentations describe ways in which interns are better prepared, professional development is accomplished, and school and college programs are changing. This is a reform initiative that has actually promoted reform. Few people who have had substantive involvement with PDSs feel their time has been wasted; typically they are tired but exuberant about what they have learned and how they have changed (Johnston, 1998, p. xxv).

Embedded within this success have been themes of redemption as defined by Popkewitz (1998a) such as calls for equity, improvement and collaboration. The Holmes Principles were outlined by Loadman and Klecker (1996) as common elements of the College of Education’s PDS initiatives: (1) Teaching and learning for understanding; (2) Creating a learning community; (3) Teaching and learning for understanding everybody’s children; (4) Continuing learning by teachers, teacher educators, and administrators; (5) Thoughtful long-term inquiry into teaching and learning; and, (6)

25 According to Gehrke, (in Fullan et al, 1998), many teacher education programs displayed PDSs as trophies that legitimized membership in the Holmes Group and represented efforts to be at the cutting edge of teacher education reform.
Inventing a new institution (Holmes Group, 1990, as quoted in Loadman and Klecker, 1996, p. 3).

As I analyzed the texts for emergent themes I realized that this framework was useful as an attempt to historicize and understand reform rather than critically position PDS as merely a technology of power. This was an important insight as a researcher attempting ‘other’ ways of theorizing PDS.

How does the fact that PDS was seen as a ‘good’ thing reflect a redemptive project? The discourse surrounding the PDS reflects the tendencies of reform moves towards social administration. This is founded upon the idea that schooling historically aimed to rescue the child to become a self-disciplined productive citizen (Popkewitz, 1998b). In this case, the PDS is often presented as saving teachers and teacher educators by producing ‘better’ teachers and thus reforming schools and universities to become more ‘equitable’ institutions. The discourses surrounding PDS support a scientific rationalist approach claiming professionalism through rigorous teacher education programs, increased certification and standards whilst masculinizing the profession to produce ‘good’ citizens and encourage social progress (Labaree, 1992).

PDS is seen as an improvement (a natural progression) in teacher education, that shares assumptions and goals (such as, reform, professional development and inquiry). In the College of Education, the PDS evaluation forms developed by the evaluation sub-committee as a pilot study sent to each PDS coordinator highlighted the central themes as “Ongoing involvement in teacher education; professional development as a central goal; and inquiry as a means to reflection and change” (Loadman and Klecker, 1996, p. 37).
PDS is presented as a 'better' teacher education model resulting in 'better' teaching practice for the 'benefit' of children (Abdal Haqq, 1998, p. 5).

When Maxine introduced the idea of PDS we heard that it would give practicing teachers a larger voice in how teachers were being trained. We had a definite interest in that. We like the idea of reforming the College of Education as the College helped to reform our school. It was a two way thing (Richard).

And:

Within this diversity [of PDSs], however, there are shared goals and assumptions that have had a significant impact on schools in the area and the College of Education (Johnston, 1998, p. x).

However, Fullan et al (1998) and others often attempt to interrupt their own call for redemption by highlighting the difficulties and challenges (and in some cases, failure) of PDS work:

After a decade of pioneering work, the field of education is significantly better off because of the work of the Holmes Group and its success in bringing national attention to reform in teacher education.

However, the real question remains—has anybody had a major impact on the field of teacher education? Substandard practices persist in the shadows of spotlighted reform efforts such as the Holmes Group, the National Network for Educational Renewal, the Renaissance Group and others, speaking to the enormity and complexity of changing institutions that are a century old. What then are the issues facing the future of teacher education, and more especially—what are the prospects, this time, for real reform? (Fullan et al, 1998, p. 53).
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The call for ‘real’ reform in this text is presented here to highlight the desire of the field for reform in teacher education. I have wondered about this call for the ‘real’ and this wondering led me to the wild thought of considering PDS as an object of desire. This is explained more fully in the final sections of this chapter. However, it also presents the possibility of reform as a mastery project designed to perfect (or normalize) education and individual students through education (Britzman, 1998). See the poem on Local Discourses and Authenticity, for more on this desire for the ‘real’ or ‘authentic’ in PDS.
However, the goal of professional development as ‘saving’ the teacher seemed to be central to the discourses around PDS: “Overall, we are convinced that our PDSs are better preparing future professionals, supporting our own professional growth, and contributing significantly to reform in the schools and at the university” (Johnston, 1998, p. xxv). From the principles of the Holmes Group, as mentioned in Loadman and Klecker’s Report (1996) to my discussions with PDS participants, professional development was often described as the most important outcome of involvement in the PDS (Johnston, 1998, p. xi).

For example:

Classroom teachers should enter PDS relationships because they want to grow as professionals and believe they have something to contribute to the profession (Chase and Merryfield, 1998, p. 138).

*A Brief Interruption.* What does this mean? It suggests that the call for reform was top-down and reflected the way the university culture (such as, research and inquiry) have been visited upon the schools through PDS.

Troubling the usefulness of Popkewitz’s (1998a) conceptualization of the redemptive culture was a central research question of this project. This section presents a summative interruption designed to frame the final section of this discussion of redemption. I interrupt at this time because I want to draw together the connections I have made from my critical discourse analysis of the texts. The two framing goals of PDS that arose in this section highlight the redemptive nature of PDS. They are the call for professional development and the centrality of inquiry (or research) in PDS. The tensions
that exist between these goals and the social administration of education, according to Popkewitz (1998a) are further evidence of the construction of PDS as a reform effort within the redemptive culture of the social and educational sciences.

When I first presented Popkewitz’s (1998a) idea to the participants for discussion in the interviews I was surprised (as stated earlier) that the only discussion around this point came from the two university ‘people’ interviewed. I continue to wonder what this means for research of this nature. At no time did my participants reach a consensus on the usefulness of this idea but does that mean it is not useful? Is consensus necessary for framing something as useful? In the following I present further data that suggests that the idea of the redemptive culture is a useful framework but certainly not the only way of looking awry at PDS (McCoy, 1995).

In the following conversation, I have used excerpts from the interview transcripts to highlight the theme of redemption in the discourses surrounding PDS. Following the strands of inquiry and professional development, I constructed the data to re-present themes tied to redemption in the ‘talk’ about PDS in an effort to consider the usefulness of Popkewitz’s (1998a) conceptualization of the redemptive culture in the social and educational sciences.

*From Redemption to Desire - Both/And*

*Lisa*: Why did you get involved in PDS?

*Janine*: I really stuck to the PDS all those years because of the conversations (around teaching). We could really go deeply into a text (or
inquiry) if a project group was interested in it. We have been through a lot of philosophical (and wonderful) ups and downs. That intrigued me and kept me in PDS for a long time.

Richard: Well, I see it really as a culture of professional development, it's a culture that embraces professional development, it's a culture that in a sense promotes research, promotes professional development, it promotes teachers looking at themselves, being reflective, it promotes people being able to talk openly about their practice. And hopefully even [defending] critiquing their practice - they may even say to a colleague - 'I need help with this. Could you help me?' I think you're getting to something other than protocols - some of those types of things that are part of PDS.

Vincent: For me it's a second job. I think a lot of us were people who wanted to have advanced professional experiences without giving up teaching.

Lisa: Why is professionalizing so important?

Vincent: It's because of the broader societal view that Money Talks. Doctors make a lot of money -teachers don't. Doctors are important- teachers aren't. You know, pharmaceutical companies throw gifts and money all over doctors. We don't get anything. You know, textbook companies will occasionally take you to dinner but they are not offering you a thousand dollars to go to a seminar in Florida for a week. That's probably why the professors in the School of Medicine make a ton more money than the professors in the School of Education. So I think to some degree it's the kind of stratification of hierarchy of professions. You
don’t hear people saying ‘I hope your daughter marries a teacher,’ (Laugh). But there’s no embarrassment - they say ‘Oh, I hope your daughter grows up to marry a doctor,’ ... And it’s not that people are saying that medicine is more important than education. Their just saying ‘I hope you marry someone rich’ and doctor means rich.

This conversation moves the reader from the ‘neutral’ position of PDS as created ‘for’ the professional development of teachers to the more complicated construction of PDS as a reform effort ‘developing’ the ‘profession’. The talk of money and status in Vincent’s interview led me to wonder about the use of the medical school model for the development of the PDS model and the accompanying status symbols of money and improved social standing (Labaree, 1992; Abdal-Haqq, 1998; Fullan et al, 1998). Themes of professional development, bridging theory and practice, and improving teacher education can all be theorized as goals within the overall project of making ‘better’ teachers, that is, saving or rescuing the teacher through masculinizing and redeeming teacher education thus regulating the norms and standards that frame it. The ‘development’ of the profession and improving the status of teachers seems central to these themes.

