36

ADMINISTRATORS ALSO DO SELF-STUDY: ISSUES OF POWER AND COMMUNITY, SOCIAL JUSTICE AND TEACHER EDUCATION REFORM*

Mary Phillips Manke
University of Wisconsin-River Falls

Abstract

Self-study of teacher education practices includes self-study of administrative practices in teacher education. Practitioners become administrators and wish to continue their self-study; practitioners who are not formally designated as administrators may recognize the importance of administrative practices in the institutions of which they are a part. These studies include those by administrators (deans, school superintendents, head teachers, school principals) who maintain their practice of self-study even though they have moved to an administrative role, by practitioners who have conducted self-studies with an administrative focus at the program level, and by practitioners writing self-studies with an administrative focus on teacher education reform. Key themes in administrative self-studies include issues of power (its source, purpose and use), issues of community (its development and purpose), efforts to incorporate social justice in teacher education, and the impact of teacher education reform. The chapter surveys a broad range of studies, primarily from authors within the Self-Study of Teacher Education Practices Special Interest Group. Because studies of educational administration are typically quantitative or, if qualitative, are done from an exterior perspective, these self-studies are unusual in the field of educational administration. They have considerable potential for revealing the impact of today's educational changes in the world of practice.

A narrow conception of self-study of teacher education practices would focus only on the work that is done in programs, schools, classes, and field experiences

*Chapter consultants: Geoff Mills, University of Southern Oregon, U.S.A. and Marilyn Johnston, The Ohio State University, U.S.A.

J. John Loughran et al. (eds.), International Handbook of Self-Study of Teaching and Teacher Education Practices, 1367–1391.

with preservice and practicing teachers. Two forces, however, have broadened the field of self-study to include studies of administration in teacher education and in schools. One force acknowledges the reality that the programs, schools, classes and field experiences where teacher education takes place exist within institutions – departments, colleges, universities and their subdivisions, and schools and school districts. These institutions are organized to require administration, and the nature of that administration has a crucial influence on the teacher education practices that occur within an institution. A second force acknowledges that the line between teaching and administration is never clear and distinct. Faculty members leave their classrooms to become program directors, accreditation coordinators, chairs and deans. School administrators leave their offices to become teacher educators, whether in schools or in universities. Researchers who have been drawn to self-study, who have acquired its habits of reflection and of focus on one's own work or the role of self in one's own work, wish to continue to focus in this way on their work as administrators. Thus it has been possible to sort out from the larger body of self-study of teacher education practices a considerable group of studies that offer an administrative focus.

Research in administration, whether in higher education or in schools, is typically quantitative in methodology (or, if qualitative, based in the more rule-bound areas of qualitative research) and pragmatic in focus. Thus this group of research studies provides an unusual perspective on issues of leadership, styles of interaction, and the ways that the demands of administration affect individuals. There is, of course, a tradition of autobiographies by higher education administrators (e.g., Kolodny's [1998] memoir of her tenure as dean at the University of Arizona) and, in a few cases, by school administrators (e.g., Cuban's [1970] early study of his work as a teacher and then as superintendent of schools in Arlington, Virginia). These works, often much focused on self-study, may provide a model for larger works yet to be written in the field of self-study of teacher education practices. Yet they do not provide the attention to the relationship between administration and teacher education that characterizes the work reviewed in this chapter.

Self-Disclosure

In the tradition of self-study, I begin with self-disclosure of my own history as an administrator in teacher education and of the role of self-study in my work. After teaching for a number of years, I entered the Ph.D. program in Social Foundations of Education at the University of Virginia at the age of 43. As a graduate student and single parent supporting my children, I spent much of my time working on research projects for a variety of professors, often poking my head into a professor's office to ask whether there was any work for me to do. Some of this work involved practice in administrative tasks, including organizing projects and persuading others to carry out activities needed to complete the research. This administrative work, while carried out far from the Dean's office,

was valuable preparation for future work in administration. I developed skills in performing administrative tasks and values for how I wanted to interact with others in an administrative role.

My experiences as a graduate student served me well in my first faculty position. The academic coordinator of the university center where I was to teach soon let me know that he wanted to pass his responsibilities on to me, and he offered significant mentoring as I learned the role. In this position I recruited, supervised, and provided professional development for the many adjunct faculty who taught in the program. I also solved student problems, kept track of a budget, and organized a series of large professional development events for the teachers who were participants in the program. While the program involved practicing teachers, rather than teacher education candidates, it had enough students to feel like a college of its own.

When I moved to another university, I began to take on some administrative responsibilities in my second year of teaching; by the end of my third year I was teaching only one course. I administered a grant, organized an action research collective involving 20 teachers from a nearby district, and carried out some of the responsibilities of an accreditation coordinator. As a result, I recognized that my interest in administration and my competence in administrative tasks were signals that this was a path I wanted to follow.

My next move was into my current administrative position as associate dean in a college of education and professional studies. My work has included administration of graduate studies at the university, program improvement work in teacher education, grant administration, and service as accreditation coordinator, communications officer, and diversity coordinator for the college. I also perform a range of tasks in support of the dean. It is in this role that I have carried out some self-study of teacher education administration practices and of the power relations that underlie my own practices (Manke, 2000). My self-study has focused primarily on naming and understanding the values that underlie the administrative practices that I prefer and choose. Through that analysis I have identified relationships between my teaching practices and my administrative practices. These include the way I model as an administrator the same kinds of values that underlie my modeling of teaching practices in educating future teachers, as well as the understanding of power relations that defines my work as teacher and administrator.

In reviewing the self-study of administrative practices in teacher education, I have found only a few papers written from the dean's office, where I find myself. However, there are many studies that illustrate the self-study practitioner writing from some other administrative perspective, such as chair, program director or coordinator, accreditation coordinator, principal or head of school, or school superintendent. Thus defined, there is a rich literature on which to draw in considering administrative approaches to the self-study of teacher education practices.

A Definition of Self-Study of Teacher Education Practices

Practitioners of self-study of teacher education practices have engaged in a continuing dialogue focused on the definition and value of this work. The issues raised in this dialogue are by no means resolved as this handbook is prepared. Years of dialogue have led to rich development of the issues, but I suspect (and indeed hope) that single answers to our questions may never be proposed and accepted. Nevertheless, agreement has been reached on certain key concepts, while the nature of differing points of view on others has been established.

Fundamental to self-study is the practice of *reflection on context and practice.* Self-study does not simply describe the context in which teacher education practices take place or the practices themselves. The self-study practitioner is one who seeks, through reflection, deeper understanding of context, practice, and their interaction. This key element of self-study rescues it from at least two potential pitfalls – the fear that self-study will be reduced to the retailing of raw anecdotes of practice, and the concern that self-study will become some solipsistic ritual of self-reflection, of interest or value to no one but the self-study practitioner (see Weber, 2002). The self-study practitioner must *reflect* on practice, not simply describe it. The self-study practitioner must also reflect on *the context of practice*, a context of which the practitioner's self is a part, but not the whole.

Self-study is enriched when the practitioner engages in *looking back at past practices and past contexts to assist reflection on current contexts and practices.* This element of self-study allows for linkage with the published and presented work of other practitioners, thus alleviating the concern that a field that focuses on *self*-study will be fragmented into as many parts as there are practitioners. This handbook is an important element in a process that unites the field; future practitioners will be able to refer to a useful compendium of past practices and contexts in reflecting on their current study. In addition, this same element of self-study practice leads to the practice of re-analysis, in which the practitioner returns to the artifacts of her or his own previous self-study and engages anew in reflection on the practices and contexts that are contained in the artifacts. In this way the ever-changing self of the practitioner can be understood and represented not just as a series of snapshots, but as a richly interconnected developmental process.

