Studying Teacher Education: A journal of self-study of teacher education practices

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:
http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/cste20

Tensions of Reimagining Our Roles as Teacher Educators in a Third Space: Revisiting a Co/autoethnography Through a Faculty Lens

Monica Taylor[a], Emily J. Klein[a] & Linda Abrams[a]

[a] Montclair State University, USA

Published online: 08 Jan 2014.

To cite this article: Monica Taylor, Emily J. Klein & Linda Abrams , Studying Teacher Education (2014): Tensions of Reimagining Our Roles as Teacher Educators in a Third Space: Revisiting a Co/autoethnography Through a Faculty Lens, Studying Teacher Education: A journal of self-study of teacher education practices, DOI: 10.1080/17425964.2013.866549

To link to this article: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17425964.2013.866549

Studying Teacher Education, 2014
http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17425964.2013.866549

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Tensions of Reimagining Our Roles as Teacher Educators in a Third Space: Revisiting a Co/autoethnography Through a Faculty Lens

Monica Taylor*, Emily J. Klein and Linda Abrams

Montclair State University, USA

(*Received 18 April 2013; accepted 23 September 2013*)

This co/autoethnography uses our lens as university faculty to examine how engaging in a year-long self-study with mentors nurtured a complicated third space where we could together begin to reimagine our roles as teacher educators. Two secondary faculty members and a doctoral assistant used co/autoethnography to revisit a collaborative self-study with mentors to better identify both the individual and programmatic complexities that arise when a third space is opened and we are invited to reinvent our perspectives and responsibilities as co-teacher educators. We ask two questions: What happens when faculty facilitate a third-space teacher education program with mentor teachers? How does this third space influence the teacher education practices in an urban teacher residency program? We present a series of tensions about our work together as teacher educators in the third space. They include professional into authentic relationships, authority into collaboration, collaborative agency into individual agency, and apprenticing to master teacher into apprenticing within a collective. Following findings about each tension, we discuss how we as faculty navigated each tension. Finally, we consider the implications of our work for all field-based teacher education programs.

Keywords: mentoring; third space; urban teachers; theory–practice divide

While the work of helping somebody become a teacher has traditionally belonged to both the university and the schools, ownership has been clearly divided, with the university responsible for the theoretical and pedagogical preparation and the schools responsible for the practice of those methods, strategies, and the enactment of theory (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 2009). Rarely does the work of the two spheres overlap, and the theory–practice divide is often bemoaned, sometimes addressed, but rarely bridged. School–university partnership work has made some attempts to create more coherent experiences for preservice teachers, especially with the professional development school movement (Clark, 1999), but largely these efforts have been piecemeal. Recently, another model for preservice teacher education – the urban teacher residency (UTR) – has developed as a response to the need to bridge theory and practice. In our NMUTR (Newark Montclair Urban Teacher Residency), teacher education occurs not only in the university and in the school, but also in a *third space* unique to itself (Klein, Taylor, Onore, Strom, & Abrams, 2013; Martin, Snow, & Franklin Torrez, 2011). In this third space, professors are not the only teacher educators; mentor teachers become important, if not primary, teacher educators. However, shifting and negotiating roles to enact such changes is neither easy nor clean.

*Corresponding author. Email: taylorm@mail.montclair.edu

This self-study uses our lens as faculty to examine how engaging in a year-long co/autoethnography (Taylor & Coia, 2006) with mentors nurtured a complicated third space where we could, together, begin to reimagine our roles as teacher educators. Reexamining the self-study that we conducted with mentors in the fall of 2011 with a second level of analysis, we attempt to unearth both the individual tensions and the programmatic tensions that emerge in our NMUTR program. Ours is a hybrid model that aims to open a third space in teacher education (Zeichner, 2010) where knowledge of community, faculty, P-12 teachers, and students are equally valued. All roles and responsibilities are redefined: no longer does the university's knowledge trump that of the schools, nor are customary boundaries between the obligations of participants in the teacher preparation process fixed. Rather, there is a "nonhierarchical interplay between academic, practitioner, and community expertise" (Zeichner, 2010, p. 89).

Zeichner borrows the term *third space* from the fields of critical literacy research and cultural studies (Bhabha, 1994; Gutierrez, 2008) to refer to this hybrid space, not an *either/or* space but an *and/also* place to share and construct knowledge. Such a space requires that participants cross customary boundaries. A third-space teacher education seeks to reorient learning toward an *and/both* experience, so that residents, mentors, and faculty have opportunities to share knowledge and learn (Klein et al., 2013). Inevitably, we had few roadmaps to help guide us in constructing this new dynamic. A co/autoethnographic self-study was seen as the vehicle best suited to explore these new constructs. We wanted to better understand the dynamic between the mentor teachers and ourselves and how we, the faculty, were constructing a third space in relationship to the mentor teachers.

We wanted to explore, programmatically, the role of mentors as teacher educators in the very specific context of a third-space hybrid UTR; we also wanted to better understand the ways that faculty can support mentors in this context. UTRs have emerged as a model of preservice teacher education that responds to growing concerns about how we prepare new teachers, particularly teachers for underserved communities. Critiques of traditional teacher preparation programs, while not new (Feiman-Nemser, 1983), have recently increased in tone and intensity (Zeichner, 2010). Debates about the quality of teacher candidates, the depth of their preparation, the quality and quantity of effective clinical practice, and how these affect P-12 student learning are primary (Darling-Hammond, 2006; Grossman, Hammerness, & McDonald, 2009). Drawing upon medical residency models of learning (Berry, Montgomery, & Snyder, 2008; Boggess, 2010; Papay, West, Fullerton, & Kane, 2012; Solomon, 2009), UTRs seek to address these concerns. In 2009, 28 new UTR programs, including the NMUTR, were created through support from five-year Teacher Quality Partnership Grants.

The NMUTR significantly differs from traditional teacher education programs where the cooperating teacher is only responsible for the clinical experience and often invites the student teacher into her classroom for one semester, during which time she gradually hands over her class preparation and teaching. In the NMUTR, the mentors act as the primary teacher educators and invite residents to work alongside them for an entire school year. They are involved in the co-construction of preservice teacher education curriculum, co-teaching and co-planning with their resident, and learning alongside the resident through joint participation in workshops, collaborative action research, and instructional rounds.