The question then, is - how do these ideas travel between the universities and the schools in PDS? The texts discussed above reflect the desire of teachers, university professors and academic authors to reform teacher education through PDS. PDS, as discussed earlier, may be framed as redemptive through the discourse practices that
surround it. From a desire for ‘real’ reform to an increase in status and from professional development to the development of the profession, I think looking at PDS as part of the redemptive culture of the social and educational sciences is a useful way to complicate the model. The next section continues this complication by highlighting inquiry as a central goal of PDS and as part of the ‘culture’ of the PDS that travels from/across/within the university and schools involved.

Even though it may be quite useful to view the PDS as part of the redemptive project of social and educational research, there are other things to consider here. It is more than redemptive - it is about desire and travel, it is fluid and blurs location. As discussed earlier in this project, looking at sites and location differently allows for an epistemological turn towards a state of flux and away from the static representation of culture/s. Throughout my study I asked questions about how the ‘culture’ of the PDS traveled and analyzed the texts for signs and suggestions that blurred location and questioned the idea of ‘home’ in PDS. Interestingly enough, the results both supported and disrupted the idea of travel as an organizing theme.

The direct responses to the question of ‘travel’ in the interviews suggested this was a theme worth researching further using an ethnographic approach. It is possible that all teacher education efforts ‘travel’ in some way, and I aim to look further into this idea in the future. The following excerpt has been constructed from the interview data to highlight the issue of travel and PDS.
Lisa: So, how does PDS travel and why?

Vincent: Well, you know, it's a university agenda and no matter where we do PDS we are doing it because the university's telling us to do it. And there's also a general sense of intellectual and academic rigor in the PDS model that one would expect in a university setting (the readings, the requirements and those things.) I don't think because you switch sites that suddenly any of that disappears. I think the presence of the professor is still there. The university professor travels. Even if the university professor is not teaching there is still that element of university requirements there. For example, when we start class by saying "You need to get this in - the quarter is ending at this point, we are coming up to midterms so you have to hand in this or that." And so there is the university schedule, the University syllabus, culture, the reading list, all of those things are still there and the actual University faculty presence is still there.

Lisa: So what carries back to the university from the schools? What culture is traveling back to the university in this model?

Vincent: Well, I suppose the culture of the schools travels back to the university does so through a single point of light - which is that individual professor. I mean I don't know that the cultures of the school really affect anything in the university other than that Professor. I mean it certainly hasn't affected the university's perspective on who does the work. The preservice teacher pays the money to get the degree and/or certification which is sanctioned by the university. It doesn't
travel back to the university in terms of recognition or compensation. To the university we are still probably just people who are helping out their professors.

Vincent is speaking from a position of dissatisfaction and frustration with university restrictions as his PDS cohort face the unknowns of a restructured future within the PDS network. However, several central ideas come out of this description of the ‘traveling’ culture of PDS that also occurred in other texts, mainly, that the culture that travels is unevenly distributed, with the suggestion that the ‘home’ of PDS is the university (also suggested by the top-down initiation of the PDS reform movement). However, this conclusion is problematic as it does not blur the boundaries of being in the PDS sufficiently. This is a useful place from which to rethink the representation of PDS and the desire for an ‘authentic’ truth in research. I use the next section to question the assumptions that PDS sites are more authentic in schools or universities.

Janine suggested that her preservice teachers were amazed at the way ‘good’ practice traveled back to the university and this reflects Labaree’s (1992) idea that practice is more central to the PDS philosophy than theory:

Vincent also mentions the preservice teachers as clients of the university, as they pay for their certification. This would be an interesting space from which to study PDS as a ‘ruin’ of the university that attempts to produce ‘enlightened citizens’ through the legitimization of technical knowledge and scientific rationalism.
Janine: I think from a preservice teacher's point of view, they felt the exact opposite of the university traveling TO the schools. They found that what they were learning at our school was going back to the University - to inform the University.

Therefore, by focusing on the idea of travel I have found a useful space from which to trouble my own desire for origins in this research project. I was interested to note that in the texts analyzed there were a lot of data supporting the idea that the PDS model 'began' with the Holmes Group and the Administration of the College of Education. Such as: "Our Deans ..... tried to create a climate that encouraged, even mandated, the development of the PDSs" (Johnston, 1998, p. x). In this way, the agenda of the university becomes paramount in the creation and institutionalization of the PDS model. The resources (time and space) and funding (tuition waivers and faculty lines) were used as incentives for projects to transport the central ideas of research and reform to the schools.

It is the research goal of PDSs that raises the most fundamental questions and limitations of this strategy. PDSs were supposed to help the teaching profession in six fundamental ways:
1. By promoting much more ambitious conceptions of teaching and learning on the part of prospective teachers in universities and student in schools.
2. By adding to and reorganizing the collections of knowledge we have about teaching and learning.
3. By ensuring that enterprising, relevant, responsible research and development is done in schools.
4. By linking experienced teachers' efforts to renew their knowledge and advance their status with efforts to improve their schools and to prepare new teachers.
5. By creating incentives for faculties in the public schools and faculties in the education schools to work mutually.

However, how do I trouble my own desire to ‘know’ the origins and home of PDS? I am interested in the way the redemptive project to govern/save/rescue the teacher traveled from the university to the schools and back again. I wonder about the usefulness of this interpretation and suggest that it has some interesting possibilities as an area for future study.

The obligation to include inquiry in all PDSs has presented a challenge. This expectation added another layer to an already full reform effort. As clinical settings we were supposed to study what we did in order to inform further development and also to add to the scholarly literature. Many faculty working in PDS were untenured and were well aware of the need to make their work into publications. School-based participants, however, were typically leery on inquiry. They did not feel like researchers, nor did they initially want to turn into, or be turned into, mini-professors. There are no tangible rewards in schools for doing this kind of inquiry and writing, and even less time for actually getting the work done (Johnston, 1998, p. xxi).

Any attempt to define and locate PDS is problematic, however, as I analyzed the usefulness of Popkewitz’s (1998a) theoretical framework and considered the traveling nature of the PDS model I was also began to entertain some wild possibilities that such analyses makes room for in the data analysis. Using the work of Britzman (1998) and Pitt (1998) in conjunction with Popkewitz (1998a) and Labaree (1992) I moved to thoughts of desire, seduction and redemption in PDS. It is clear from the data analysis that PDS is more than the critical realist interpretation allows. It was not until I moved into the realm of signifiers and the unconscious that I could move beyond the givens to the ‘as ifs’.
Wild Thoughts and ‘As Ifs’

Using Critical Discourse Analysis (Fairclough, 1995) as my method of analysis has led me to three discourse levels in my attempts to think wildly about PDS. Any stratification is problematic and reifies epistemological boundaries, however, for the purposes of this study, I am following Fairclough (1995) by dividing the societal, institutional and local discourses into separate pockets of analysis to provide a more accessible presentation of the data. For example, the societal level will be used to represent the redemptive possibilities and goals of the PDS as a reform movement. The institutional level considers the possibilities of the desire of the university and schools to ‘jump on the wagon’ (Maxine) of PDS - thus making it an object of desire leading to status, power, and institutional reform. The local discourse analysis suggests that PDS is both consciously and unconsciously an object of desire for voice, professional development and collaboration.

Free verse will be used to reflect the wild thoughts in a more artistic and imaginative manner. Richardson (1997; 1994) supports the act of writing as a method of inquiry. “Understanding language as competing discourses, competing ways of giving meaning and of organizing the world, makes language a site of exploration, struggle” (Richardson, 1994, p. 528). Richardson (1994) goes on to outline how the use of poetic free verse is an experimental representation. Poetic representation aims to display tropes derived from the texts to engender understanding and knowledge as “settling words together in new configurations lets us hear, see, and feel the world in new dimensions. Poetry is thus a practical and powerful method for analyzing social worlds” (Richardson,
Thus I complicate the assumptions framing PDS in both analysis and representation of the data. If this project is to allow me to play with wild thoughts about PDS, I need to reconsider the more realist tales I have used in the earlier parts of this chapter and interrupt the redemptive project that I am questioning and immersed within to find a new space for being in the Enlightenment institution of social and educational scientific research.

Even when we think we are not telling a story, we are, at the very least, embedding our research in a metanarrative about, for example, how science progresses or art is accomplished (Lyotard, 1979). Quite wondrously, the convention paper’s format reveals its own narratively driven subtext. Just listen to us: theory (literature review) is the past or the (researcher’s) cause for the present study (hypothesis being tested), which will lead to the future—findings and implications (for the researcher, researched, and science.) (Richardson, 1997, p.77).