Also important to self-study, somewhat surprisingly, is its focus on *collaboration.* At first glance, it seems improbable that a field of study that focuses on the self would include collaboration as a vital element. Certainly, collaborative practices work against the concerns about solipsism and fragmentation already noted. Collaborative practices may be selected by practitioners who have these concerns, but they also arise naturally in the contexts in which individuals work together in similar roles (as teacher educators and as administrators, for example) and in which individuals learn of others who are engaged in the self-study of similar practices or contexts. Collaborative self-study supports the credibility of the work, providing simple triangulation and also a context for mutual critique that becomes part of the self-study. This critique functions like the discrepant

case analysis (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) of qualitative research, displaying for the reader the commitment of the practitioner to a critical approach to the work. In addition, practitioners of self-study know that it is rigorous, demanding work, and that collaboration provides support and commitment when other demands call more loudly.

I have used the three elements of reflection on context and practice, looking back at past contexts and practices, and collaboration as criteria in the selection of studies reviewed in this chapter. Studies lacking these elements have not been included.

Origins of Self-Studies of Administrative Practices in Teacher Education

The reviewed studies fall naturally into three major categories: self-study by practitioners who become administrators and proceed to apply self-study methodology to their work, self studies at the program level that include reflection on administrative practices, and self-studies that focus on teacher education reform. Inevitably, there is some overlap among these categories, but I use them to introduce the range of studies included in the chapter.

Self-Study Practitioners Who Have Become Administrators

Hamilton, writing as part of the Arizona Group (1996, 2000) as well as independently (2000, 2001), is a teacher educator who served as head of a division of

Table 36.1. Origins of self-studies of administrative practices in teacher education

Studies by self-study practitioners who have become administrators	Studies by self-study practitioners reflecting on administrative practices at the program level	Studies by self-study practitioners engaged in fostering teacher education reforms
Hamilton (Arizona Group, 1996, 2000)	Vavrus (Vavrus and Archibald, 1998)	Vavrus (Vavrus and Archibald, 1998)
Hamilton (2000, 2001)	Hamilton (Arizona Group, 2000)	Holley (1997)
Senese (2000)	Hamilton (2000, 2001)	Hamilton (Arizona Group, 2000)
Austin (2001)	Delong (1996)	Hamilton (2000, 2001)
Griffiths & Windle (2002)	Kosnik (1998)	Squire (1998)
Mills (2002)	Upitis & Russell (1998)	Loftus (1999)
Upitis (1996)	Johnston with The Educators for Collaborative Change (1997)	Delong (2002)
Upitis & Russell (1998)	Evans (1995)	
Deer (1999)		
Manke (2000)		

teacher education at a major American research university. She describes both her efforts to use a review process as a tool for reform centered on social justice and the frustration she experienced when colleagues resisted the reforms.

Senese (2000) is assistant principal of a high school in Illinois, with responsibilities for professional development of the staff. His study focuses on how he applied to his work in professional development the insights he gained through self-study of his own teaching practices in the high school classroom, including his students' response to innovative practices.

Austin (2001), a head teacher at a school in Alaska, led a professional development effort that brought together student teachers and experienced teachers to reflect on their work individually and collectively. She looked explicitly at the ways her work with this group paralleled her teaching practices in an upper elementary school classroom.

Griffiths and Windle (2002), respectively Professor of Educational Research (an administrative position) and Research Administrator at a university in England, inquired into the administrative practices that can create support for faculty members' interest in and practice of research. They also explored ways to support the development of research in an era of financial constraints and erratic government decisions.

Mills (2002), dean of a graduate program preparing teachers at a university in Oregon, wrote about the way his intentions were frustrated by conflicting faculty agendas.

Upitis (1996) carried out a self-study early in her deanship at a university in Ontario, looking at how she was able to establish time to allow her to continue important aspects of her personal and professional life while serving effectively as dean. Later (1998), she collaborated with Russell, a colleague, to explore how she had developed improved communications and stronger community in the faculty.

Deer (1999), an administrator of a teacher education program in Australia, focuses on her role of leading major structural reform as well as a move from a teaching to a research culture in her unit.

My own study (Manke, 2000) returns to the question of the nature of power relations that I had explored in previous self-studies (Manke, 1995, 1998) and also in ethnographic research (Manke, 1997). The study considers whether the theoretical framework I had previously developed for the classroom is applicable in the administrator's office.

Self-Studies at the Program Level

A second group of self-studies includes those in which the unit of study is the program rather than the individual course or field experience. Studies focused on courses and experiences may note the roles or effects of administrative practices, but they do not make them central to the analysis. Program-level studies can hardly ignore the role of administration in the functioning of the program, and in some studies the role of administration is a central element.

Vavrus (Vavrus & Archibald, 1998) studied his experiences as an administrator seeking to institute reform in two contexts, first in a small private college (Iowa, US) and then in a state college with a strong tradition of faculty self-determination (Washington, US).

Hamilton, again as part of the Arizona Group (2000), experienced similar difficulties in dealing with issues of administrative versus faculty control of programs. She also writes of her work in trying to advance a social justice agenda in her program (2000, 2001).

Delong (1996) explored the values and attributes she brought to the work of school superintendent in the province of Ontario as she sought to promote reform through self-study.

Kosnik (1998) wrote about her work as director and faculty member in an elementary teacher education program at a university in Ontario. She focused on the collaborative work with both students and faculty that led to changes in the meaning of teaching.

Upitis, dean of a teacher education program at a university in Ontario, worked with a faculty member to study the methods she used to create a positive environment for change and reform in the program (Upitis & Russell, 1998). This collaboration led to their collaborative conclusion that "good pedagogy leads seamlessly into good deaning."

Johnston (Johnston with The Educators for Collaborative Change, 1997), a professor at a university in Ohio, directed a professional development school collaboration and wrote with many of the teacher participants. She offered her reflections on the kind of leadership position she tried to assume.

Self-Studies of Teacher Education Reform

Teacher education practices today exist in an era of reform, a time of political forces as well as internal intentions to improve the preparation and professional development of teachers. These forces exert intense and often contradictory pressures in both teacher education and the schools where teachers work. Thus many self-studies are set in a context of reform, and often are written by those leading or intending to lead reform processes. This kind of leadership is usually closely tied to administrative roles within the hierarchical settings of schools and universities. Previously mentioned studies by Vavrus & Archibald (1998) and Hamilton (2000, 2001, and also in her role in the Arizona Group, 2000) must be included in this category. This category also includes a study by Squire (1998), who went from a teaching position to a bureaucratic job creating standards of practice for teachers through a professional regulatory body in Ontario. Squire's study focuses on how her work in the Ontario College of Teachers, especially in the area of action research, helped her make sense of her own teaching life, sorting out its multiple strands as she worked through the tasks assigned to her.

The third category also includes research by a number of individuals who wrote self-study dissertations in educational administration at the University of

Bath. Studies by members of the group supervised by Whitehead consistently focus on discerning how the living values of the administrator/researcher are expressed in the context of their work. Because of the rich and multiple focal points of these studies, I have selected a single portion of each thesis to review for this chapter. Austin (2001), already mentioned, is part of this group.