Research Questions

Making the shift from operating in a conventional preservice teacher education structure to a third space is not automatic. Looking through the lens of two university faculty members

and a doctoral assistant, much like Kosnik and Beck (2009), ours was a complicated self-study working at three levels: "individual (e.g., studying our own practices as teacher educators)" and specifically the relationships we were building with the mentor teachers, "institutional" (e.g., studying our mentors and their interactions with both their residents and us), and "collective (e.g., drawing on and contributing to the literature on teacher education)" (p. 213). Our questions were two:

(1) What happens when faculty facilitate a third-space teacher education program with mentor teachers?
(2) How does this third space influence the teacher education practices in a UTR program?

Review of Literature

Mentors in Teacher Preparation

While the literature about preservice teacher mentors has identified a lack of clarity about the role they play in teacher preparation (Clarke, 2006; Wang & Odell, 2002), most agree that they play a significant part in facilitating preservice teachers' transition from being students of education to becoming practitioners (Grossman, 2010; Wilson, Floden, & Ferrini-Mundy, 2001). Mentors are described in the literature in several ways: as educative co-learners who support preservice teacher learning and reflection (Feiman-Nemser, 1998, 2001), as models of teaching practice (Franke & Dahlgren, 1996), as nurturing and supportive guides (Awaya et al., 2003), as school-based teacher educators (Bullough, 2005; Feiman-Nemser, 1998), and as collaborative colleagues and co-creators of knowledge for teaching (Beck & Kosnik, 2002). However, these conceptions of mentoring have been developed through studies on mentors while, as Clarke (2006) notes, there have been few studies conducted with and by mentors themselves.

Mentors as Teacher Educators

It was our goal to help support mentors in developing identities as teacher educators. Our vision for this came from Feiman-Nemser's (1998) work on mentoring. She describes teacher mentoring as "serious and sustained work on teaching among teachers" (p. 68). As she discovered, many mentors do not see themselves as teacher educators, often because they believe teaching is a talent people are born with and that cannot be taught. She suggests this is further hindered by notions of the theory–practice divide in teacher education:

> The prevailing message is that universities know best what good teaching is and what novices need to learn. Consequently most teachers and teacher educators have little experience with teacher education that makes effective use of what thoughtful teachers know and do. (Feiman-Nemser, 1998, p. 65)

It is challenging to help mentors develop identities as teacher educators, where they view their role as more than just providing a teaching space for preservice teachers. Traditional teacher education programs that place student teachers in mentor teachers' classrooms do not necessarily support this identity shift (Bullough, 2005; Feiman-Nemser, 1998; Korth, Erickson, & Hall, 2009; Korthagen, 2004; Young, Bullough, Draper, Smith, & Erickson, 2005).

There are a number of examples of both preservice and in-service education programs that attempt to engage and support mentor teachers as teacher educators (Erickson, Minnes Brandes, Mitchell, & Mitchell, 2005; Le Cornu, 2010; Martin et al., 2011). Many occur in

professional development schools, where universities develop deep and sustained collaborative partnerships with schools and teachers (Levine & Trachtman, 2009; Sands & Goodwin, 2005). These collaborations highlight the importance of allowing teachers ownership of the agenda, especially as it involves their own professional learning (Erickson et al., 2005), as well as the role that the university can play in supporting their shifting identity to that of teacher educator. Korth et al. (2009) found in a study of mentor teacher identities that those who were engaged in collaborative university partnership programs for extended periods of time had richer understandings of their role as teacher mentors. They posit that such mentors, "may be more likely to provide field experiences that are more purposeful and more directly focused on teaching preservice teachers about teaching as opposed to simply providing a classroom for preservice teachers to practice teaching" (p. 8). However, less is known about the ways in which faculty and mentors navigate the development of teacher educator identities, the shifts in power between the university and the school, and theoretical and practitioner knowledge. Bullough (2005) refers to the importance of, "arrangements that support sustained interaction about teaching and that have the potential to produce, over time, collegial collaboration and subject positions supportive of collaboration" (p. 153). He emphasizes the relational aspect of being a mentor/teacher educator, not simply the training of mentors in specific skill sets.

Mentoring in a Third-Space Urban Teacher Residency

In order to avoid recreating our power dynamics with the university as the owners of theory and the schools as the owners of practice, it became clear to us as we designed the program that we must involve the mentors as teacher educators. Yet reimagining those roles was not as simple as we first hoped. As Bullough (2005) describes, it was not enough to turn to our mentors and announce "Voila! You are teacher educators!" In fact, many were frustrated by the lack of instruction from the faculty, for they wanted clearer roles, more defined and discrete tasks, and top-down professional development. In many ways they wanted the skill set for mentoring, while we were trying to push toward a community of inquiry that would support the identity development that Bullough (2005) described. Both individually and programmatically, we needed a way to understand our role in the process of supporting the mentors in their work as teacher educators. There is little research about the experience of university faculty, whom Zeichner (2010) refers to as "hybrid teacher educators" trying to support mentor teachers as they develop teacher educator identities, but whatever little research is available suggests that it is complex and relational (Le Cornu, 2010; Le Cornu & Ewing, 2008). Martin et al. (2011) indicate that hybrid teacher educators are constantly engaged in shifting roles, "moving through varying degrees of intersubjectivity and distributions of power" (p. 303).

From the inception of the program, we facilitated generative conversation where all stakeholders (university faculty, mentor teachers, residents, and community representatives) could help develop roles and responsibilities, curriculum, assessments, and admission criteria. A mentor's role in the NMUTR also had to be conceptualized differently. In the first months of the program, mentors and residents met to discuss and role-play co-teaching models (Friend & Cook, 1996). We envisioned that residents would gradually take the lead *for* (rather than *take over*) the mentor's classes during the course of the school year and recognized that we needed to put structures in place to make this possible. Initially, mentor–resident relationships resembled the more familiar student–teacher model but, as we continued to transform the relationship between mentor and mentee, we moved to an apprenticeship model. When the resident worked alongside the

mentor, rather than in tandem, it allowed her access to the moment-by-moment thinking and decision-making of the experienced teacher.