The facticity and credibility of the ‘story’ must make sense through the artistry of the teller. In the following poems I will draw upon the data to highlight tropes and themes that emerged through the critical discourse analysis. There are three levels of discourse re-presented, as mentioned above. The first discourse is societal and attempts to bring together the themes of redemption and desire at this level. As I worked through the institutional and local discourses, however, I found many subtexts within the tropes. Therefore, each level has a number of parts to highlight each subtextual theme as important to understand PDS as an object of desire.
Societal Desire: Redemption through Reform

Crisis, Crisis, Crisis
a renewal through reform
with the promise of progress
through the mission of PDS
which is both urgent and critical

Reform, Reform, Reform
this is
Revitalizing reform
to ensure
‘Better’ teachers and
‘Better’ learning for ‘everybody’s’ children

The tropes of reform and renewal appeared frequently in the texts. By bringing the work of Popkewitz (1998a) and Labaree (1992) to the data excerpts the connections between the redemptive project and the rhetoric of the reform movement are highlighted. In this poem, the ideas of redemption, foundations and desire all meet in new ways. This poem enables the reader to think about education in new ways as constructed by and constructing the discourse about reform. This is a moment to wonder—How might education be imagined in the twilight of our millennium? (Britzman, 1998, p. 3). What are the promises and dangers of PDS?
Institutional Desire Part I: Jumping on the PDS Wagon

We jumped on the PDS wagon

And traveled the road toward reform

and the revitalization of Teacher Education

Along the way, we made Teacher Education:

more rigorous

reputable

intellectually more defensible

masculine

with higher standards

more standards

better teachers

more certified

and institutionalized

The phrase 'jumping on the PDS wagon' was used by Maxine and Richard in their discussions of the PDS model at this institution. The other phrases are taken directly from the texts to highlight the aims of the PDS idea that make it an object of desire at the institutional level. Labaree (1992) talks of the masculinization of teacher education as one of the outcomes or agendas of the Holmes Group.

I am using 'we' to draw myself inside this discourse as a member of the academy and as a teacher educator.
Institutional Desire Part II: Status

A Cutting edge program
A better Teacher Education program
A more rigorous and academic program
A mandated reform movement
A top-down initiative
    from Dean to Faculty
    from University to schools
    from Field Professors to Preservice Teachers

and Schools
Desire reform and to reform teacher education
To be the focus of attention for professional development
cutting edge reform
fee waivers, release time,
The Superintendents—'wanting to jump on the band-wagon'
And the Teachers laughingly say
"I hope your daughter grows up to marry a Teacher"

30 There are many themes or tropes in this poem. It is again drawn from the texts and presented in this fashion to highlight the many levels of desire at the institutional level for involvement in PDS. This poem connects with the conversation presented earlier entitled "From Redemption to Desire - Both/And". For example, in that conversation Vincent outlined the 'money' issue as a reason for the development of the profession of teaching.
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In the interviews the centrality of inquiry was frequently mentioned. However, the subtext that arose from those conversations clearly placed the desire for inquiry as a mandated requirement of the PDS model. Some of the teachers felt that they were being recruited for the Ph.D. program (Loadman and Klecker, 1996). In the interviews inquiry was presented as a ‘requirement’ of/from/with faculty involved in PDS. They were considered ‘successful’ if they were able to take advantage of the opportunity to merge their publishing agenda with their work in PDS. Publications were also cited as another symbol of success in Johnston et al (1998). Johnston (1998) also mentioned that the PDSs who had failed to do all three elements of the PDS initiative - teacher education, professional development and inquiry ceased to exist as PDSs. As mentioned earlier, the ‘death’ of PDSs is an interesting suggestion/space/place for further research.
Localized Desire Part I: Professional Development

We desired to develop professionally and have more voice in teacher education

So, we worked collaboratively

We worked in partnerships

Developing relationships, new roles and opportunities

spending a LOT of time and energy - To Change the Status Quo

and gain long-term professional growth

to produce better teachers

We were committed to PDS

It can be so

empowering and enabling

32 The phrases above were drawn from the interviews and from Johnston et al’s (1998) testimonial excerpts from teachers and teacher educators involved in PDS. Throughout the textual analysis, the fragility and integrity of the participants in PDS brought to mind the political and ethical implications for researching the foundational assumptions of an existing program of reform.

Professional development may be seen as something ‘yet to become’ as it creates a binary of ‘unprofessional development’ as highlighted in discussion about the traditional model. The binary supports the idea that there is an authentic goal of professional development and in doing so pathologizes teachers as unprofessional (Britzman, 1998, p.4). What do we forget with PDS? What can we not think without (Spivak, 1993)? The desire for professional development speaks to the ideas of progress, empowerment, and mastery espoused in the redemptive culture outlined by Popkewitz (1998a). It is in this space that the blurring of desire and redemption enable us to re-think education using psychoanalysis.

Psychoanalysis reminds one of the failure of knowledge, the work of forgetting, the elusiveness of significance, the incidental, the coincident, the bungled action, and the psychic creativity of selves: how self crafts its meaning of the self in the world, what these meanings do to the psyche, and what the psyche does to these meanings. Psychoanalysis interferes with education’s dream of mastery, for, through its methods, it catches in the fault lines of inattention: free association, wondering over the elusive significance of the thing furthest from one’s mind, and interpretation of dreams (Britzman, 1998, p. 10).
Localized Desire Part II: Authenticity

Real reform
real stories
real practice
in real settings

Grounded language
grounded theorizing
grounded preservice teachers
in real settings

Like seeing the wildlife in its natural habitat

---

Both faculty and clinical educators/field professors openly admitted the desire for a more authentic preservice teacher education program. The desire for authenticity in this poem addresses assumptions of a 'real' - real practice (as divorced from and better than theory); real settings (as removed from the 'ivory tower' into the 'blackboard jungle'); real language and experience (as improved teacher education). All of these 'reals' can be interpreted as reflection of populist assumptions and redemptive possibilities and frame PDS as an answer to the 'crisis' in education.

Vincent said that working in a PDS setting was like “Seeing the wildlife in its natural habitat.” This statement and the repetition of the ‘real’ in texts such as Fullan et al (1998) and Johnston et al (1998) was a surprising discovery that enriched this project.
Localized Desire Part III: Not Quite Resistance

There are admittedly many challenges

problems with time, space, energy

people

placements

fee waivers

and shared decision-making

However,

You have as much control

as you do about the IRS

You can do what you want

until they tell you what you are doing!

Vincent made the statement about the IRS. It was a moment of passion and was a reflection of the powerlessness he was feeling as a member of a PDS in transition. Overall, he was very positive about the opportunities PDS offered for his own development and for his preservice teachers. This statement, however, when presented as a challenge to the assumed neutrality of PDS as a reform model, highlights the passions and the individual experiences that are part of any local discourse of reform.

For example, throughout the texts the issues and problems of PDS were discussed. However, the critical realist presentations did not frame this as resistance. So, what is it? Britzman (1998) states that an insistence for immediate change may actually be a symptom of resistance. "People do not give up their libidinal positions easily, and when encountering differences, they seem to work hard to assert their own continuity" (p.10) as the ego defends itself from what seems worrisome, dangerous and senseless. Change in teacher education, and then change within a PDS (teachers come and go, faculty come and go) may make this experience seem dangerous and senseless.
A Reflective Moment. The re-presentation of poetry as data analysis provided a moment of creativity that allowed thoughts, tropes, ideas and wondering to come together in a non-traditional format that complicates the data of this project. I have attempted to bring together strands of redemption, reform, renewal and revitalization. I have also wondered about the dangers and promises of PDS when the model is taken as 'common-sense' and the neutrality of progress is assumed. The multiple levels of discourse as presented in the poetry highlights the multiple realities of those touched by PDS. From professional development to the development of a more rigorous profession, I have highlighted the desires of institutions, individuals and society in this PDS project.

The dangers of PDS include constructing teachers as unprofessional unless they are 'invited' into a PDS, which also suggests that PDS is a mastery project reflecting curative thoughts and desires (Britzman, 1998). The elevating of practice over theory through the 'bridging' mechanisms of PDS highlights the danger of assuming theory and practice are statically framed within the university and schools respectively. Death also came up as a trope in the interviews and the other texts. How does PDS die or fail to fulfill its promise? I think it is very important to study the 'small deaths' of PDS - 'deaths' when PDS is 'killed' by parents (Richard) - what does that mean? Is it 'death' when PDSs fail because they fail to meet the criteria of the institution? Is it a 'deaths' when Preservice teachers fail to succeed in PDS? I also wonder about the 'deaths' of Clinical Educators when they are 'burned' out from involvement in PDS or their faculty mentor leaves PDS. This is one area that I believe would provide a useful starting point for theorizing the role of the unconscious in educational reform (Britzman, 1998).
Overall, the poetic re-presentations have been an attempt to disrupt my tendencies towards the critical realist analysis of data and provide an interesting reflective moment suggesting/unleashing/releasing my wild thoughts and 'as ifs'.