Loftus (1999), head of a primary school in England, examined how the culture of the English school where he was head teacher was developed, within the context of bringing a marketing approach to the school.

Delong (2002), a superintendent of schools in Ontario, brought a penetrating lens to her work in developing Action Research as a focus for professional development in her district.

Holley (1997), head teacher of a secondary school in England, explored the frustration she experienced in a setting where both monitoring of teacher compliance with reform initiatives and a more personal and interactive form of professional development were expected of her in working with the same set of teachers.

Topical Threads in Self-Studies of Administrative Practices in Teacher Education

In the remainder of this chapter, I review in some detail the papers described above, organized this time by major topical threads found in the literature. These include papers that focus on *issues of power* (Upitis, 1996; Upitis & Russell, 1998; Manke, 2000; Mills, 2002; Delong, 1996, 2002; Senese, 2000; Kosnik, 2002; Austin, 2001; Holley, 1997; Evans, 1995; Loftus, 1999; Johnston with The Educators for Collaborative Change, 1997); papers that raise *issues about community* (Upitis & Russell, 1998; Manke, 2000; Senese, 2000; Griffiths & Windle, 2002; Austin, 2001; Evans, 1995; Loftus, 1999); papers that raise *issues of social justice* (Hamilton, 2000, 2001; Griffiths & Windle, 2002; Vavrus & Archibald, 1998); and papers that consider *issues of reform in teacher education/teacher professional development* from an administrative perspective (Hamilton, 2000, 2001; Squire, 1998; Arizona Group, 1996, 2000; Vavrus & Archibald, 1998; Deer, 1999; Delong, 2002; Holley, 1997). Naturally these categories overlap. For example, the nature of community is strongly affected by the ways power is perceived and used. Both social justice and teacher education reform are sought or imposed in environments of power and community. Conversely, the exercise of power and the development of community are strong influences on efforts for social justice and teacher education reform.

Issues of Power

Having written a dissertation focused on issues of power in classrooms (Manke, 1990), my memories of the literature review do not allow me to suggest that there are only a few ways to understand the nature of this elusive concept. However, most of the work reviewed here relies on one or more of the following ideas about issues of power considered more broadly:

Table 36.2. Papers focused on major themes in the study of administration

Issues of power	Issues about community	Issues of social justice	Issues of reform
Upitis (1996)	Upitis & Russell (1998)	Hamilton (2000, 2001)	Hamilton (2000, 2001)
Upitis & Russell (1998)	Manke (2000)	Griffiths & Windle (2002)	Hamilton (Arizona Group, 1996, 2000)
Manke (2000)	Senese (2000)	Vavrus (Vavrus & Archibald, 1998)	Vavrus (Vavrus & Archibald, 1998)
Mills (2002)	Griffiths & Windle (2002)		Deer (1999)
Delong (1996, 2002)	Austin (2001)		Delong (2002)
Senese (2000)	Loftus (1999)		Holley (1997)
Kosnik (2002)	Evans (1995)		
Johnston and The Educators for Collaborative Change (1997)			
Austin (2001)			
Holley (1997)			
Loftus (1999)			
Evans (1995)			

- Power can come from several sources, such as that inherent in a position such as dean or president, that inherent in acknowledged expertise (of which professors and medical doctors are often said to be examples), and that inherent in the possession of economic, political, or social power (corporate leaders, presidents, and high society leaders are examples) (Barnes, 1998).
- Power can be exercised either *over* others or *with* others, in autocratic or collaborative structures (Kreisberg, 1992).
- Power is most obvious as it is exercised by the strong, but it also available to weaker members of a society (Janeway, 1980).
- Power is evident not only in political documents, weapons, and punishments, but also in administrative and social structures and in the nature of the gaze that the powerful cast upon the weak (Foucault, 1980).

The self-studies in this section do not reflect all these ideas about power at the same time. These ideas are not mutually exclusive, but authors assume one or more of them as an underlying understanding(s) of power. This is appropriate, given that administrators and their faculties, employees, or subordinates typically accept the idea that power is assigned to them by the nature of their positions.

Upitis (1996; Upitis & Russell, 1998) exemplifies an administrator who intends to exert "power with" her faculty. If she accepts at all that she has power as a dean, she attributes it only to the position to which she has been assigned. Her interest is in developing strong communication with faculty and a sense of shared

enterprise that will lead everyone to work together for change and improvement. She grasps the existence of the "powers of the weak" (Janeway, 1980) as she struggles with some faculty who make it clear that her way of being dean is not for them and who interfere with her progress toward her goals. Interestingly, the power she struggles against is the power of the position to shape her personal and professional life, as she seeks time for research and learns to do academic writing "curled up in the economy class of a crowded airplane" (Upitis, 1996, p. 76) She uses this struggle for her own ends, as she seeks to model for faculty a balanced lifestyle that, even in a demanding job, allows time for her to feel in control of her own life and her own pleasures.

I appreciate Upitis' work because my own view of what it means to be a dean and my own values are similar to hers (Manke, 2000). Like Upitis, I prefer "power with" to "power over." I recognize that there is power of position assigned to the dean's office and that I am exercising it whether I want to or not, even as an associate dean. In my paper, I reflect on the idea that, even though I take pleasure in solving student problems and receiving their thanks and smiles, I am exercising the power of my office as much as did a predecessor who reportedly liked to make students cry. In my earlier studies of classroom power, I was strongly aware of the mutual possession of power by the teacher and the students, and I resisted any analysis that gives power (and therefore responsibility) to the teacher alone. This awareness, however, was based on the intensive and long-lasting interaction that occurs in classrooms. Writing the paper, I continued to doubt that without such interaction the "powers of the weak" (Janeway, 1980) could be as significant as those of the strong. After a longer period in the dean's office, though, I would suggest that multi-year interactions with faculty allow the powers of the weak to be quite well developed.

Mills (2002), the third and last dean in this group, offers a distinctly different view of the nature of a dean's power. He understands his power to come from his position and, most specifically, from the resources his position allows him to control. He is displeased to discover that his exercise of "power over" changes irrevocably the relationships he has built as a peer of the faculty members in his college. The powers of the weak include the ability to refuse social comfort to the strong (Janeway, 1980), and Mills describes himself as losing friends when he makes decisions without taking into account their points of view. He also exercises "power over" when he uses the resources he controls when faculty behave in ways he judges to be unprofessional.

Delong (1996) defines the core of her administrative work in a school district in Ontario as one of building trust. This places her squarely with Upitis and Manke as one who prefers "power with" to "power over," and who recognizes that the powers of the weak (Janeway, 1980) are not only present but also able to interfere with her effectiveness as an administrator if the necessary relationships are not developed. More than any of the authors previously reviewed, Delong places her administrative position in a larger context, one that includes forces that limit the success of her efforts. As she attempts to build an action research group in her district (2002), Delong is frustrated by interference from

colleagues and university staff. Perhaps she, located in an administrative power structure, is able to place these frustrations in public view because they do not come from her superiors in school administration. This frustration also may arise from her assumption that, in addition to power of position, she should be recognized as having the power of expertise.