Creating a hybrid space with new relationships between faculty and mentors also required philosophical and practical shifts. Building trusting and authentic relationships that invited honest and open communication helped to push faculty and mentors to shift. As faculty, we had to position ourselves in ways that were at times unfamiliar and uncomfortable (the privileging of academic knowledge can be difficult to dismantle), and this required vigilance to and deliberate changes in our language and actions (Kruger, Davies, Eckersley, Newell, & Cherednichenko, 2009). This shift began by having regularly scheduled meetings with mentors using an open agenda.

After the first year of the program, during which we largely focused on building relationships and developing the residency curriculum, we knew we needed a way to better construct a true third space for our mentors. Based on our and the mentors' critiques of the first year, we organized a more formal framework for the mentors as we moved forward into the second year of the residency. In the fall semester, as part of a weekly mentor study group, all the mentors engaged in self-study with the faculty. This began to position mentors and faculty as active knowledge-creators and full subjects in their own learning as we provided support and critique of one another. University faculty examined their own work in the program and school-based mentors provided input and feedback, and vice versa. Examining our practices transparently and opening ourselves to critique and change with the co-participation of the mentors allowed for the beginnings of a true shift in power and authority over knowledge about how to grow teachers. Now, one year later, we reanalyze our collaborative self-study with the mentors to identify tensions that emerged. We knew, as Martin et al. (2011) write, that "making sense of the complexities and uncertainties of practice (McDonald, 1992) can only be dealt with through ongoing experience and reflective practices, both individual and collaborative" (p. 309). This study marks one effort of individual, programmatic, and collaborative sense making.

Self-Study Methodology

Self-study seemed the most appropriate methodology for this study. Much like LaBoskey (2006), we aimed to explore both individual and programmatic dimensions of our interactions with mentors and realized that many self-study researchers had addressed similar perspectives using this methodology (Bullough & Pinnegar, 2001; Cole & Knowles, 1998). Intending to examine our practices as teacher educators, we moved beyond solely theorizing and focused on "our pedagogical imperatives, responsibilities to our current student teachers [the residents], as well as their students" (LaBoskey, 2004, p. 819). Our self-study was interactive and facilitated by a team approach in that the faculty and their doctoral assistant together analyzed data with the mentors using a "collective self-study method" (Samaras, 2011; Samaras & Freese, 2006). This allowed all involved to engage in meaningful ways that were individual in terms of participation, purpose, and process, and contributed to a "collective wisdom" (Davey & Ham, 2009). The use of multiple qualitative methods, such as individual narrative writing, reflective responses to narratives, and group discussions and note-taking, to generate and collect data further supported our use of self-study. Additionally, our self-study demonstrated trustworthiness in its clarity of description not only in terms of process, but also in terms of findings. Much like Mishler (1990), our intention was to show "trustworthiness or verisimilitude rather than truth" (LaBoskey, 2004, p. 853). We did not claim objectivity but rather positioned validity within the constructs of "our discourse and actions" (Mishler, 1990, p. 420).

Co/autoethnography

We opted to use co/autoethnography (Taylor & Coia, 2009) as our methodology because it incorporates the autobiographical elements of self-narrative and extends its effectiveness by engaging participants in written exchanges and dialog about and around their individual stories. This methodology honors multiple knowledges of teaching to derive a mutual, living construct of teacher education. Aiming to understand what is "at the intersection between theory and practice, research and pedagogy" (LaBoskey, 2004, p. 827), we selected a co/autoethnographic self-study because:

> it allows us to be reflective and do self-research in a way that mirrors how we engage with one another as teachers and people. We are always insider/outsiders … Our understandings of ourselves and others can, however, be enhanced by composing our autoethnographies together. (Taylor & Coia, 2009, p. 176)

More specifically, our multilayered self-study seemed to meet all the criteria of co/autoethnography. Our research was "generated from the lived experiences, past and present, of teacher educators" (Coia & Taylor, 2009, p. 11). Our research involved examining these experiences collaboratively using a cyclical sequence of literacy practices, including writing, rewriting and sharing narratives, talk and discussion pre- and post sharing narratives, reflective writing and response, making sense of theory and research, and collaboratively analyzing the generated texts. As Coia and Taylor (2009) wrote, "Our process is messy. Sometimes the writing flows and other times it is labored. Our conversations often help us to get through the tensions" (p. 12).

Context and Participants

The original self-study took place as part of a course offered to mentors in the NMUTR in the fall of 2011. That original group comprised 3 university faculty (2 from the secondary cohort and 1 from the elementary cohort), 1 doctoral graduate assistant, and 14 mentor teachers who were all at varying stages of their careers. The group represented diverse races, classes, genders, and sexualities. The course was designed as an action research/self-study course where everybody engaged in research. The secondary mentors were later responsible for leading an action research cycle with the residents in the spring of 2012. Narrowing our lens, the next level of our self-study, which is the focus of this article, involved only two secondary faculty and a doctoral assistant, and the data generated from the eight secondary mentors. At various stages of our academic careers and with diverse backgrounds in middle and high school education, we are all women who are engaged with the residents in urban teacher preparation.

Data Sources

Initially, during the first collaborative self-study, we collected data through writing and sharing personal narratives. We wrote our narratives weekly and then met in person to share written responses, discuss our perceptions, and push deeper into analysis. Mentors and faculty read about action research and self-study; in addition to writing narratives about our work, we chose to engage in either action research on teaching or self-study about mentoring. We developed action plans, collected data, and analyzed our data in face-to-face meetings. Each meeting began with an open forum in which we talked about challenges with the residents. We would then turn to our working groups to address our specific data plans and then reconvene to talk about next steps. We took field-notes during our meetings to keep a record of the conversations. All data were posted in shared files that

were accessible to all. Mining the narratives, individual burning questions emerged that guided our investigation using multiple forms of data including observational notes, resident reflections, and personal narratives.