**Floating Significations and Dereferentialized terms**

Another wild thought about PDS is that the concept of professional development is both a floating signifier and a dereferentialized term. From professional development in ruins to the im/possibility of definition of PDS, we may begin to think beyond the critical analysis of foundational assumptions towards a more troubled and troubling discourse. PDS is in many ways the site of a struggle over competing discourses as various groups vie to define (and control) professional development schools. This project refuses the "simple and moralistic romance" of education. Thus, the wild thoughts about PDS are as desire gone awry:

They [artists] refuse the simple and moralistic romance that we in education call 'self-esteem,' 'role models,' and 'childhood innocence.' The artists are not the invisible hand that centers the child. Theirs are decentered concerns with desire gone awry, with the clash between the desire to represent and the representation of desire, and with the offer of making difference and hence provoking new and imagined communities from the limits of experience and history. In doing so, the responsibility for fashioning new meanings, for making new projects, lies elsewhere: in the doing of dialogue, in the arguments over what can constitute authenticity, appropriation, and the limits of culture, in the bildungsroman of schooling (Britzman, 1998, p. 60)

The dream for public education is of community, participation, collaboration, progress, empowerment, and professional development (Britzman, 1998; Anderson, 1998; Popkewitz, 1998a; Labaree, 1992). To think beyond this antidotal approach Anderson (1998) has utilized the concept of the floating signifier in discourse practices. As I created
the poem above on the 'problems' of PDS I was struck by the defensive position often taken by PDS members or advocates as a response to my attempt to complicate the model. Power issues and tensions antithetical to the philosophy of PDS were present and the death of some PDSs had occurred in passing when they failed to meet the 'requirements' of the model. It was also clear that not all teachers were cut out to be clinical educators (Chase and Merryfield, 1998). What did this mean for rethinking PDS? Who gets invited, for example, and under what conditions? Professional development to what end? (Adaptation of Anderson's, 1998, questions on participation). All of the texts studied did outline problems, challenges, issues and discuss ways of working around and beyond such problems. However, I want to think wildly for a moment and consider the discourse practices that maintain PDS.

I found the work of Gary Anderson (1998) very insightful in this area as he talks of participation and how this discourse practice taps into populist rhetoric. I want to frame professional development (or PDS) in much the same way by using Anderson's (1998) presentation of a floating signifier which illustrates diverse agendas resulting in linguistic slippage. In the poem above "Local Discourses: Not Quite Resistance," I finished with Vincent's passionate statement that suggests that even though the traditional model has been transformed into this more professionally collaborative discourse, there are still issues and problems that strike at the very heart of PDS.

Anderson (1998) states that although the current discourse surrounding school reform talks of empowering teachers, the opposite often occurs. "Many participants are reporting a sense of disempowerment rather than empowerment from so-called
participatory reforms and, in the case of education, are increasingly calling for more authentic ways to participate in the governance of their schools” (p.573). This is both about PDS as a reform and the call for more authenticity in teacher education through PDS.

According to Anderson (1998) if we consider PDS as a floating signifier it refers to a discourse practice that stands for and against its representative practices whilst acting as a legitimation process. This is useful here as it enables the critical whilst interrupting tendencies towards the metanarrative:

While attempting to hold on to critical theory’s modernist project of public spaces that promote multiple discourses, at the same time, I find postmodern approaches to the deconstruction of the complex ways that social reality is constituted useful in demystifying inauthentic approaches to participation (Anderson, 1998, p. 574).

The phrase ‘a discursive umbrella’ frames Anderson’s (1998) discussion, much the same way Bob used ‘umbrella’ to define PDS in his interview:

I sort of define PDS as the larger umbrella and under the PDS you’ve got different compartments (not that these are compartmentalized) that sort of mix together. Although not too much as they still retain their identity because there are different conventions and norms that apply to different degrees in different places. But PDS is the larger umbrella and under the umbrella you’ve got the professional development of teachers in conjunction with the preservice teacher development and the synergy of the two.

Maxine hesitated to define PDS in any definitive manner, and when asked what PDS was, said:

According to who? You know, I don't know. Our PDS is as much about professional development and inquiry and reform in the schools as it is about preservice teachers and I think when we started we saw those as three very distinct
goals and things we were supposed to pay attention to but we could only do one at a time and we had to take care of the students first because here they were on our doorstep.

Janine talked of the changing nature of PDS from year to year, according to the change in membership:

Every year we have a topic that defines PDS. But for me the definition is that - if you really want to pursue a particular idea that has to do with your practice or theories that could inform your practice, you usually can find somebody within that collaborative group to work with. So you are not out there in the hinterlands alone. You do have some people have different kinds of expertise, have different perspectives, and to me that’s what the collaboration is about.

Well, there was a nucleus here on our faculty. I mean that “we” and then the “we” changed as different people went in and out (for Master’s work for instance). We had some younger faculty that did their Masters work through the PDS. The “we’ became broader. Sometimes it would be people from different schools. So the groups were fluid and that’s the “we’ that I mean.

So, what does all of this mean—change, movement, fluidity? The legitimization of PDS enables the governing of those involved to go relatively unnoticed/invisible/unimagined. Hence there is no hesitation to talk of the ‘problems’ of PDS, and the ways it fails to be a total success. However the underlying trope is one of a desire for redemption, voice and participation despite the slippage and the tensions of this regime of truth (i.e., professional development schools). The micropolitics of participation, or in this case, of professional development, are carefully orchestrated but often result in the power and influence staying in the same hands (Anderson, 1998, p. 583).

By rethinking PDS as a floating signifier I imagine a space from which to address the practices that work for and against professional development in this particular reform
agenda. In this way I wonder if it is more acceptable to talk of the normalizing tendencies of PDS as a regulatory institutional device and also offer a more complicated picture that is not arrogantly critical but instead questions the ways discourse practices and linguistic slippage shape PDS.

_A Bridge or a Ruin?_

Vincent: I guess I would say the goal of PDS is to provide a bridge between theory and practice in preservice education simultaneously providing improved preservice education for aspiring teachers and providing professional development for existing teachers.

PDS was often referred to in the interviews and in the other texts as a bridge between the university and the school. According to Vincent, for example, this bridge allowed for the traveling of theory and practice between two institutions. However, how may I rethink this representation of a binary given the 'top-down' nature of the reform? What does this mean for PDS? I suggest that another wild possibility for rethinking PDS is to consider the concept of professional development as dereferentialized. Readings (1996) uses this term to allow for a creative and innovative shift in thinking about the University. The invitation, introduction and institutionalization of PDS has been highlighted throughout the texts as university initiated. Phrases such as top-down, mandated, requirements for membership have been used to contextualize the 'origin' of the PDS model in teacher education programs.

The context of the PDS reform has been situated in the teacher education programs of the university. Therefore, teacher educators and teachers are working with the ruins of the university (an institution in transition from a cultural mission to a
corporate mission as discussed in the glossary in chapter one). Is PDS a ruin? This talk of ruins provides a useful space that makes discussions of foundations, legitimizing discourse and redemption possible.

Readings (1996) outlines how the jeremiads suggesting the bankruptcy and betrayal of the project of liberal education highlight a shift in the role of the university. Whereas Popkewitz (1998a) presents the jeremiad as a response to the populist aims of public education, Readings turns to the role of the university as the focus of this 'crisis'. It is not just a 'crisis' of education, it is a legitimation crisis, according to Readings, that has resulted in an internal struggle concerning the nature of knowledge, and an external struggle surrounding the function of the university. As such, he suggests that the increasing corporatization of the university is one sign of this shift away from a cultural mission towards a more economic mission. Using the concept of 'excellence' that has emerged as the key focus of the more corporate logos and publicity statements of the 'posthistorical' university, Readings (1996) highlights that excellence is a simulacra, and a dereferentialized term. 'Excellence' is non-ideological, and has no content:

I also trace this process and insist that it would be anachronistic to think of it as an 'ideology of excellence,' since excellence is precisely non-ideological. What gets taught or researched matters less that the fact that it be excellently taught or researched. In saying that some things, such as the discourse of excellence, are ono-ideological, I do not mean that they have no political relatedness, only that the nature of that relation is not ideologically determined. 'Excellence' is like the cash-nexus in that it has no content: it is hence neither true nor false, neither ignorant nor self-conscious (Readings, 1996, p. 13).

As I analyzed the data and the tropes of economic return and market influences arose through the rhetoric of professionalization, I began to wonder about this
corporate/masculine turn. Also central to this consideration is the centrality of the concept ‘professional development’ to the discourse practices around PDS. I believe that it may be useful to consider professional development as a non-ideological (not apolitical) term that has no content.

Richard: I see it really as a culture of professional development, it’s a culture that embraces professional development, it’s a culture that in a sense promotes research, promotes professional development, it promotes teachers looking at themselves, being reflective, it promotes people being able to talk openly about their practice.