Senese (2000) understands his power as being based on the skill with which he interacts with students (in the classroom) and faculty (in the professional development program). Perhaps realistically in an American high school, especially one in a wealthy and progressive community, he is aware that the power of his position as assistant principal is severely limited vis-à-vis the faculty. He *must* use "power with," developing relationships with the faculty that lead to shared work in the improvement of teaching through action research. Thus Senese (2000, p. 229) develops three counterintuitive axioms based on his classroom teaching:

- Go slow to go fast.
- Be tight to be loose.
- Relinquish control in order to gain influence.

The first and third of these are fairly obvious as examples of accommodating the weak (Janeway, 1980) or of exercising "power with." You do not rush people faster than they want to go, and you can affect their actions more easily if you are not seeking to control their lives. The second axiom, though, reflects Senese's understanding of what his teacher colleagues want: they are uncomfortable when he seeks to make them more independent by refusing to provide a clear sense of direction or procedure for them. As assistant principal and leader of professional development, he has the power of expertise, and the teachers are unwilling to allow him to completely abrogate that power. (See also the discussion of Evans, 1995, below.)

Kosnik (2002) describes her work as director of a teacher education program focused on intensive field experiences for the students. As a faculty member in one program cohort, she has been able to engage in systematic research on a variety of aspects of the program over a five-year period. She indicates that is through this research that she has been able to influence others in making needed changes in the program. Although she makes some use of the power of position, her primary source of power, she suggests, is the power of expertise. As a researcher, she brings her results to bear as powerful change motivators, affecting action research, student workloads, communication between students and teachers, and arrangements for practicum supervision.

Johnston (Johnston with The Educators for Collaborative Change, 1997) is a university professor who writes thoughtfully about the ways she used the power of her position in her work in a professional development site where she was designated as co-coordinator. Her thinking has strong connections for me because she makes an effort, as I have in the past, to deny her own power. She positions herself not as weak, but as neutral with respect to power. She seeks to be out of the arena of power. She refuses, on most occasions, to offer the group

of teachers she works with either the power of her position as university representative and co-coordinator or the power of her expertise as experienced teacher and educated professor. She goes beyond not wishing to exercise "power over" to seeking *not* to exercise "power with": "In retrospect, I think I overdid the attempt to position myself in nonhierarchical ways" (p. 28). Interestingly, she finds that this attempt on her part made her role and the relationship with the university central to the discussion, which she thought was valuable. Yet she found that it also worked against possible learning for the teachers in the group. Later she defines her role in the group in three ways taken from the world of the newspaper: as an advertiser, a reporter, and an editor – but not a managing editor. She assigns herself roles that are vital to a paper's functioning, but are not directive. She continues to look for ways to position herself away from the location where power is used.

Four members of what I term the Whitehead Group (all masters and Ph.D. students of Jack Whitehead at the University of Bath) also reflect on issues of power. Evans (1995) is a deputy head teacher of a comprehensive school in England, responsible for professional development and deeply committed to a constructivist approach to this work. The relationship between teacher and learner in a constructivist philosophy of education has one of its roots in "power with," and Evans sees her role as one of working with the teachers as they work out changes they can make in their classrooms that will lead to better student learning. To her dismay, some of the teachers would prefer that she tell them what to do or, if she is unable to tell them what to do, that she send them to be taught by someone who can. She is asked to appear as a confident leader, but she is left in confusion as to whether it is sufficient to be confident that constructivist methods are best.

Austin (2001) writes as leader of a professional development group at a school in Alaska (US) that brings together student teachers and teachers in a course setting that allows them to reflect on and discuss their practice each week. Austin, who has considerable expertise in teacher reflection, attempts to assume neither the power of expertise nor the power of position, but focuses on exercising power with the teachers in developing their process. She tries to conceal the power she does exercise, by arranging the room, the music, and the process of sharing floor time in the discussion. At the same time, she is acutely aware of the power that the teacher members of the group have in deciding whether or not to participate in this activity and how it will proceed. She writes from a perspective of unease that reflects her understanding of her power. Will anyone sign up for the class? Will anyone come to the first meeting? Will this afternoon's session go well? Will anyone sign up for the second semester of the class?

Holley (1997), head teacher of an English secondary school, parallels Delong in her frustration with the ways that the power conferred on her by position and expertise are limited by the larger social context in which she must work. She is called on to carry out, simultaneously, roles that she sees as antithetical to one another, especially because they involve relationships with the same teacher colleagues. On the one hand, she must serve as a monitor who checks

to see whether and how well they are carrying out the prescribed actions and process of their teaching. On the other hand, she is expected to engage the teachers in a self-directed appraisal process of professional development in which they reflect on their own teaching with regard to their understanding of themselves as teachers. Eager to exercise power within the latter process, she is required to assume the power of position and the power of expertise while she exercises "power over" in monitoring the teachers. The power of administrative structures, the power of her gaze as she engages in monitoring the teachers, is controlling not only the teachers but also herself as she carries out her work. She and the teachers, co-located as "the weak" (Janeway, 1980) in this structure, seem unaware of any power they can use.

Finally, Loftus (1999) writes as an English head teacher who works to bring an "industrial marketing perspective" to his primary school, but who learns in the process that maintaining the culture of the school in a marketable condition requires approaches to power other than those implied by that phrase. The portion of his work reviewed here is more relevant to the ensuing discussion about community than to this section about power, but it is useful to note here that his data indicate that members of staff felt that the culture they viewed as highly positive was actually created by the senior management of the school. One staff member said that it would be unfair not to support the management group because of the effort put into their work. Loftus himself indicates that, despite many external pressures and internal changes, the culture of the school continued to be a positive one. This remark and those of the staff members seems to indicate that power was used collaboratively in a "power with" environment, even though Loftus apparently saw his power coming both from his position as head teacher and from his expertise in marketing approaches.

Power and its many facets emerge as a significant theme in these 13 studies by 11 administrators from three English-speaking countries. A majority of the administrators prefer "power with" approaches, recognizing the powers of the weak (Janeway, 1980) while acknowledging the sources of their own power in their positions and their expertise.

Issues of Community

The idea that developing community is important in administration derives directly from concepts discussed in the preceding section on issues of power. Developing community is important if power-with (Kreisberg, 1992) is to be used and if the mutuality of power implied in the notion of the powers of the weak (Janeway, 1980) is to be recognized. Community, however, is an object of analysis with a history far shorter than that of power. Community has existed as long as humanity, but for most of those centuries community simply existed, unanalyzed, as a sort of artifact of human interaction. Even in the 18th and 19th centuries, when intentional communities, often utopian in nature, began to be developed, their purpose was not simply to create community but to achieve some particular goal of religion or socialism or agriculturalism. The complex

analysis of power that is so well-developed in the literature is not present in literature on community, which typically assumes that community is a positive and productive condition and proceeds to explore how community can be created. This is the stance of the self-studies focusing on community that are discussed here. An example of such literature is Sarason's (1972) *The Creation of Settings and Future Societies* (cited by Upitis & Russell [1998]), which discusses what is needed to create strong new communities from the broken materials of failed communities.

Upitis and Russell (1998), for example, find their faculty of education in some disarray, with faculty divided into factions and an overall aura of mistrust. Upitis as dean and Russell as faculty member work to build a functioning community, to transform the same people who are so divided into a single working unit. Their paper focuses on just one of the tools employed to achieve this end, the development of improved communication among members of the community. Also briefly mentioned are structural changes that imply a reduction of distributed power and a concentration of power in a more democratically focused center, with positive motivation promoted by, "delivering carefully worded and passionate messages in large assemblies" (p. 78). Among the communication activities used are individual conversations, larger gatherings at which difficult topics are raised and confronted, and electronic messaging. This last is the focus of the self-study the two have written. Upitis establishes a list serve that she uses to communicate not only information but also a vision of her deanship and of the community she wants to create. This featured idea of communication for community-building is thematic in a number of other self-studies.