For the secondary self-study, we reviewed only the data discussed above that were generated through self-studies of our mentoring practices. We added transcribed interviews of the mentors that had been conducted at the middle and end of each school year. We produced additional narratives and documented several follow-up discussions with the mentors. Again mining the data, this time we looked for tensions to emerge as we understood this complex work would not resolve itself in simple recommendations for practice, but rather would reveal itself in tensions that we negotiated daily. We looked at the work of the mentors to better understand the dynamic between the mentors and the faculty, as it was in these relationships that we could understand ourselves both individually and programmatically.

Data Analysis

Our data analysis was collaborative, reflective, and participatory. It was also recursive; we analyzed the data inductively by means of constant comparison as they were collected (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). We also looked for emerging patterns across the data (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998). Because it was conducted through varied lenses and across the data of multiple group members, this analysis led to trustworthiness. A preliminary version of this article was presented at the 2012 International Conference on Self-Study of Teacher Education Practices (Taylor et al., 2012), and conversations from that session led us to name tensions that recurred throughout our work together. We defined the tensions in analytic memos, shared them, and then separately coded the data.

We attempted to look at the data from multiple perspectives: "researcher/researched, subject/object, and insider/outsider" (Coia & Taylor, 2009, p. 15). These lenses helped to further our trustworthiness. Reexamining the original self-study was a natural next step for co/autoethnography as "narratives by their nature are open to multiple interpretations," "fixing on one interpretation can be superficial," and reflecting "on the data over long periods of time" (p. 15) invites new interpretations.

Findings

The topics that follow are themes that emerged as tensions that we had to manage as teacher educators in the third space we created. The tensions are unresolvable, and the goal is not to find some ideal point on a continuum, but rather to navigate the tensions perpetually throughout our work. We are not surprised by these tensions, as they naturally emerge from a utopian third space that is constantly being negotiated and reconstructed. We include tensions that occurred on multiple occasions, but here we report only one or two instances of each tension for illustration. We also explore how the findings from our self-study have tangibly influenced the structures of the NMUTR program. The findings offer a description of a tension and then report how better understanding that dynamic has influenced us as teacher educators and recursively influenced the structures and relationship needs that support the program.

Professional Versus Authentic Relationships

Throughout our mentoring experiences, mentors and faculty struggled with the balance between a professional and an authentic relationship. We entered these relationships being

cautious, considerate, and respectful. Monique, a high school biology teacher, saw her own teaching and professionalism as an important aspect of her mentoring:

> Being a mentor has taught me that my actions, thoughts, opinions, and experiences play a major role in shaping my mentee's experience. I have become extremely mindful of how my frame of reference – surfaced from my own experiences – causes me to think about my profession and react to different situations.

Walter, on the other hand, shared that "a mentor is not necessarily someone to model yourself after, as if you were not worthy of an individual identity. A mentor can be a person you develop a unique relationship with that allows you to have a mutual learning experience." We navigated between being a model and being a learner.

Instinctively, mentors felt that their resident relationships should be professional and that these should resemble the hierarchy that they assumed. Although faculty were interested in disrupting these traditional boundaries, we too could not move immediately to a more authentic relationship. Gradually, we realized that residents and mentors were more open to critique when critique was supported by a relationship that blurred the line between the personal and the professional. Lara, a mathematics mentor, illustrated this when talking about how difficult it was to give feedback: "Last year my biggest challenge within the program was finding the courage to deliver feedback." By participating in sessions with faculty and having multiple experiences, this became more natural; the mentors began to realize that their expertise mattered. Another mentor, Edie, discussed her internal struggle with providing feedback that was honest but also gave the resident some flexibility in terms of improving her practice:

> I left it more open for her and said "Well, you can do this," and kind of didn't put in "This is the best way to do it," like I just wasn't firm enough and then she didn't really ever take my advice when I did it that way, so I had to start kind of putting more of my opinion into what I was saying to her without saying "You have to do it my way."

In trusting relationships, our feedback could be honest, critical, and suggestive of new ideas. As Walter commented: "With the merger of two personalities there must exist trust so that teaching between the two becomes fluid." We trusted that all of us would do our share of relationship work so that we could fulfill our professional responsibilities.

This process of building blended relationships was difficult. Emily commented: "I also assume that a blending of formal/informal relationships to develop something that is more reciprocal demands constant attention. I would like to think these relationships are developed automatically, but I think from experience that I know better." As these relationships formed, we were able to engage in mentoring around the curriculum. Linda, a doctoral graduate assistant, offered her assistance to two residents struggling with planning. The mentors asked for help with curriculum development, something that would not have happened prior to the work we did together building relationships. Finding the balance of both a professional and personal connection between mentor and resident was often complicated; being a teacher educator sometimes means having difficult and painful conversations, but this is also a means of engendering trust. When hard conversations are handled well, residents come to believe their mentors take seriously the job of helping them to develop as teachers.

Operationalizing Tensions: Building authentic professional relationships

Through this co/autoethnography, the faculty has begun to more deliberately build authentic and professional relationships with the mentors and residents. This new

commitment is time-consuming and often uncomfortable, but seems to greatly benefit professional relationships and the larger third-space community. Monica illustrates this:

> I have often thought about how important it is to share personal information with one's students/mentors but it was not an act that I did purposefully. I was going through an emotional transition in my life and in the moment shared with a mentor.

Lara, a mentor, wrote about the same incident:

> I remember one day last year … you shared something personal with me about your sister and how you've looked for her before and then she ended up finding you. I think that after that moment I felt very comfortable and safe sharing with you.

Although the act of being vulnerable was uncomfortable for Monica, this action strengthened the trust in her relationship with Lara. In Monica's and Lara's eyes, this was an example of having an authentic relationship with someone where there is give-and-take and you position yourself in a vulnerable way. This positioning creates what Brad, a physics mentor, called a "mutualistic" relationship where "we both have goals of enriching teaching/learning in our classrooms and personal growth." Writing about his relationship with Monica, he continues:

> I feel that I can gain from your perspective, experience and guidance. And I can give you my perspective and observations for your own analysis … Without trust it would be difficult to discuss the things we discuss. Our conversations are open, honest, and critical.

These authentic professional relationships have nurtured a third space for the NMUTR where all the stakeholders share the responsibility for urban teacher education. As Kyra, a mathematics mentor, put it, "So I think I'm part of the evolving UTR program, not just as a mentor but also as a participant in the ever-evolving creation of it."