Why is this useful? As my work has focused on PDS, I have received many questions that frame PDS as either/or, success or failure, good or bad. Readings (1996) provides a space from which I may address such questions. By claiming institutional pragmatism, he states that we can recognize the move away from transcendental claims. Therefore, I can shift or trouble the desire for redemption, unity and consensus from within. This brings together the work of Britzman (1998) and Anderson (1998) to suggest that there is no consensus in rethinking PDS. Indeed, there is no consensus in PDS as a discourse practice. Rather, to present PDS as dereferentialized, allows one to recognize the university as a ruined institution no longer on a cultural mission and PDS as a ruin of reform. In this way the ‘ruins’ may be a ‘site’ for study and discussion.

Change comes neither from within nor from without, but from the difficult space—neither inside nor outside—where one is. To say that we cannot redeem or rebuild the University is not to argue for powerlessness: it is to insist that academics must work without alibis, which is what the best of them have tended to do (Readings, 1996, p. 171).
The aim of this rethinking of PDS is to create a space from which to do what we can as teacher educators and teachers and also to provide a space for “what we cannot envisage to emerge” (Readings, 1996, p. 176). In the final chapter of this dissertation I present the tentative conclusions, wild thoughts and ‘as ifs’ of this project.
CHAPTER 5

PDS AS INCONSOLABLE

Introduction

This project has been an amazing journey as a researcher and as a teacher educator. My original intentions were outlined as an introductory narrative in the first chapter. I think in retrospect that I was leaning towards a relatively holistic ethnographic study outlining the manifestations of power in PDS and the way PDS as a technology of power traveled. Whilst some of that has come out in this final edition of the project, I hope that the reader will find it a more gentle, creative document that ponders the possibilities of PDS as a reform effort in teacher education from a (post)critical perspective.

This final chapter will address each of the questions in a summative fashion that will blur the boundaries of representation thus encouraging a more fluid conclusion. This chapter will not be a presentation of the ‘findings’ of this study. In a sense, I did not ‘find’ anything as that presupposes a ‘real’ or ‘authentic’ result. I would rather consider this
chapter a resting place, or a launching pad for further discussions and wonderings about
research and reform in education.

Redemption, desire, empowerment, professional development – I have been using
a lot of words and attempting to suggest other ways of thinking about PDS. In this final
chapter I hope to make possible a space to ponder the outcomes of this study whilst
suggesting further ideas and possibilities for research in PDS and the use of
poststructural/psychoanalytic perspectives in educational reform. Ultimately this project
has been about ‘knowing’ in PDS – the epistemological assumptions that frame our being.
The importance of this work has been to provide a space from which to think differently
about PDS. Complicating this particular teacher education reform model has enabled me
to move beyond questions of the failures of successes of PDS to the wild thoughts and
possibilities that poststructural and psychoanalytic perspective encourage.

The results have highlighted one framing question: What can I not think without
as a teacher educator, as a teacher, as a researcher? (Spivak, 1993) This project is an
object of desire for me – just as I have suggested PDS is an object of desire societally,
institutionally, and personally as it is presented as a ‘proper’ way of doing teacher
education (Britzman, 1998). So, as I summarize and contemplate the productions of this
project - ideas, possibilities, complications, and methodological questions - I am working
within and against my own desire to redeem teacher education and find a ‘proper’ way of
doing research.

This project has highlighted the epistemological assumptions of PDS, the ways it
travels as a discourse practice, and the redemptive culture of research. The final framing
question of ‘what can I not think without’ arose from the research questions in a surprising way. By initially questioning the redemptive project of PDS I found a useful place to start questioning the foundational assumptions of the model. Yet it went much further than that. Thus I stumbled onto some other ways of thinking about PDS: an object of desire; a floating signifier; and even as a dereferentialized term. And then, in conclusion, I began to think of a way to ‘bring together’ the ideas that I had been playing with. I have wandered off into the realms of the as ifs?

A Retrospective Moment

In the first chapter I posed a number of questions. These questions arose from my own experience in PDS and my wonderings about the dominant representations of this model in victory narratives and progressivist explications that failed to address the foundational issues and ways of being constructed by and constructing the model. The work of David Labaree (1996; 1995; 1992) was most useful in supporting the ‘findings’ of the critical discourse analysis on the PDS texts.

So, the first question was framed to elicit the foundational assumptions of the model and historicize it in social and educational thought whilst considering the traveling nature of reform. By using the work of Popkewitz (1998a) I was able to work further towards complicating the model as a part of the redemptive culture. According to Popkewitz (1998a) historically the populist agenda was to support the ideals of individual freedom and betterment in public education and also provide for the social administration of the child. The resulting tensions in public education and ‘crisis’ talk of the failure of education launched educational reform (science and the scientist) as an American Jeremiad.
that called for rescue of children and teachers. The second question of this project was an attempt to think about the usefulness of this conceptualization of educational reform in terms of PDS.

My third question is the point of "take off" for this project. I began to think wildly about PDS. I wondered how I could rethink PDS, and what alternative conceptualizations of this reform effort would further complicate it but also provide spaces for other ways of being in the PDS, in research, and in teacher education. Finally, I asked about the political and ethical issues of this research project. This is in no way the "final" or least important question and in the section on methodological implications in this chapter I will address some of the difficulties and tensions of this project.

Chapter two was a presentation of the literature supporting this project and also highlighting the lacunae in the field of teacher education for work of this nature. I began with the big picture of the modernist project (Lincoln, 1998) and the redemptive culture (Popkewitz, 1998a). I discussed the populist rhetoric of the Holmes Group (Labaree, 1992), and attempted to move away from issues of judgement of PDS and towards the more creative spaces of psychoanalytic interpretation and poststructural analysis presented in the work of Deborah Britzman (1998), Alice Pitt (1999), Bill Readings (1996) and Gary Anderson (1998).

The third chapter was an attempt to blur the separation of method from the theoretical considerations of chapter two as I presented the ideas of the 'new' postmodern ethnography as a valid way of addressing this project. The move away from a totalizing representation and the suggestions for a more fluid way of knowing in research was an
exciting space from which to study PDS. As the first research question suggested PDS was a traveling culture, I presented literature supporting that idea and wondered about issues of ‘home’ in PDS.

Chapter four started off with a more critical realist atmosphere and ended in a moment of experimental data representation. As I worked through my data analysis I used footnotes and a variety of presentation ideas to provide multiple levels of interpretation and different ways of arriving at some interesting places from within the data. Issues arising in the data were not only in response to the research questions but also spoke to the methodology such as travel and ‘home’ and the limits of representation in research.

This chapter will address each research question briefly to discuss the products of this project and then move into methodological ‘findings’, suggestions for further study, intended and unintended learning outcomes. What does this all mean for research in these areas of teacher education, reform, redemption, desire, and method? I have attempted to move beyond/across/within and against the aporia of critical realism (Lather, in press) by insisting upon the notion of the unconscious in educational reform and by framing the emergent themes in the data analysis using the tools of poststructuralism and psychoanalysis. I have concluded that PDS is ‘inconsolable’ in an attempt to ask different questions and entertain my wild thoughts and as ifs. This study has not asked if the PDS model is ‘good’ or ‘bad’. Nor has it asked if PDS is an improvement (although this theme emerged as a ‘truth’ within the texts studied). I have wondered and wandered through PDS and believe that this study provides a space to stimulate alternative ways of thinking and talking about PDS.
How the Foundational Assumptions of PDS travel.

Historicizing PDS was attempted through an analysis of the foundational assumptions of the reform highlighted through emergent tropes and themes. Together with the assumptions, I looked at the ‘origins’ of the reform effort in the Holmes rhetoric (Labaree, 1992) and the populist agenda (Popkewitz, 1998a). The issues of invitation and initiation were central as were the tensions and challenges of collaboration. It seemed as if the discursive practices of PDS legitimized the assumptions of progress and neutrality while also regulating the experiences of individuals involved. In the conversation entitled “Invitations to a PDS Party: Or Are You Crazy?” I focused on the top-down nature of PDS and the murkiness of the assumption of agency in PDS. Issues of invitations, membership, established relationships and PDS as an institutional technology of power were discussed. Who gets invited? How are they invited? How does this shaped the discursive power relations within a PDS? Such questions have been suggested here as troubled wonderings for further research.

Using a more traditional excerpt/discussion approach in this section also enabled me to bring the literature to bear. ‘Crisis’ talk and ‘good’ teaching arose in this section as important points and began the blurring of questions one and two. It was not easy to separate (maybe an im/possibility in this kind of research) the critical discourse analysis and the use of the literature review. Playing with the linguistic slippage suggested by the work of Gary Anderson (1998) I think it would be interesting to study the professionalization discourses surrounding PDS as both attempts to encourage professional development and also as an attempt to develop the profession.
And as chapter four concluded with poetic representations the boundaries of the questions blurred intentionally and unintentionally to highlight in some ways the success of the project and the difficulties of this attempt. This move towards the (post)critical was a result of dissatisfaction with my own questions as mired in critical realist assumptions and I also wanted to trouble the idea of the redemptive culture as more than a technology of power (Popkewitz, 1998a).