My own self-study (Manke, 2000) includes reflections on the leadership style I prefer, which I call relational leadership. Somewhat like the style of a teacher who channels classroom interaction through herself, so that the students all interact with her and not with one another, I pictured myself at that time, shortly after assuming my position, as the center of a web of relationships that could be described as a community. This web of relationships, still to some extent a feature of my work as associate dean, allows me to move an agenda forward in the community while avoiding the confrontations between individuals that had characterized the community into which I came. As I write this I am questioning whether this kind of community interaction is healthy, yet I must admit that it has allowed some important changes to begin in an environment that has historically buried needed changes under a mountain of conflicts. I might conclude that it has not contributed to changing the nature of the community, and that I must wait for time and change to alter the balance of influence. But I also acknowledge that over several years the kind of interaction experienced among faculty members has become consistently gentler and more focused on working together.

In his self-study of his role as assistant principal and professional development leader in an American high school, Senese (2000) describes his role in creating a community by setting standards for the behavior of members. Participation

in the Action Research Laboratory is voluntary, and Senese has set clear expectations for how teachers will function if they choose to join. He indicates that this firmness in setting expectations (enacting his axiom "be tight to be loose") has been effective in developing a community in which the teachers show respect for one another by accepting their responsibilities. Deadlines may be negotiated, but the premise that everyone will do the work and do it well is accepted by all. This strategy on his part may be related to Upitis' (Upitis & Russell, 1998) provision of messages about the kind of community she is trying to create.

Austin (2001), who studied her leadership of professional development in a school in Alaska, combines features of Senese's, Manke's, and Upitis' concerns in seeking to create a community in which teachers can reflect together on their work. She worries that teachers will interact in negative or unproductive ways, that certain teachers (especially males), will dominate the discussion, and that teachers will not attend the class or will not participate in the activities she suggests. Like Senese, she reflects constantly on the lessons she has learned from her teaching to understand how to respond to the teachers and what to expect of them. She gives them time to get started writing about their classroom experiences, knowing how her sixth-grade students often have trouble getting started with writing. As she does in her classroom, she provides entertaining ice breakers and amusing gifts to loosen the tensions of the day. She uses structured tools for sharing the floor, tools she has found effective with her students. Her work to create community has a tone of nurturing, mothering care (Noddings, 1986; Ruddick, 1995), not surprising in an elementary school teacher.

Evans (1995) focuses part of her study on her effort to build community among a certain group of teacher-administrators in her comprehensive school in England. She is convinced that they will be more effective contributors to school improvement if they have a sense of collaborative community. Though they have been working together, they insist that their lack of knowledge about one another is an impediment to their work. Evans takes the risk of asking them each to write a list of their own characteristics and then to give words describing the personal characteristics of the other group members to them. It is hard for them to agree to do this, but in the end they do, and they find that in general their understanding of one another is quite similar to their individual self-understandings. Later, Evans shares with the group an edited transcript, or story, of their meeting. She is clearly convinced that self-knowledge and group reflection on their interaction will lead them to a stronger sense of community.

Griffiths is working to create a community for the specific purpose of developing a research culture in her university, but she is also working to create one that is in tune with the political and social values that are so important to her. She demonstrates what these values look like by co-authoring and co-presenting a paper (Griffiths & Windle, 2002) with the research administrator of her unit, a member of the support staff. She describes her "research principles" as, "partnership, small-scale relevance, involvement in teacher education, [and being] inclusive of all levels of research experience" (p. 88). These principles require only a small amount of translation to be seen as social justice principles of

community, local action, goal-centered action, and inclusion of all people. Thus Griffiths has created a strong link between the purpose of the community and the guiding values for its creation. The paper suggests that this cohesion gives strength to the growing community. Interviews with participants produced descriptive words like encouragement, welcome, support, ownership, warmth, security, and understanding (p. 89). Windle's role in providing prompt, courteous support on request is highlighted. Griffiths indicates that a core value is a basic trust in human beings (p. 90). Griffiths and Windle conclude that "peace, laughter, enjoyment, and excitement" are essential (p. 91). In the world of social justice that Griffiths envisions, communities maintain precisely these values for all.

Loftus (1999) provides an interesting contrast with Griffiths and Windle. He enters his research with the intention of applying industrial marketing knowledge to the English school where he is head, planning to sell the school as a desirable product to the parents of children who will attend. But an important focus of his work turns out to be the culture of the school community. He marvels at the ability of the culture/community to remain whole under the battering of personnel changes and increasing demands from the education establishment. Collecting data from the school staff, he seeks to understand what strengthens the school community and finds that staff support each other without relying heavily on senior management. Loftus perceives caring support among colleagues, as well. He asks not how he could or did create community but what his place was in the community. Based on data from the staff, he concludes that his ability to intercept negative interactions and to help reduce the stress of work in school was essential to the maintenance, if not the creation, of the school community. He also notes the potential for senior management to destroy, rather than support, the positive culture of the community.

These self-studies of issues about community in American, Canadian and English teaching-learning environments portray self-study researchers who are convinced they have an active role in building community. Only Loftus' (1999) study even questions the role of the "senior management," and he finds that he has an important role in maintaining, if not creating, the community in his school. In addition, these researchers have a clear sense of both the kind of community they want to create and the pragmatic purposes of creating such a community. Senese wants to create a community with clear expectations in which members take responsibility for their share of the tasks to be completed. Manke wants a community in which problem-solving takes place in an orderly and civil manner. Griffiths wants a community that exemplifies social justice and supports change in the research culture. Austin seeks to create a space in which all can participate in an equitable manner in order to encourage reflection and improved teaching. Upitis seeks to put an end to the divisiveness and lack of focus she perceives in the community's past in order to move forward with reform. Evans wants a community that can work collaboratively for change, and Loftus wants to maintain a community of mutual support among staff, a community that will encourage parents to see the school as a desirable place for

their children. Self-study has helped these eight administrators to clarify their intentions in building community.

Issues of Social Justice

Only three self-studies related to administration look explicitly at concerns about social justice. This may reflect a sense on the part of some self-study practitioners that social justice and teacher education are not closely linked. For the authors of these studies, however, that relationship is not only clear but also preeminent. In the preceding section, I discussed Griffiths' social justice agenda (Griffiths & Windle, 2002), highlighting the significance of social justice both in the purpose of her work and in the kind of community she wants to build in an English university. Earlier in this chapter, I could also have examined her preference for using "power with" and her recognition of the "powers of the weak" (Janeway, 1980). None of this is surprising in view of Griffiths' work as a feminist philosopher of education who emphasizes social justice in many publications. It is in this paper, however, that she makes explicit the connection between social justice and her administrative role.

Hamilton (2000) initially titled her paper, "Change, social justice and reliability: Reflections of a secret (change) agent," and then revisited the same events in a second paper (Hamilton, 2001). As she positions herself as a secret agent, an undercover worker in the effort to secure social justice in an American university, she implies that it is not an agenda pursued by many in the program of which she was the director at the time the paper was written. Her self-study shows her using traditional academic governance activities – preparing position papers, sending informative e-mail messages, holding meetings – to promote an agenda of social justice for the teacher education program. Academics know how lengthy and intensive such processes are. Despite the fact that reform at her university followed a demand from the Board of Regents that the university "meet the needs of America and Kansas," (Hamilton, 2001, p. 109), a demand of a type that rarely calls for social justice, Hamilton set out to use the reform process to promote that very end. After two years of work, the committee tabled the issue of social justice and had not returned to the topic when the papers were written.