Authority Versus Collaboration

The third space invited both mentors and faculty, in their roles as teacher educators, to explore how to participate in a democratic community that respects individual authority as well as collaborative meaning making through inquiry. Striving to integrate academic and practitioner knowledge, we hoped that the third space would distribute the power of knowledge-making across constituencies and not privilege one over the others. Authority in this context took the shape of knowledge and expertise, and for many of us the first step was in knowing when to co-construct our knowledge with others. A new tension emerged in knowing when it was equally appropriate to own or to embody authority in the form of expertise. The shifting between owning (exerting) and sharing became a contextual process that we needed to learn how to read, much as we as teachers know how to read our students.

One piece of this growth, however, involved understanding that we were not the sole source of authority. The mentors initially worried they would not be up to the task of working as teacher educators because they believed mentors must be experts. Kyra shared:

> I still feel like I'm doing too much talking, too much direct instruction almost. In particular, in working with one of my residents who is very quiet, I felt like I dominated the conversation instead of eliciting her understanding and knowledge.

The instinct for many mentors was to teach by telling. However, throughout our co-learning, the mentors began to see an alternative framework for teacher education. Edie addressed this concern when she discussed how much she has learned from her resident and how mentoring has given her an opportunity to improve her own teaching:

> I've learned a lot of different approaches to content and sometimes my resident sees the whole subject in kind of a different angle that I hadn't thought about and also has different supplementary things … Being a mentor teacher doesn't mean you are perfect or an expert in the field. It doesn't mean that you have all the answers. I want to be a mentor so that I can continue to grow and learn *because* I don't have all the answers.

Clara, another biology mentor, also embraced her mentoring as an opportunity for growth:

> This year was a more metacognitive year for me in the sense that I really had to force myself to reflect on what I was doing, how I was learning as a mentor, and then be able to deliver that message to my residents. It's a lot harder than you think because a lot of things come naturally and so it's very hard to say, "Well, just watch what I'm doing" and then tell them what you were actually doing, "you know I walked around because Suzy was talking or I made this decision at this time because of this."

We believe that part of this shift was due to the ways in which we as faculty consistently emphasized our role as co-learners. In her first journal entry, where we explored present understandings about mentoring and which she shared with the class, Emily emphasized her own desire to reframe notions of mentoring:

> In all of these cases mentoring took the form of peers working through something together. And yet still I have a hard time letting go of the notion of mentor as a parent like figure offering wisdom. And yet often I am in situations where the teachers know more than I do. How do I figure out my role then? I think the clues are in my own mentoring experiences, that I let go of those traditional notions of mentoring and embrace a new way of co-learning and constructing.

Together, we learned that the teacher educator–mentor–resident arrangement is fundamentally a relationship that grows over time and one where knowledge does not reside in a single individual. Monica and Walter wrote into each other's narratives as they explored the relationship between mentor and resident:

> Monica: We have to get to know our mentees and ourselves before we can truly design a mentor–mentee relationship that is effective. And a trusting relationship can nurture reciprocal authority where we are both mentor–mentee.

> Walter: How can I draw upon my own intuition to figure out what a mentee needs and, vice versa, what I need as a mentor? No one person's truth is better than another's. My biggest question … is how do I, as mentor, withhold my own judgments and values about what "good teaching" is so that my mentee has the appropriate space to grow and figure out what "good teaching" means to him?

Part of Walter's concern was about defining the nature of "good teaching." The pressure to be the teaching "expert" still weighed on him, as the expectation is that the teacher educator holds this knowledge. However, co/autoethnography allowed us to attempt to disrupt this narrative and, following the principles of a third space, allow authority to shift and embrace reciprocity.

Operationalizing Tensions: Nurturing reciprocal authority

One of the key ways we attempted to develop our notions of reciprocal authority was through our co/autoethnographic writing, using storytelling and metaphors from our lives to help us make sense of how to think differently about the role of the mentor and the mentee, and our working understandings of authority. Edie wrote of learning to bake alongside her grandmother, providing us with a model of loving apprenticeship, yet another way of conceptualizing both mentoring and authority:

> Geri, my grandmother, is an amazing baker. One of her best desserts is her lemon meringue pie. This past summer Geri and I were in the business of making pies, and although my

> confidence is still shaky at this point, each pie did get better. In the beginning, the pie was made together, 50-50. She provided instructions, talked me through what we were doing, and provided examples of what she has done in the past to improve the crispiness of the crust, the taste, etc. When the pie came out mediocre at best, we shared the "failure" together ...
>
> Over time, she loosened the reins and lessened her verbal instructions as well as her physical input. I was left to do the procedural work of measuring and mixing, while she *really* watched me. During this transition period, her verbal input was minimized, strategically. She would interject only when absolutely necessary, and was willing to let me stray from her methods (to an extent) without commentary. She is an excellent participant observer; her gaze remained critical and evaluative throughout our endeavors, yet I still remained mostly at ease. The success of both of us was contingent upon the environment being judgmental and evaluative, yet I never felt threatened. My discomfort stemmed from the fact that I was doing something new, not from her close evaluation. In fact, I wanted the evaluation to be as critical as possible. I wanted to hear her comments and concerns after I had finished. "What should I have done differently Grandma?" When she did provide me with feedback she was real and honest, yet eloquently supportive and nurturing to me.

In sharing these metaphors and writing through the co/autoethnographic process, our assumptions of what collaboration and mentoring looked like and what they *might* look like rose to the surface and we then had the potential to reshape them and create new stories. Edie's metaphor wove into Monica's metaphor, providing a new vision of mentoring. As well, we were able to unpack what Edie's metaphor assumed about what teaching and learning look like.

Collaborative Agency Versus Individual Agency

Another significant tension that emerged for us was the notion of individual agency as opposed to collaborative, community agency. Most mentors had spent years working as individual agents of change. For many, becoming a change agent was a significant part of their identity, and as faculty we supported the development of change agency for our residents and mentors. However, over time we also realized that individual change agency was not nearly enough to make the sustainable change that is needed in the district and that, in fact, our program created the need and the vehicle for collaborative agency. Shifting from a goal of creating individual change agents to collective agency emerged from our experiences in the schools and the kinds of obstacles that we all faced. This was a difficult change for all involved because of the common rhetoric in schools and in society of competition and individual success, and many of the mentors had not had positive experiences with formal collective structures, such as the union.