Other assumptions included the 'improvement' or erasure of the theory/practice 'gap' with an inverted binary privileging practice over theory and the centrality of professional development as a framing assumption. Questions of problematically situating theory in the university and practice in the schools was one outcome that requires further research and discussion. The privileging of technical competence and scientific technical rationalism in PDS, as suggested by Labaree (1992), highlights the dangers of leaving the foundational assumptions of PDS obscured within populist rhetoric and 'crisis' talk.

In the conversation “Historicizing PDS” I attempted to discuss the seduction of PDS ‘people’ through the desire to enhance professional opportunities as tied in with the idea of professional responsibility. This conversation ended, however, with the ‘voiced’ frustrations of Vincent regarding the difficulties of gaining entry to the regulated and prescribed (legitimized) PDS world. This highlights issues about the ‘ownership’ of PDS reflected in the desire of the university to institutionalize the model (Johnston et al, 1998; Fullan et al, 1998). “We had a lot of trouble establishing ourselves as a reputable legitimate PDS because we weren’t a ‘site’” (Vincent).
In summary, the general themes discussed in the previous chapter of the foundational assumptions of PDS were populist notions of the role of education and teacher education, such as: a natural and neutral improvement (progress) in teacher education; the possibility of empowerment for all involved (agency); collaboration as work among and between equals (shared power and situated decision making); and, emphasis on practical training and teacher socialization (professionalism).

Whilst the foundational assumptions that arose from my analysis of the PDS texts were not necessarily surprising, the ways in which it was suggested they travel from the university to the school was very interesting. However, I was interested in extending that idea of cultural travel as discursive and reciprocally shaped. Therefore, I want to spend a moment contemplating the idea that the reform initiative was a discursive traveling populist agenda that led to an interesting conjunction of societal, institutional and local discourses. The ways in which the various levels of discourse become blurred in this discussion is useful in troubling PDS. From invitation to facilitation, the ‘culture’ (foundational assumptions) of the model travel from/between/and around the University and the Schools.

However, it was during the creation of experimental presentations of the data that I began to see that my questions of travel had been a launching pad for rethinking critical interpretations of the ‘culture’ of PDS. Central themes such as professional development, the improvement of teacher education, and the masculinizing scientific rationalist rhetoric of reform came up on all levels of analysis.
It was in response to a lacunae in the field, the failure to address the discursive practices of PDS and the way they shaped our ability to ‘be’ in PDS led to this project. So, where do I go from here? In the next section I suggest that my tendency towards critical realism is just another sign of the culture of redemption. This project has provided a space for me to work within and against my own redemptive assumptions and my desire to ‘improve’ teacher education and do ‘good’ research.

**Working Within and Against Redemption as a Useful Framework**

I purposely began the section on redemption in chapter four with a reflective personal narrative arising from my research journal that talked about the personal and professional reasons for this project (see ‘Professional Angst’). This was an attempt to begin the interruption of the critical realist re-presentations of data by introducing psychoanalytic notions into the discussion. By presenting it in single spacing then continuing the discussion in the double-spaced ‘official’ text I wanted to highlight the ongoing nature of reflection in research. This study is always already a work in progress and my ‘Professional Angst’ narrative illustrated a moment in this work that led to a more situated and complex attempt to trouble my own assumptions and the assumptions of PDS.

The usefulness of Popkewitz’s (1998a) idea of redemption was the focus of the second research question in this project. I can tentatively conclude that it is useful but what does that mean? The ‘texts’ studied highlighted the centrality of the Holmes Principles as framing the PDS project. Using critical discourse analysis my discussion moved from the texts to the literature in an attempt to trouble this idea. Ultimately, the
success of PDS was presented in the texts as increasing equity, improving teacher education, and leading to successful collaboration. This comes back to the idea that the Holmes Group principles were reflected in the texts as a 'better' way of doing teacher education to produce 'better' teachers, professional development for inservice teachers and 'better' learning environments for students.

The conversation entitled "From Redemption to Desire-both/and" was the beginning of my wondering about the interconnectedness of ideas of redemption and desire in PDS as the participants 'talk' of their reasons for involvement in PDS and why it is important to increase the status of teachers in society. Many of the themes discussed in this summary arose in the poetic representations in chapter four as a blurring, merging, and messy textual analysis.

So, where do I go from here? I discovered that I can not think without redemption possibilities as a teacher/teacher educator and researcher (Spivak, 1993). However, I want to continue to trouble this idea. My own tendencies towards redemptive metanarratives and dogmatic suggestions for improvement were highlighted in this project as I was comfortably immersed in the very 'culture' I was analyzing. However, it was by bringing together the questioning of the foundational assumptions and the idea of a redemptive culture that I was again encouraged to blur any separation of discourses in this study. I think the most exciting suggestion that resulted from this blurring is the idea that not only is it useful to look at PDS as part of the 'redemptive culture', it also travels and carries the desire for 'good' research into the schools. According to this study, PDS is discursively framed, fluid and traveling. Thus I am moving away from the suggestion that
PDS can be represented holistically and moving towards the idea that it is more than the sum of its parts (Pitt, 1998). The desire in the redemptive culture of social and educational scientific research is for ‘authenticity’, the ‘real’ and ‘origins’. It highlights the position of the researcher as ‘authority’ and the voice of the participants as truth. In this way the normalizing tendencies of PDS as a regulatory reform effort may be studied in future research. Uninterrogated assumptions are dangerous but not necessarily ‘bad’ and Popkewitz (1998a) suggests we think both within and against this governing project to trouble the ‘natural’ progress of educational reform as ‘saving’ the teacher and the child which may reinscribe dominant cultural norms.

Many of the texts studied suggested that critical realism and confessional tales presented authentic and ‘genuine’ experiences within PDS. Therefore, I was constantly struggling with my own desire and the desire of others to find the ‘truth’ of PDS. This was an im/possibility, thus, I looked for other ways of thinking about PDS that enabled a more fluid and exciting re-presentation. In the next section I take the project into another space and re-consider the PDS as more than a redemptive project as one way of working within and against the normalizing tendencies of educational research.

Desire and all that Jazz

*Redemption and Desire.* The poems were the high point of this project for me as both researcher and writer. Finally, I began to loosen up and enjoy the possibilities of rethinking PDS. The use of the levels of discourse was an attempt to highlight the threads of desire and redemption through the discourse practices of PDS.
One of the main ‘findings’ has been that PDS is all about competing discourses and contested sites. Therefore, the poems allow for multiple interpretations and a more fluid presentation to encourage an exploration of the ‘real’ in research. The reconsideration of PDS as an object of desire highlights learning as a conflict with ego, the unconscious in education, and educational reform as a desire for consensus (Britzman, 1998). Thus, I have found this concept very useful as it allows for the tensions and issues that emerged as themes in the critical discourse analysis to be considered as part of PDS as a complicated reform effort. The poems were exciting in the way they brought forth the different levels of discourse and also the way they blurred the boundaries between these levels of discourse. Using sub-themes and repetition, I have attempted to highlight the many ways of being in PDS as an object of desire and the way the ‘culture’ of PDS is legitimized through the traveling manifestations of power and knowledge. The poetry was a way of rethinking PDS beyond a call for mastery and professional development as you can see the foundational assumptions, rhetoric and notion of travel in the poems also.

*Floating Wild Thoughts in the Ruins.* I have concluded, however, that my wild thoughts and ‘as ifs’ in this project require more research and consideration to be more fully explicated. This project is my first attempt to look at research, educational reform and teacher education differently. For example, looking at PDS as a floating signifier and/or dereferentialized term were also marginally analyzed. The main consideration here is that I need to continue to work to understand how to use these wild thoughts move my thinking beyond critical realist perspective narratives. Thus, when thinking about the tensions and issues that arose from the texts of PDS as part of the messiness of PDS. In
this way I want to continue to study PDS as constructing and constructed by surrounding discourse practices.

The final wild thought to discuss here is the idea that within the ruins of the university lie the ruins of PDS as a reform effort. I use the phrase ‘ruins’ to highlight the suggested failure of the modernist project (Lincoln, 1998; Readings, 1996) as part of the PDS model. Not only is the university in ruins as the bastion of ‘culture’, the PDS exists within the ruins of the redemptive culture and mastery project of education. This rethinking of PDS creates a space from which to consider what we cannot envisage to occur as the PDS is seen as a simulacra for professional development - a failed project, mired in populist rhetoric, desiring consensus across competing discourses and within and against contested sites. I have wondered about PDS as if it is a simulacra, as discussed briefly in chapter one. In this way I have attempted to reveal previously concealed foundational frameworks that exist in the absence of referential finalities (Lather, 1991).