Hamilton's review of her journals at this time reveals her sense of "horror that colleagues could vote against social justice" (p. 111). In her self-study, she explores explanations for this event, ranging from racism to personal animosity to the effects of a changing and hardening political climate. She concludes her paper by foregrounding the responsibility of white scholars to raise and pursue issues of social justice against all odds.

Vavrus, writing in Vavrus & Archibald (1998), also studies his role as an administrator in pursuit of a social justice agenda in two American universities. Vavrus' central assumption is that a clear conceptual framework, adhered to in practice and belief, is the essence of teacher education reform and of quality teacher education. In his first position, he found a faculty with no interest in or knowledge of their mission statement and, in addition, with no interest in the

social justice agenda that for Vavrus equates with reform. Thus he spent years struggling to interest, convince, and move the faculty in the direction he strongly believed was right. His account indicates that his only success came because he was able to hire two new faculty members (in a group of 15) who agreed with his agenda. By the end of his tenure in this position, he was able to achieve a conceptual framework to which faculty members were at least superficially committed and which met his criteria for reform.

Moving to another position, Vavrus found another set of problems. Faculty seemed to share the values that underlay Vavrus' desire for teacher education reform with a social justice perspective but feared that written articulation of those values would inhibit the creativity of their teaching and curriculum design. It would seem that at some level they held liberal values of individual freedom more deeply than the democratic and social justice values they also espoused. Just as in his previous position, Vavrus made use of the demands of state and national accrediting bodies for a clearly articulated conceptual framework. He employed this tool to push the faculty into creating "a structure and thread of their curricular ideology" (p. 154). This appears to be an instance of "power over" operating under the guise of "power with." Vavrus had a definite ideological goal, which he promoted by stating that "they" (the accreditation bodies) want "us" (faculty and Vavrus, the director) to do it.

This small group of studies raises the interesting question of what administrative paths will actually lead to an increase in the social justice orientation of faculty. In writings on the benefits of accreditation, it is often stated or hinted that accreditation weaknesses are useful to schools of education as a way to get funding for improvements from their universities. The parallel benefit of using accreditation weaknesses as a way to induce faculty to move in a direction preferred by leadership is rarely mentioned. There is a definite contrast in the leadership focus of Griffiths, who seeks to model social justice in her administrative work, and of Vavrus, who uses the tools that come to hand to push faculty further into a social justice approach to teacher education. This point recalls comments by Guilfoyle (Arizona Group, 1996), who writes about the tendency of critical teacher educators to embrace a transmission style of teaching, not taking responsibility for teaching others how to pursue social justice in the classroom. Hamilton is in a somewhat different position as she describes her belief that faculty must surely support social justice when given the opportunity, and her distress at learning that they do not.

Issues of Reform in Teacher Education and Teacher Professional Development

As the 21st century begins, we appear to be living in an era of intense efforts to reform teacher education. Some might say that reforms led by conservative political forces seeking to achieve a deprofessionalized, state-controlled curriculum in schools throughout the English-speaking world have now made teacher education reform the arena for erasing the last vestiges of progressivism in

schools. Others might hold up the standards-based reform movement as a road on which to realize the twin goals of equality and quality in education for all children. As self-study practitioners in administrative roles choose one of these views, or take a path between the two, their efforts at or responses to teacher education reform become quite different stories.

Vavrus, for example, recognizes the anti-progressive aspects of much current teacher education reform, but seems to see the movement as having the potential to make a reform agenda oriented to progressivism more effective (Vavrus & Archibald, 1998). The discussion of his work in the previous section highlights his views on this issue. He seems to believe that, however reform is enacted, it can remain progressive in effect. At the end of his portion of the paper, he reflects that he feels confident that even if he were to leave his institution, the faculty would continue in the direction he has made possible for them. When he speaks of the faculty at his first institution and their resistance to his efforts, he does not recognize that they are using the "powers of the weak" (Janeway, 1980) to resist his power, the power of the strong. His work is an interesting example of an effort to create community around a set of ideas, with the ideas very much in the mind of the administrator, especially in his first position.

Hamilton (2000, 2001), also discussed in the previous section, seems to reason much as Vavrus does. She hopes to use the process of curriculum redesign, stimulated by accreditation pressures, to achieve progressive reform, only to find her efforts collapsing around her because of faculty resistance to the values she seeks to promote.

Squire (1998) is not so radical a reformer. Precisely because she believes that standards-based reform will lead to better educational outcomes, she accepts a position creating the standards for the Province of Ontario that will guide the work of teachers and teacher educators. At the end of a teaching career, she almost luxuriates in her office job, where she has a phone on her desk and the time and quiet to see a task through. She wonders, "How could she share with her peers her beliefs about the positive new directions?" and "How can we keep the teachers' voice as we frame policy?" (p. 13). Answering her questions involves a process of engaging groups of teachers in action research to help develop the new standards. Her role was to analyze the data they created, uncover themes, and share those themes with the teachers while weaving them into the standards she was helping to create. It must be noted that this is a very power-filled set of tasks. Many have noted that one way to control the outcome of a meeting is to take one's place at the chalkboard to make notes and outlines of what is said. The opportunity to shape the results according to one's views is obvious. Yet the tone of Squire's self-study implies that she is genuinely striving to let the teachers' voices be heard. Thus, although Squire clearly believes that standards-based reform is a positive influence, she also believes that such reform will be ineffective without the participation of representatives of the group that will teach to the standards. The power of her position allows her to influence the development of standards, but she seeks to share that power ("power with") with teachers.

Deer (1999) undertook the position of Head of the School of Teacher Education at the University of Technology, Sydney, at a time of change and restructuring in teacher education, when her institution was required to change the culture of its teacher education school from one of teaching to one of research. One of her areas of professional interest was the theory of change, and she expected that the change would not be easy and would require much professional development for the faculty. She planned to "lead by example" (p. 4) and to get feedback from the faculty on the effectiveness of her leadership. She also expected to be supported in the change process by her superiors. (The relationship of leaders to *their* leaders is a topic that receives relatively little discussion in most of the self-studies reviewed in this chapter).

Deer does not give a clear sense of what she means by "lead by example," and her knowledge of change theory seems to have done little to cushion her against the expected negative responses of some of her staff and the unexpected lack of support by senior administrators who met with her as she proceeded on the road to reform. Still, when she retired after five years in her position, she had been able to accomplish the reforms that were her goals from the beginning. Faculty had learned to be researchers and were including research as well as teaching in their professional lives. There had been a large increase in the number of graduates in her program. And she had been able to obtain much of the financial support needed from the university administration. The internal successes she attributes to the provision of formal professional development opportunities for the staff. In effect, she approached the internal aspect of her administrative work as a teaching task. What learning experiences could she provide that would enable faculty to accept the changes she had in mind? This is a straightforward and systematic approach that seems quite different from the styles of other administrators included in this chapter.