Early in our work we saw frequent concern for individual agency and worries about how to help the residents persevere through the demands of teaching urban children in challenging circumstances. Clara illustrated this objective when she stated:

> This may sound cheesy, but I hoped to produce a dedicated teacher. I think our district is lacking some people that genuinely care for our students and want our students to succeed. So I feel like in a way I'm contributing to that.

All the mentors and faculty throughout the development of the NMUTR expressed their deep commitment to urban education and preparing residents with strategies to address issues that emerge outside of their students' school lives. Lara describes this sort of care for her students:

> You have to really know the kids because our kids have a lot of problems. Some kids have to work right after school. Some kids have kids ... I remember I had a student two years ago in Pre-Calc[ulus] honors. His mother had cancer, and he didn't know, and she had a month to go.

Like Lara, Michael emphasized the value of knowing your students and the impact this personal connection has on their potential to learn. He explains that, to be an urban teacher, you have to get to know your students. He continues:

> I feel that it's like, if you can relate to the kids, it's easier to grasp them and get their attention. It's like they already come with this barrier and prejudgments, so when they see someone standing up there who can relate, that definitely opens a lot.

Throughout, we saw echoes of the individual teacher battling against a dysfunctional system, advocating for his or her students.

While we knew that such persistence, perseverance, and capacity for individual agency are qualities we wanted to nurture in our residents, it was also a core program mission that we think on a larger scale about sustainable change. As we explored, in writing and in our action research, how to build this, we began to see evidence of it in final reflections and exit interviews. Walter relayed: "The mentor–mentee relationship forces me to do things I never wanted to do. I had to process with another person. More than the individual against the system. Now it is to be me and this … other person." Below he further describes his gradual shift from being a lone teacher change agent to working in collaboration for change with his resident through the program. Walter explores his role as a teacher leader and mentor to his resident working through any challenges *with* the group:

> 'Cause I'm used to just, oh, the department is lackluster this year, for whatever reason just figuring, okay, I'll do all of this by myself. But now that I have him here, I have to help him navigate that. I can't just be a recluse. So I've led a lot of time-planning meetings. We both took on changing the final and midterm exams. He's made a lot of the data analysis sheets for the entire department. So we've done a lot of work for the department this year.

Similarly, Kyra in an interview about the year in the course and two years in the program spoke of how the NMUTR had become a vehicle for her to engage in collaborative agency:

> Just being a part of the program I feel like I'm able to almost mentor mentors, like Edie's a newer teacher and she's struggling with mentoring, so I feel like I was mentoring a mentor. Being a part of selecting the residents, I've never done that before, so having some responsibility or some say in who will be a part of the program is huge and important and valuable. I feel like it's going to produce systemic change globally down the line and that's why I feel so invested and it's so important to me. It was important for me to be a cooperating teacher but this is different. That's why I've been an educator for 16 years, teaching's important to me, the children are important to me, and the city of Newark and this program is vested in this city, in these students, and part of my role is to be invested with the city of Newark and these students and this program seems to be parallel with my beliefs and values.

Operationalizing Tensions: Developing collaborative agency

The shift to a third space had an impact not only on the mentors, but also on the faculty. Although we were well aware of the dangers of teachers as isolated practitioners, we had subconsciously recreated a program that supported individual change agents as opposed to collective change agents. It was through our co/autoethnography that we began to understand that we needed to rethink how to support the collective over the individual. Slowly we began to implement strategies that better support collective change and a "we" voice programmatically as opposed to an "I" voice. In small ways we began to communicate regularly with mentors through a weekly update about how our curriculum was emerging from the needs we perceived in the classroom. In the spring of 2012, the mentors and faculty co-constructed a video protocol to support mentor teachers in talking through their instructional moves with residents, and in the fall of 2012 mentors and faculty rethought how to use video to support the resident curriculum and instruction.

Apprenticing to Master Teacher Versus Apprenticing Within a Collective

Traditional teacher education programs emphasize teacher education as an individual process that often occurs in isolation. The individual preservice educator works individually with a mentor in schools and individually with faculty in universities; rarely do those two communities converge, and, when they do, those instances are rarely of significant collaboration. However, an important finding for us was that mentoring a resident was something that we do in community, both between and among faculty and mentors, and across participants. This notion of apprenticing within a collective as opposed to apprenticing solely to a master teacher has, again, evolved over time and is a tension. We do not reject the notion of the master teacher, but rather nestle it within a larger collective of experts creating a more complex and dynamic view of teacher education.

Part of this new orientation to teacher education developed as we discovered that breaking down the hierarchies in which we usually exist and negotiating issues of authority are complex and often emotional processes. Further complicating our endeavor, we were determined to create a community that was not only a safe space where all voices could be heard, but also a critical learning environment where we pushed one another to experience cognitive dissonance. The process of building third-space relationships did not happen automatically. Emily was shocked when she learned that one of the residents described her as intimidating:

> I was so stunned by this! I don't know if anybody has found me intimidating in my entire life! I know I'm struggling to connect with Ella and it impacts my ability to mentor her. I know that you can't be "close" to all your students and it's okay if she's intimidated, but not if it hinders her ability to learn. So what to do? I'm not sure I know the nature of what is keeping us from connecting. It may be a culture piece – as an older white woman she may not see me as somebody that she can connect with.

Emily found support in working through her rocky start with Ella by sharing her feelings with Kyra, Ella's mentor. Together they used co/autoethnography to analyze their relationships with Ella and to coordinate their support. Emily wrote: "My sense is that she is feeling safer in her NMUTR community. It's clear her mentor plays an enormous role in this – she's the 'mama' figure that Ella has never had." Reflecting back on her own dynamic, Kyra wrote:

> I have thought about the role I play and I am trying to balance that of a "mother" figure with that of a colleague/friend and what it means to be a mentor. I have to know when NOT to be a mother figure. Sometimes I have to let Ella make mistakes without offering immediate assistance.