Methodological Implications

*The Ethics of Psychoanalysis.* My excursion into ‘wild thoughts’ allowed me to more fully explore the possibilities of other ways of doing research and brought together the ideas behind the ‘new’ postmodern ethnography, and poststructural/psychoanalytic perspectives. It also allowed for the interrogation of my own positionality as researcher in this project, situated within and yet against the discourse practices I was studying.

Britzman (1998) highlights the resistance of the field of education to entertain ideas of the unconscious and the conflict implicit in learning when studied psychoanalytically. I have attempted to use a more fluid re-presentation of data while struggling with the limits of
representation and the requirements of the academy. Given the hybridity of my analytic framework developed specifically for this study I have attempted to maintain an awareness of the framing assumptions that make this project possible whilst also disrupting my own tendency towards the critical realist perspective. I hope to continue to work towards a tolerance of ambiguity in my own research and in the research of others.

**Home and Travel.** Throughout this project the theme of travel was a central focus in an attempt to 'explain' the ways in which PDS moved from site to site and was discursively legitimated in that movement. Historicizing this model through discussion of the Holmes Group and the top-down mandate from the University suggested that the legitimization of discourse practices regulated the ways of being in PDS and the success or failure of PDS through 'improvement', professional development and conforming to the institutional criteria of the model. However, travel in this project is not just referring to PDS. It also suggesting that cultures travel, ideas travel, power travels and knowledge travels. Further work needs to be done in this area but I think the idea that travel is a central framing assumption of the 'new' postmodern ethnography may go a long way towards interrupting holistic and static representations of culture.

**The Colonizing Tendencies of Research.** One of the limitations of this project is the lack of attention to the issue of research as colonizing and imperialist. Although I have situated myself both inside the PDS (as teacher educator, PDS supervisor, academic) I am also on the outside as researcher. This has informed the project significantly but also highlights the question of power in research. In the future I hope to address this 'colonizing' question. However, the main methodological learning at this stage comes
back to the idea that redemption and colonizing are interconnected and I intend to follow this idea further in theorizing and researching the missionary zeal of research in the postmodern moment.

I wonder if the colonizing tendencies of research are exacerbated by assumptions of 'authenticity' and truth in research? Therefore, as a researcher I will continue to trouble my own desire to re-present the data as critical realist (something I am still struggling with) and also use a (post)critical approach to disrupt the assumed authority of the researcher (Lather, in press).

*Does Someone Gain from This Research?* This is a question I have been struggling with as I work to summarize and conclude this project. I hope that this project will inform the field as a move away from uninterrupted discourses of participation and professional development (Anderson, 1998). I also suggest that the use of psychoanalysis advances theorizing in the fields of teacher education, postpositivist research and curriculum theorizing and that this project is my initial attempt to explore such creative and imaginative spaces (Britzman, 1998; Pitt, 1998).

In an attempt to do 'wild' research that moves away from critical realist to poststructural/psychoanalytic musings I have reframed PDS as an object of desire. Bringing my interpretive frame to bear on the data may give rise to accusations of a lack of 'grounded theorizing'. For example, I have used poetry to suggest that PDS may be seen as part of the redemptive culture and as a result of the 'crisis' talk that calls urges society to 'fix' schools (Popkewitz, 1998a; Pinar, 1998). However, I think that this work is important in suggesting other ways of thinking about PDS. In some ways it is grounded
theorizing and in other ways it moves beyond to fields of play and possibilities (Richardson, 1997). Ultimately the role of the public intellectual must be considered. Pinar (1998) talks of the need for advanced theorizing in curriculum studies as vitally important:

Like physics or art, curriculum as a field cannot progress unless some segment of the field explores phenomena and ideas that perhaps few will comprehend and appreciate, certainly not at first and perhaps never. Our field will not progress beyond a certain primitive point unless we support a sector of theory...that perhaps most in the field cannot fully understand initially. Imagine physics progressing if scholars in that discipline were limited to work which beginning students readily understood. Imagine art progressing unless forms of painting and dance were supported which, initially, very few could appreciate. In any field there must be a sector of advanced work; otherwise, a field cannot advance (Pinar, 1998, pp xiii-xiv).

This is not to suggest that my project is advanced theorizing. Indeed, I am troubled by Pinar's (1998) suggestion that other, less advanced work is 'primitive'. However, this study has become a symbol of my advancement in theorizing. The struggle to work within and against my critical realist tendencies has led me to entertain difficult to understand concepts and ideas in an effort to inform the field.

The use of the 'new' postmodern ethnography was an attempt to bring into focus the messiness of ethnographic research and thus the theorizing that resulted from this study is messy and raises more questions. The framing research questions highlight the attempt here to move from the critical realist to the (post)critical perspective by bringing the tools of poststructuralism and psychoanalysis to bear on the data.

As I present this work to teachers and teacher educators in the future I will struggle with the label of being an 'expert' on PDS. In discussions with my participants,
however, they were supportive of any attempt to wonder about PDS and commented that they had not thought of PDS in the ways I was but that it had merit and a place in the field. This member-check feedback was very important as I continue to wonder about the place of this research in teacher education.

Where do We go from Here?

This project has been in many ways the launching pad for my own imaginings for future research. In this section I want to briefly outline a few ideas for further study in this area and tangential to this topic. Firstly, I think any research that works to complicate models of reform, trends in education and pedagogy, and ‘natural’ and ‘neutral’ ideas in the field of teacher education and education in general is called for because there is a lacunae in the field of teacher education historicizing reform models. This could take the form of case studies of particular PDSs from both insider, outsider and insider/outsider positions. However, gaining entre to the ‘sites’ of a PDS is sometimes problematic and this may ‘protect’ the PDS from critical research. This raises the question of who gets researched and how?

I also think an ethnography of institutional frameworks and the administration of PDSs in a large research institution could shed further light onto the ‘findings’ of this project in the area of institutional desire and the redemptive project of social institutions. One of the limitations of this project has been the attempt to study the broad conceptualization of PDS rather than a particular PDS. Thus, an ethnography of the
institution (the university, the College of Education, the individual school) involved in PDS could be enlightening and interesting in addressing a more situated 'knowing' in PDS.

Most of these suggestions arise from the limitations of the study. Therefore, another possibility for future research could be a longitudinal study of the changing nature and shape of PDS over time. This could address the ways traveling cultures alter and reform as the result of changing membership and leadership which came up as a concern and difficulty in the local discourses of PDS.

The literature and the texts also call for more studies in the area of how PDS affects student learning (Fullan et al, 1998; Abdal-Haqq, 1998). Parents and students in the schools are silenced in this research project. It is my understanding of the field that this is neglected in much of the research in teacher education reform efforts. I think it would be interesting to conduct in-depth interviews with parents and students who have experienced a PDS effort and also speak to the parents who, as Richard highlighted, could kill a PDS with their refusal and in effect this did occur in at least one school in Mid-West county. What does this silence mean for research in this area? Does this speak to the disenfranchisement of students in the learning process? Is this contradictory to the increasing 'power' of parents in education? Anderson (1998) suggests that the result of the call for increasing participation in education is normalized to include 'empowered' upper-middle class white parents and exclude people of color and lower socio-economically situated parents. Does this happen in PDS? Are the 'sites' of the PDS schools geographically, socio-economically, ethnically significant? Who gets to be in a
PDS school? The suburban/urban site debate is another factor here worth studying as are the assumptions framing that dichotomy.

Which teachers are invited into a PDS? What does a desirable teacher look like? What does this say about the regulation of the profession through PDS? Another theme that arose during the research but that due to the limits of the study was not pursued is the whole idea of not just who does the inviting - but - who gets invited? This is another interesting possibility for study in this area and I believe this will inform future teacher education. I am not suggesting that any of the above lacunae are the fault of previous research or the lack of a critical perspective by those involved in PDS.

The issues of 'site' and travel could also be used as a starting point to study how far PDS goes? By this I mean, do the ideas and philosophy of PDS reach other teachers in the school 'sites'? Are cooperating teachers (often invited within the schools by their Clinical Educator colleagues without much initiation into PDS) disadvantaged in PDS? And what does PDS mean for the Preservice teachers? This study failed to address that area of concern. I wonder what the Preservice teachers (student teachers) would think of this study? Do they feel redeemed? Saved?

Britzman (1998) and Pitt (1998) suggest that ultimately research and concepts such as pedagogy are not consolable. Actually, the idea of education is one of conflict and repression, that leads to moments of desire, love, hate and learning as the ego defends the individual from her/his own ignorance.