Deer's study was presented under the aegis of the Self-Study of Teacher Education Practices Special Interest Group at AERA. However, she defines self-study as, "working out how to proceed and then reflecting on how my chosen course of action works" (p. 4). One reason for including it in this chapter is to highlight the contrast between a study like this and the more revealing self-study that actually looks at the self, at one's own beliefs, actions, relationships and the like, in trying to understand events and processes. Without this aspect of self-study, it is difficult to know much about the underlying aspects of actions described and processes used by the administrator.

As a superintendent of schools in a school district in Ontario, Delong's (2002) self-study dissertation focuses on her efforts to reform teacher professional development by introducing action research for teachers, in collaboration with university faculty. In some ways her task was parallel to that set for Deer, who was asked to change the culture of her School of Education to a research culture. Like Deer, Delong provided professional development opportunities to staff so they could learn a new way of working and of thinking about the work they were already doing. Like Deer, Delong identified an area of professional expertise for herself. For Deer, that area was "change," and for Delong, it was "systems."

In the early years of her project, Delong used her political understanding of systems to forward her goals, whether with teachers or with administrators. She assumed an active teaching role, working with teachers to increase their understanding of action research and bringing in university-based consultants to teach them more. After three years she was able to assume a supporting role that allows her the luxury of observing the teachers working out the results of her project, while she has time to enjoy observing what they are doing. Support activities include moving the actual administrative work of the program to selected participants, assisting teachers in producing written representations of their work, and arranging conferences and publications for dissemination of the research in environments that would feel safe to the teachers.

Certainly Delong's growing expertise in action research was a starting point for her power, and in the early years she made use of the power of her position. However, if we see her goal not as ensuring that teachers did action research but rather as ensuring that they became better teachers through the action research process, it is clear that she has chosen a "power with" approach to the reform of teacher professional development. Her development of an action research network was carried out in collaboration with the teachers, who shared her goal of educational improvement.

Holley (1995) was involved in teacher education reform from her role as deputy head of a comprehensive school. In the preceding section on issues of power, I described the conflicts she experienced between dual expectations for her relationships with teachers. Here I frame those same conflicts as warring approaches to education reform, particularly the reform of faculty professional development. On the one hand, Holley was asked to "monitor" the teaching of a group of faculty, observing them in their classrooms, rating them on a set of predetermined criteria and informing them of what they had done "right" and "wrong." This activity embodies a "power over" approach to teacher professional development that treats teachers as lacking in the abilities necessary for good teaching and capable of improvement only by being chastised for their failures. This is the approach to education reform that has been implied in many government-sponsored publications and in many publications sponsored by non-profit and political groups in the United States. It is an approach that casts teachers in the role of "the weak," and thus invites them to use the "powers of the weak" (Janeway, 1980) to resist and subvert what is being done to them.

At the same time (and this simultaneity was what frustrated her so deeply), Holley was also involved with the teachers in a process of "appraisal" that asked the teachers to reflect on the strengths and weakness of their teaching and then work out what kinds of changes were needed in order to make them more effective as teachers. Holley's role was supposed to be one of talking with and listening to the teachers as they carried out this process. Such a role is similar to the role of "critical friend" often held up as a model in self-study research. This process gives teachers responsibility for their own development and for the quality of their own work, avoids deskilling them in the improvement process, and moves them toward increasing professionalization of their roles. It is a

"power with" process that invites teachers to co-create improved teaching and learning in their schools and classrooms.

The imposition of two opposing processes at the same moment was not painful only for Holley; it was almost guaranteed to fail. How could the teachers change their responses to Holley depending on whether she came to them wearing her "monitor" hat or her "appraiser" hat? How could they assume different stances related to power with the same person, depending on what she said her role was? How could trust be cultivated? This situation is analogous to teacher education reforms in the United States that say to teacher candidates, "We will work with you, using performance assessments and rubrics, to ensure that you can meet the pedagogy and content standards needed for good teaching" and then add, "But, by the way, you will not be allowed to complete the program unless you pass content and pedagogy tests over which neither we nor you have any control."

The Arizona Group, a collaborative of four women faculty in teacher education, wrote in 1996 of their journey through a "maze of contraindications" in dealing with teacher education reform. For Pinnegar, the role of candidates' experience in teacher education was in the foreground. Would they be treated as "blank slates" or as slates covered with misinformation, or would they be treated as owners of valuable experience that could be incorporated in their new learnings? The parallel with Holley's concerns (above) is obvious. For Guilfoyle, teacher education reform must not involve efforts at "transmission of even the most desired values, but a feminist, collaborative approach to learning that respects the learner." Placier speaks of the need to respect the value of existing practices, to seek change without denigrating the worth of what is being done now. Hamilton echoes Pinnegar in seeking to foreground the role of experience and weave needed theoretical learning into spaces within and around experience.

When these four came together four years later (Arizona Group, 2000), they chose not to identify themselves by name as they addressed "myths and legends of teacher education reform." One of them asked how reform could take place in deeply divided faculty groups where a dean was exercising "power over" to define and impose changes called for by outside groups. One found that little change was taking place, despite much talk of reform, while another feared the conservative political power that was mandating reform. How could it be that the reform pressures that had been working on schools for years had now penetrated the perceived safety of teacher education?

During the 1996–2000 period, the Arizona Group's perception of teacher education reform seems to have shifted from one that saw it as a problematic internal process involving decision-making within schools of education to one that recognized it as imposed by exterior political forces that gave little consideration to the knowledge and expertise of teacher education faculty, even at major research universities. This shift moves teacher educators from the position of "the strong," who may need to be aware of the "powers of the weak," (Janeway, 1980) to that of the weak, who may be able to exercise their power subversively. It ceases to ask whether they use "power-with" or "power-over" (Kreisberg,

1992), and positions them as the recipients of power-over, dreaming of the possibility of at least having access to power-with. It exposes them to the gaze (Foucault, 1980) of politicians and bureaucrats, who claim the ability to control their every move. And it robs them of the power of expertise, of position, and even of their status as white, middle-class, educated professionals at high-prestige institutions (Barnes, 1988).

I have arranged this section so that these self-studies by administrators can portray what I see as the progress of teacher education reform in my own country, the United States. What I hear from colleagues in other English-speaking countries suggests that the reform process is the same in varied contexts, differing only in how far it has gone. I conclude that self-studies by administrators have the potential to broaden our view of what is transpiring in the name of reform.

Conclusion

As a participant in the Self-Study of Teacher Education Practices Special Interest Group, I have been both faculty member and administrator and, for the past several years, only an administrator. I typify the self-study practitioner who will not give up the methodology and practice of self-study just because the classroom is left behind or is not the sole focus of her professional life. I began this chapter asking myself what might be the special value of self-study of administrative practices in teacher education. I recognize that self-study can lead to deep self-understanding when it involves reflection on context and practice, review of past reflections, and collaboration with fellow self-study researchers or critical friends. I conclude the chapter in the belief that this self-understanding can raise and consider critical questions about the ways people in education work together (issues of power and community) and about the goals they set (social justice and teacher education reform, for example) that may be unique to self-study by administrators. I urge self-study practitioners who are administrators to continue this revealing work. I also urge administrators who work with self-study practitioners to consider self-study as a mode of learning about administration that can make great contributions to educators' understanding of the context and practices that surround them.

References

Arizona Group (K. Guilfoyle, M. L. Hamilton, S. Pinnegar, & P. Placier) (1996). Navigating through a maze of contraindications: A conversation on self-study and teacher education reform. In J. Richards & T. Russell (Eds.), *Empowering our future in teacher education.* Proceedings of the First International Conference of Self-Study of Teacher Education Practices, Herstmonceux Castle, East Sussex, England (pp. 94–99). Kingston, Ontario: Queen's University.