Emily's mentoring relationship with Ella strengthened because of both the support she received in her relationship with Kyra as well as the insights gained through examining Kyra's relationship with Ella. She was better able to get a sense of Ella's personal and professional needs, which often overlapped as she carved out a new professional identity. Traditionally, narrow roles of student, teacher, and faculty were insufficient for making sense of highly complex and fluid relationships that were sometimes best understood *in relation* rather than *in isolation*.

Operationalizing Tensions: Approaching teacher education as a collective

Knowing that teacher education happens in community has had a significant influence on how we structure our program so that there are multiple opportunities for teaching and learning. We have created different configurations to support this kind of teacher education community. All residents meet with multiple stakeholders from the program

(staff, mentors, faculty) at the beginning of the program for a pre-contract meeting in order to discuss strengths, areas for concern, and expectations of the program. At different points two faculty members give feedback to a resident on aspects of practice, and we always rotate who provides feedback on critical incidents and video blogs that residents work on, recognizing the importance of multiple perspectives. Additionally, we have placed two residents in a classroom with a single mentor in three successive cohorts, working to provide opportunities for a resident to team teach with another resident and learn both collaboratively and individually how to learn to teach. We have also increased our number of instructional rounds in the program. In our version of instructional rounds (modified from the model developed by City, Elmore, Fiarman, & Teitel, 2009), mentors and then residents prepare and present a lesson that is observed by all. We script the lesson in order to collect data to support our developing understandings about what happens in the class. Finally, we debrief the lesson around one or two motifs (such as student discourse), using our scripts as evidence to make sense of what we observed. Similarly, at the mentor level, our work using video has been an outgrowth of our developing awareness of teacher education as a collective process.

Conclusion

A third-space teacher education program is a continual negotiation due to its utopian nature, and our co/autoethnography has helped us to examine and continue the ongoing negotiation and reflection that are necessary. This process of naming or renaming ourselves as teacher educators and later taking action from these new identities were our first steps toward shape-shifting. Our experience has pushed us to blur the borders that distinguish the traditional roles of resident, mentor, and teacher educator. In our third space, hierarchical arrangements of responsibilities, knowledge, and relationships were reconsidered and eventually identified as meaningless to our work. Co/autoethnography facilitated this process; by writing into each other's narratives, we created a space for mutual support and meaning making.

Throughout this article we have described some of the supports and theoretical shifts that helped us to navigate the inevitable tensions that emerged from this work. Well aware that our residency model is unique and often perceived as a program that cannot be generalized, here we think about the larger implications of our self-study for other teacher education programs.

We posit that teaching courses on site, as is common in professional development schools and urban teacher residencies, is only valuable if universities and faculty are able to develop collaborative relationships with teachers that enable reciprocal teaching and learning. Faculty must find ways to read the school and bridge the two agendas of school and university, engaging in reciprocal work. As Zeichner (2010) explains, this must be more than shared physical space. There are many ways that we have managed to create genuine joint teaching and learning, but initiating the process by having all parties engage in self-study and action research was invaluable in that it supported us in all becoming co-learners.

Teacher education must exist across multiple spaces. The challenge of teacher education is simply too large to continue to reside solely in the university, isolated from the realities of schools and, more specifically, urban schools. Much like the constructs of a third space, we need to cross boundaries and create a hybrid new space where we can engage the expertise of multiple meaning makers – in our case, teachers, community organizers, faculty, and students. A third space, continually negotiated, invites a site of

praxis where all stakeholders can work together to grow professionally and make collective change. We must think dynamically of how we do teacher education; it is not simply an apprenticeship, nor is it something that can be learned via individual secondary experiences. No one person can take on the challenge, nor can one single institution.

Finally, our conceptualization of teacher education is dynamic and recursive. So often we think of becoming a teacher as a linear process where we move from being a preservice teacher, then a novice teacher, to an expert/master teacher or even a university professor. We often expect our coursework and clinical experiences to adequately prepare teachers for teaching. Analyzing our co/autoethnography has reminded us that we know better than to have these expectations. Teacher development is a lifelong process and we all, no matter the stage, need opportunities to reflect, learn from, and teach one another. This self-study has helped us to realize that as educators, we are all shape-shifters, navigating the various contexts and challenges we face. We also conclude that our self-study must be ongoing because just as we need to renegotiate the third space continuously, so do we need to shape-shift continuously as teacher educators to serve the needs of the residency.

Acknowledgements

Special thanks to Jeff Kuzmic, who helped us to articulate the tensions discussed in this article.

References

Awaya, A., McEwan, H., Heyler, D., Linsky, S., Lum, D., & Wakukawa, P. (2003). Mentoring as a journey. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *19*, 45–56.

Beck, C., & Kosnik, C. (2002). Components of a good practicum placement: Student teacher perceptions. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, *29*, 81–98.

Berry, B., Montgomery, D., & Snyder, J. (2008). *Urban teacher residency models at institutes of higher education: Implications for teacher preparation*. New York: Center for Teaching Quality.

Bhabha, H. K. (1994). *The location of culture*. London: Routledge.

Bogdan, R., & Biklen, S. K. (1998). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Boggess, L. B. (2010). Tailoring new urban teachers for character and activism. *American Educational Research Journal*, *47*, 65–95.

Bullough, R. V. Jr., (2005). Being and becoming a mentor: School-based teacher educators and teacher educator identity. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *21*, 143–155.

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

City, E. A., Elmore, R. F., Fiarman, S. E., & Teitel, L. (2009). *Instructional rounds in education: A network approach to improving teaching and learning*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.

Clark, R. W. (1999). *Effective professional development schools*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Clarke, A. (2006). The nature and substance of cooperating teacher reflection. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *22*, 910–921.

Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. L. (2009). *Inquiry as stance: Practitioner research for the next generation*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Coia, L., & Taylor, M. (2009). Co/autoethnography: Exploring our teaching selves collaboratively. In D. L. Tidwell, M. L. Heston, & L. M. Fitzgerald (Eds.), *Research methods for the self-study of practice* (pp. 3–16). Dordrecht: Springer.

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

Darling-Hammond, L. (2006). Constructing 21st century teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *57*, 300–314.