This study attempted to complicate the assumptions framing PDS as a reform effort. In doing so, I found my own assumptions and questions were challenged and
towards the end of this study I found myself looking awry at PDS. By moving into the realm of 'as if' in analyzing PDS I found an exciting, almost 'accidental' way of framing my own research efforts and analytical assumptions (McCoy, 1995). There are so many questions that continue to interrupt any attempt at conclusion here. For example, the many 'deaths' of PDS (through failure to fulfill institutional requirements, lack of resources and funding, and individual participants retirement/withdrawal) present the possibility of vital spaces for troubling the celebratory narratives of PDS that abound.

I wonder about the 'real' stories of PDS that are presented in confessional victory narratives that speak to the experiences, successes and failures of PDS. The assumptions of the 'real' suggest there are 'false' stories or 'unreal' stories. Are my (post)critical efforts here to interrupt mainstream critical realist narratives destined to be discarded as 'unreal', 'ungrounded', 'false' and thus worthless? I think my move towards a (post)critical study is an important one. The (post)critical turn challenges the field to think within and against the historically normalized constraints of educational research to the wild possibilities and the 'as ifs' of this study and educational research in general.

**What did I learn?**

This chapter has not been an easy chapter to write. The 'findings' as ascribed to each research question were 'learnings' for myself as teacher educator and researcher. But overall, as seen in the number of ideas for further research, I found that PDS is extremely complicated. My 'wild thoughts' for rethinking PDS were very useful. Indeed, I think they were more useful because they also came out of an analysis of PDS as part of a redemptive culture. Looking awry (McCoy, 1995) at PDS as an object of desire, a
floating signifier and as a dereferentialized term allowed me to attend to the inconsistencies and tensions in PDS whilst troubling my tendency toward the 'real' and the critical. McCoy (1995) in her dissertation entitled “Looking Awry: A Genealogical Study of Pre-Service Teachers Encounters with Popular Media and Multicultural Education” uses the work of Slavoj Zizek (1992) to look awry at the predictable analytic practices that often frames research. I conclude that looking awry at PDS has enabled me to consider the wild thoughts and as ifs that arose accidently and fortuitously from the situatedness of my study. McCoy (1995) states:

By consciously borrowing, changing, and mixing metaphors in this study, I was able to move away from predictable analytic practices toward what seemed to me more fruitful ones....I’m not suggesting that these particular metaphors and the analytic practices that they evoke for me are appropriate for anyone else’s study or even for any other I might do. They arose accidentally and fortuitously in the situatedness of my study...and they inevitably shaped what was possible for me to do in this study. What I am suggesting here is that researchers ought to seize opportunities to use unlikely metaphors and practices from unlikely sources. It has the potential to energize scholarly work and take it in directions not yet imagined (McCoy, 1995, pp152-153).

Questions of origins, membership and invitations, ‘crisis’ talk, seduction and desire led me to wild thoughts and as ifs in this study. The linking of foundational assumptions, redemption and desire provided a fruitful place for rethinking PDS. I think the desire to change teacher education and ‘improve’ society is central to the development and continuation of PDS and I found troubling that idea using Popkewitz’s (1998a) work useful in complicating notions of progress and improvement. However, maybe I had the cart before the horse.
For example, was it really pertinent to start with the foundational assumptions and
the redemptive culture? I believe this was necessary. I could not move into my fields of
play and 'wild thoughts' until I was in a more informed position (again highlighting here
my own desire for mastery as a populist notion). Thus I could then wander and wonder
about PDS as being more than the sum of its parts (Brtizman, 1998). However, I also
learned that I was setting myself up as an 'expert' in PDS by the very nature
of this project. This was a real shock and will require constant attention to the
consequences of such positioning and the danger of 'expert' roles.

**Unintended Learning Outcomes**

I am really attached to PDS. Having completed a project of this depth I have
unearthed my own connections and desires tied to PDS and the things I cannot think
without (Spivak, 1993). I have attempted to move beyond the role of judge to be seduced
by the 'as ifs' of PDS. As I move forward into the academy, and into teacher education
in this troublesome yet privileged 'expert' position I aim to continue struggling with my
own redemptive projects - that is, to 'save' research from victory narratives. However,
whilst the final section of chapter four attempts to find other ways of thinking about PDS,
I think the dangers of falling into victory narratives is always already present. I am
invested in my 'wild thoughts'. Does this mean they are another victory narrative? If
anything it may be that my failure (lack of skill, lack of imagination) led to unrealized
possibilities for this research project. However, any attempt at representation fails.
Therefore, I find myself contemplating how this project may have been improved and yet
satisfied that it is an adequate place from which to begin my exploration into further
exciting areas of research and the study of methodology. I conclude that I now have a
stronger respect for the complicated idea of educating teachers and an increasing
awareness of the assumptions and discourses that frame teacher education.

Implications for Mid-West State

What are the implications for this project for the institution studied? This project
is an attempt to provide alternative conceptualizations of PDS as an educational reform
effort and as an effect of power. The use of the psychoanalytic and poststructural analyses
also led to discussions of desire, linguistic slippage in floating signifiers and
derreferentialized terms. I think it would be useful for the institution studied to consider
this work as an attempt to complicate the model of PDS and thus address other ways of
being in PDS that may otherwise go unnoticed. This may lead to the opportunity for
anyone (teacher, professor, administrator, preservice teacher) involved in PDS to consider
the inconsistencies of the model and thus work within and against the 'dangerous'
assumptions of neutral and natural progress in teacher education.

My argument is that the particular ideas of progress and redemption inscribed in
the social sciences are the effects of power which, when they go unnoticed in
contemporary research and policy, may inter and enclose the possibility of change
by reinscribing the very rules of reason and practice that need to be struggled
against (Popkewitz, 1998a, p. 3).

There is no cure for the tensions that exist in teacher education (Britzman, 1998).
As a teacher educator working within and against the dominant normalizing 'culture' of
the university and the schools, I have tried to find other ways of being to complicate the
representations of PDS that dominate the field. The contested sites and competing
discourses presented in this project merely scrape the surface of the multiple ways of being in PDS. However, I suggest that through thinking wildly and attempting to historicize assumptions and rhetoric, I have begun a lifelong project that engenders more questions than answers. Throughout I have wondered joyously about the 'as ifs' of PDS. I think this project, especially my attempts at poetry, may provide some joy and interest in the field by creating a space for reflection and rethinking of this thing we call PDS which is much more than the sum of its parts. It is more than more than a response to the 'crisis' in education. It is more than the Holmes Group rhetoric and more than a College of Education's mandate. It is even more than the people involved. My concern has been and continues to be with the 'unapparent' of teacher education and the regulating pressures of social discourses (Britzman, 1998).
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Structured/Open-ended

What is a PDS?
Tell me the story of PDS from your point of view?
   How did you first get involved in the Professional Development School? When? Why?
   What were your first impressions?
Do you think the PDS's are unique?
   Do they have a particular culture?
   Does it move and change from site to site?
   Does it differ from the Global to the local level? From Broad conceptions to specific locations?
In your experience is the PDS model successful?
   What inhibits or restricts the success of the PDS?
Do you have any concerns about the PDS?
   What are they?
   How do you think you might resolve them?
What would you say are the specific aims of the PDS?
Have you been involved in other models of teacher education?
   How does this differ from previous teacher education models?
How is class constructed or addressed in the PDS?
How would you define collaboration?
   Would you call this model collaborative?
   How does the collaboration work in PDS?
What are the advantages and disadvantages of the PDS model?
Who organizes the PDS? How do you feel about this?
   Who initiates contact between the members?
   Who chooses preservice teachers/FPs/CTs?
   Who designs the syllabus? Handouts? Materials?
   Who evaluates the preservice teachers? Who assigns their final grades?
Are these decisions mandated or do they change?
How would you describe the content or knowledge of the PDS?
   Do you think any content or knowledge is privileged in the PDS?
   What would that be?
What do the Preservice Teachers learn using the PDS model?
Describe the various roles within the PDS, in your experience?
   University Professor
   Field Professor
   Cooperating Teacher
   University Supervisor

203
Preservice Teacher
Do you think there are advantages and disadvantages for the individuals involved?
What are they?
E.g., What is a Field Professor?
How have FPs been enlisted?
Tell me more about your role? What do you do?
How do you feel about the role?
What do you think other people involved would say?
Can you tell me any specific stories of critical incidents or epiphanies you experienced through your work in the PDS?
Do you think Global Education is a focus of the PDS?
How and why? Or why not?
Do you think the PDS changed during the period of your involvement?
How?
Do you think you will continue to be involved?
Why/Why not?
What do you think the future of PDS is?
Why?
Do you see the issues of gender constructed in the PDS? How?
Do you think Multicultural issues should be addressed in the PDS?
Are they?
Why do you think this is so? Why not?
Have you any idea of the attitudes and opinions of students and their parents about PDS?
If you could change the model of PDS what would you do?
Do you think the PDS model will change or be replaced here?
What do you see as the future of the PDS model at the Ohio State University?
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