Arizona Group (K. Guilfoyle, M. L. Hamilton, S. Pinnegar, & P. Placier) (2000). Myths and legends of teacher education reform in the 1990s: A collaborative self-study of four programs. In J. Loughran & T. Russell (Eds.), *Exploring myths and legends of teacher education.* Proceedings of

the Third International Conference of Self-study of Teacher Education Practices, Herstmonceux Castle, East Sussex, England (pp. 20–24). Kingston, Ontario: Queen's University.

Austin, T. (2001). *Treasures in the snow: What do I know and how do I know it through my educational inquiry into my practice of community.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Bath, Bath, UK. Retrieved February 22, 2003, from http://www.bath.ac.uk/~edsajw/austin.shtml.

Barnes, B. (1998). *The nature of power.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Cuban, L. (1970). *To make a difference: Teaching in the inner city.* New York: MacMillan.

Deer, C. (1999, April). *Leading reform in teacher education: A rocky road.* Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montréal, Québec.

Delong, J. (1996). Facilitating and supporting action research by teachers and principals: Self-study of a superintendent's role. In J. Richards & T. Russell (Eds.), *Empowering our future in teacher education.* Proceedings of the First International Conference of Self-Study of Teacher Education Practices, Herstmonceux Castle, East Sussex, England (pp. 174–179). Kingston, Ontario: Queen's University.

Delong, J. (2002). *How can I improve my practice as superintendent of schools and create my own living educational theory?* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Bath, Bath, UK. Retrieved February 22, 2003, from http://www.bath.ac.uk/~edsajw/delong.shtml.

Evans, M. (1995). *An action research inquiry into reflection in action as part of my role as a deputy head teacher.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Kingston University, Kingston upon Thames, UK. Retrieved February 22, 2003, from http://www.bath.ac.uk/~edsajw/moyra.shtml.

Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings (1972–77).* New York: Pantheon Books.

Griffiths, M., & Windle, J. (2002). Helping teacher educators learn to research: Bread and roses – and a phoenix. In C. Kosnik, A. Freese & A. Samaras (Eds.), *Making a difference in teacher education through self-study.* Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference on Self-study of Teacher Education Practices, Herstmonceux Castle, East Sussex, England (pp. 87–91). Toronto: OISE, University of Toronto.

Hamilton, M. L. (2000). Change, social justice and reliability: Reflections of a secret (change) agent. In J. Loughran & T. Russell (Eds.), *Exploring myths and legends of teacher education.* Proceedings of the Third International Conference on Self-study of Teacher Education Practices, Herstmonceux Castle, East Sussex, England (pp. 109–112). Kingston, Ontario: Queen's University.

Hamilton, M. L. (2001). Living our contradiction: Caught between our words and our actions around social justice. *The School Field, 12*(3/4), 19–31.

Holley, E. (1997). *How do I as a teacher-researcher contribute to the development of a living educational theory through an exploration of my values in my professional practice?* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Bath, Bath, UK. Retrieved February 22, 2003 from http://www.bath.ac.uk/~edsajw/erica.shtml.

Janeway, E. (1980). *Powers of the weak.* New York: Knopf.

Johnston, M., with the Educators for Collaborative Change (1997). *Contradictions in collaboration: New thinking on school/university partnerships.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Kolodny, A. (1998). *Failing the future: A dean looks at higher education in the twenty-first century.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Kosnik, C. (1998). The effect of an inquiry-oriented teacher education program on a faculty member: Critical incidents and my journey. In A. L. Cole & S. Finley (Eds.), *Conversations in community.* Proceedings of the Second International Conference of Self-study of Teacher Education Practices, Herstmonceux Castle, East Sussex, England (pp. 135–139). Kingston, Ontario: Queen's University.

Kreisberg, S. (1992). *Transforming power: Domination, empowerment, and education.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Lincoln, Y., & Guba, E. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Loftus, J. (1999). *An action research enquiry into the marketing of an established first school in its transition to full primary status.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Kingston University. Kingston upon Thames, UK. Retrieved May 5, 2003, from http://www.bath.ac.uk/~edsajw/loftus.shtml.

Manke, M. P. (2000). Power relations and how they work: Weaving threads of meaning. In J. Loughran & T. Russell (Eds.), *Exploring myths and legends of teacher education.* Proceedings of

the Third International Conference of Self-Study of Teacher Education Practices, Herstmonceux Castle, East Sussex, England (pp. 168–172). Kingston, Ontario: Queen's University.

Manke, M. P. (1997). *Classroom power relations: How students and teachers interact*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Manke, M. P. (1998, April). *Blinded by the light: Self-study in the context of an assessment-intensive classroom*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Diego, CA.

Manke, M. (1995, November). *When a professor does action research in her classroom: A constructivist understanding of power relations*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Studies Association. Cleveland, OH.

Manke, M. P. (1990). *Constructing the power relationship: A study of two elementary school classrooms*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA.

Mills, G. (2002). Herding cats and nailing jello: Reflections on becoming a dean. In C. Kosnik, A. Freese & A. Samaras (Eds.), *Making a difference in teacher education through self-study*. Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference on Self-study of Teacher Education Practices, Herstmonceux Castle, East Sussex, England (pp. 72–73). Toronto: OISE, University of Toronto.

Noddings, N. (1986). *Caring: A feminine approach to ethics and moral education*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Ruddick, S. (1995). *Maternal thinking: Toward a politics of peace*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Sarason, S. (1972). *The creation of settings and the future societies*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Senese, J. (2000). Opposites attract: What I learned about being a classroom teacher from being a teacher educator. In J. Loughran & T. Russell (Eds.), *Exploring myths and legends of teacher education*. Proceedings of the Third International Conference on Self-study of Teacher Education Practices, Herstmonceux Castle, East Sussex, England (pp. 228–232). Kingston, Ontario: Queen's University.

Squire, F. (1998). Action research and standards of practice: Creating connections within the Ontario context. In A. L. Cole & S. Finley (Eds.), *Conversations in community*. Proceedings of the Second International Conference of Self-study of Teacher Education Practices, Herstmonceux Castle, East Sussex, England (pp. 13–16). Kingston, Ontario: Queen's University.

Upitis, R. (1996). On being both a researcher and a dean: Listening to voices of authority. In J. Richards & T. Russell (Eds.), *Empowering our future in teacher education*. Proceedings of the First International Conference of Self-Study of Teacher Education Practices, Herstmonceux Castle, East Sussex, England (pp. 74–77). Kingston, Ontario: Queen's University.

Upitis, R., & Russell, T. (1998). Building a teacher education community: Combining electronic mail with face-to-face interactions. In M. L. Hamilton (Ed.), *Reconceptualizing teaching practice: Self-study in teacher education* (pp. 77–109). London: Falmer Press.

Vavrus, M., & Archibald, O. (1998). Teacher education practices supporting social justice: Approaching and individual self-study inquiry into institutional self-study. In A. L. Cole & S. Finley (Eds.), *Conversations in community*. Proceedings of the Second International Conference of Self-Study of Teacher Education Practices, Herstmonceux Castle, East Sussex, England (pp. 162–166). Kingston, Ontario: Queen's University.

Weber, S. (2002, April). *Navel gazing: Self-indulgence or social obligation?* Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.