Davey, R., & Ham, V. (2009). Collective wisdom: Team-based approaches to self-study in teacher education. In C. A. Lassonde, S. Galman, & C. Kosnik (Eds.), *Self-study research methodologies for teacher educators* (pp. 187–203). Rotterdam: Sense.

Erickson, G., Minnes Brandes, G., Mitchell, I., & Mitchell, J. (2005). Collaborative teacher learning: Findings from two professional development projects. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *21*, 787–798.

Feiman-Nemser, S. (1983). Learning to teach. In L. Shulman & G. Sykes (Eds.), *Handbook of teaching and policy* (pp. 150–170). New York: Longman.

Feiman-Nemser, S. (1998). Teachers as teacher educators. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, *21*, 63–74.

Feiman-Nemser, S. (2001). From preparation to practice: Designing a continuum to support and sustain practice. *Teachers College Record*, *103*, 1013–1055.

Franke, A., & Dahlgren, L. O. (1996). Conceptions of mentoring: An empirical study of conceptions of mentoring during school-based teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *12*, 627–641.

Friend, M., & Cook, L. (1996). *Interactions: Collaboration skills for school professionals*. New York: Allyn & Bacon.

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Chicago, IL: Aldine.

Grossman, P. (2010). *Learning to practice: The design of clinical experience in teacher preparation* (policy brief). Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education and National Education Association.

Grossman, P., Hammerness, K., & McDonald, M. (2009). Redefining teaching, re-imagining teacher education. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, *15*, 273–289.

Gutierrez, K. D. (2008). Developing a sociocritical literacy in the third space. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *43*, 148–164.

Klein, E. J., Taylor, M., Onore, C., Strom, K., & Abrams, L. W. (2013). Finding a third space in teacher education: Creating the MSU/NPS urban teacher residency. *Teaching Education*, *24*, 27–57.

Korth, B. B., Erickson, L., & Hall, K. M. (2009). Defining teacher educator through the eyes of classroom teachers. *The Professional Educator*, *33*, 1–12.

Korthagen, F. A. J. (2004). In search of the essence of a good teacher: Towards a more holistic approach in teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *21*, 77–97.

Kosnik, C., & Beck, C. (2009). Teacher education for literacy teaching: Research at the personal, institutional, and collective levels. In D. L. Tidwell, M. L. Heston, & L. M. Fitzgerald (Eds.), *Research methods for the self-study of practice* (pp. 213–229). Dordrecht: Springer.

Kruger, T., Davies, A., Eckersley, B., Newell, F., & Cherednichenko, B. (2009). *Effective and sustainable university-school partnerships: Beyond determined efforts by inspired individuals*. Canberra: Teaching Australia.

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

LaBoskey, V. K. (2006). Course assignments for self and program renewal: Learning to lesson plan. In C. Kosnik, C. Beck, A. R. Freese, & A. P. Samaras (Eds.), *Making a difference in teacher education through self-study: Studies of personal, professional, and program renewal* (pp. 227–241). Dordrecht: Springer.

Le Cornu, R. (2010). Changing roles, relationships and responsibilities in changing times. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, *38*, 195–206.

Le Cornu, R., & Ewing, R. (2008). Reconceptualizing professional experiences in pre-service teacher education . . . reconstructing the past to embrace the future. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *24*, 1799–1812.

Levine, M., & Trachtman, R. (2009). *Professional development school pathways to teacher quality in urban areas: Linking PDSs to improve teacher induction and alternate routes to certification*. Washington, DC: NCATE.

Martin, S. D., Snow, J. L., & Franklin Torrez, C. A. (2011). Navigating the terrain of third space: Tensions with/in relationships in school-university partnerships. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *62*, 299–311.

McDonald, J. P. (1992). *Teaching: Making sense of an uncertain craft*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Mishler, E. (1990). Validation in inquiry-guided research: The role of exemplars in narrative studies. *Harvard Education Review*, *60*, 415–442.

Papay, J. P., West, M. R., Fullerton, J. B., & Kane, T. J. (2012). Does an urban teacher residency increase student achievement? Early evidence from Boston. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, *34*, 413–434.

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

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

Sands, D. I., & Goodwin, L. D. (2005). Shared responsibility for teacher preparation: An exploratory study of the match between skills of clinical teachers and those required of their teacher candidates. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *21*, 817–828.

Solomon, J. (2009). The Boston teacher residency: District-based teacher education. *The Journal of Teacher Education*, *60*, 478–488.

Taylor, M., Abrams, L., Klein, E., Wray, S., Cordero, E., Silva, J., …, Strom, K. (2012). Shape shifting or becoming third space teacher educators?: A co/autoethnographic self-study of mentors and faculty. In L. B. Erickson, J. R. Young, & S. Pinnegar (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 9th international conference on self-study of teacher education practices* (pp. 272–275). Provo, UT: Brigham Young University.

Taylor, M., & Coia, L. (2006). Revisiting feminist authority through a co/autoethnographic lens. In D. Tidwell & L. Fitzgerald (Eds.), *Self-study research and issues of diversity* (pp. 51–70). Rotterdam: Sense.

Taylor, M., & Coia, L. (2009). Co/autoethnography: Investigating teachers in relation. In C. Lassonde, S. Gallman, & C. Kosnik (Eds.), *Self-study research methodologies for teacher educators* (pp. 169–186). Rotterdam: Sense.

Wang, J., & Odell, S. (2002). Mentored learning to teach according to standards based reform: A critical review. *Review of Educational Research*, *72*, 481–546.

Wilson, S. M., Floden, R. E., & Ferrini-Mundy, J. (2001). *Teacher preparation research: Current knowledge, gaps, and recommendations. A research report prepared for the U.S. Department of Education*. Seattle, WA: Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy.

Young, J. R., Bullough, R. V. Jr., Draper, R. J., Smith, L. K., & Erickson, L. B. (2005). Novice teacher growth and personal models of mentoring: Choosing compassion over inquiry. *Mentoring and Tutoring*, *13*, 169–188.

Zeichner, K. (2010). Rethinking the connections between campus courses and field experiences in college and university-based teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *61*, 89–99.