

English summaries

Per Lindqvist & Ulla Karin Nordänger, 2007: »Lost in translation?»: On the relation between teachers' practical knowledge and professional language/ Lost in translation? Om relationen mellan lärares praktiska kunnande och professionella språk/. *Pedagogisk Forskning i Sverige*, Vol 12, No 3, pp 177–193. Stockholm. ISSN 1401-6788

Can teachers' practical knowledge be formulated, and if so, how? Can it be transferred to new generations of professionals and lifted over the magical boundaries in teacher education, i.e. across the gap between the academy and teacher praxis? With these questions in mind, we have periodically conducted intensive discussions with 41 teachers during 2003–06. These conversations were carried out within the framework of two research projects with the aim to improve knowledge about the relationship of practical knowledge to language.

In the first project, which was carried out during 2003–04, we collected so-called life stories from 25 teachers who had mainly taught in the senior years of compulsory school. The other project involved 16 teachers from all stages of compulsory school. This project, which runs from 2005–08, includes various types of interactions with the teachers. In the introductory part, the Delphi Technique was used and thereafter the teachers were filmed in their daily work, and then discussions took place in the form of stimulated recall. At the end of the project the teachers were invited to attend a dialogue seminar, that is a structured group discussion with individually produced texts as a starting point.

The aim of this article is to demonstrate possible bridges between the personal and contextual practical knowledge and assumed general teacher competence. We want to highlight the kind of experience teachers describe as central for experiential vocational skills, illustrate how this experience is formulated, as well as test if and how this way of speaking about experience can be seen as a professional language and with potential for professional learning.

We focus primarily on the relationship between what is called »experience» and teachers' practical knowledge. With the help of empirical examples, mainly linked to theoretical concepts taken from Martin Buber, we discuss the phenomenon of experience on the basis of two separate questions: Is experience a uniform concept? Do we mean identical phenomenon when we refer to experience? In light of one type of experience – that which Buber calls

insight – we consider our empirical material afresh and suggest that it is the teacher's willingness and ability to encounter their students, and the desire to form a relationship, which are the decisive ingredients in teaching practical knowledge.

Secondly, we relate the experience-based practical knowledge to the existence and the development of teachers' professional language. We set out data against quite general occurring statements in the discussion about teachers' knowledge, namely that teachers lack an explicit professional language and that, by and large, their knowledge is considered as tacit. Research which studies teachers' work states time and again that their knowledge is practical, based on personal experience, and has a strong connection to the complex and situated practice, which leads to the assumption that teachers' development of generic knowledge and professional language is immature, if not to say absent. At the same time, the existence of a collective knowledge base is strongly upheld in management and policy rhetoric about teaching.

The article discusses the possibility of generating general knowledge from experienced skills. Perhaps the alleged lack of a developed professional language is related to something vital being lost in the transposition of the teachers' stories to what is traditionally characterised as a »professional language«. Maybe the decisive content is lost in the actual translation process?

In our study we can see that teachers describe the core of their competence largely by using examples, similes, analogies and metaphors. This could be seen as a substitute for a more apt use of language but in the analysis, the use of metaphor is interpreted not as a lack but as an attempt to convey insight. Thirdly, in this article, we therefore want to note this way of speaking about practice and investigate if – and if so, how – such use of language can contribute to a common professional learning. We also demonstrate the use of »living metaphor« as such a possibility.

Henrik Hegender, 2007: Learning objectives of school based preservice teacher education: A »mishmash« of theory and practice/ Lärarutbildningars kunskapsmål för verksamhetsförlagd utbildning – ett »mischmasch« av teori och praktik/. *Pedagogisk Forskning i Sverige*, Vol. 12, No 3, pp 194–207. Stockholm. ISSN 1401-6788

Research on teacher education shows that integration of so-called theoretical and practical teacher knowledge as well as campus based and school based teacher education is complicated (e.g. Kessels & Korthagen 2001). Teacher education programs are often organised in campus based and school based education periods; during these periods, student teachers have to handle the tension between understanding teaching and practicing teaching (Calderhead & Shorrock 1997). This tension is the focus of this study which analyses

teacher knowledge learning objectives directed to the school-based parts of Swedish pre-service teacher education.

The analysis tools of this study are dualistic: teacher knowledge can be seen as propositional knowledge and procedural knowledge (Fenstermacher 1994). Propositional knowledge can be expressed verbally in propositions, written or spoken. Procedural knowledge can only be expressed through procedures in a certain practice, orally or bodily (Fenstermacher 1994). Teacher knowledge can also be seen as knowledge-for-practice and knowledge-in-practice (Cochran-Smith & Lytle 1999). Knowledge-for-practice is research-based and theoretical; something which practitioners should use within practice. In contrast, knowledge-in-practice is experience-based and practical; something that practitioners create and develop within practice (Cochran-Smith & Lytle 1999). For this study, the initial target group consisted of the learning objectives of all the pre-service teacher education campuses in Sweden (N=26). In the end, the empirical data was formed from the responses from seventeen of these campuses.

The analysis of quantitative data shows that teacher knowledge learning objectives vary at the campuses. Although many of the campuses have a predominance of propositional knowledge objectives, there are also many campuses which have a predominance of procedural knowledge objectives. Furthermore, while some of the campuses have a great number of objectives, some have just a few. The analysis of qualitative data shows that several of the learning objectives could be understood as being both ambiguous and vague. From a student teacher perspective, it is possible to interpret that some of the learning objectives could be achieved through experience-based knowledge as well as research-based knowledge.

This article discusses whether learning objectives of school-based teacher education should have a predominance of so-called theoretical or practical knowledge; it also discusses how learning objectives prescribe student teachers' learning processes. There is a considerable difference if the resources, which student teachers should use to achieve the objectives, are research-based or experience-based knowledge. There is also a considerable difference if learning objectives have a predominance of propositional knowledge or procedural knowledge.

Propositional learning objectives prescribe that student teachers should have knowledge about teaching. However, procedural learning objectives will focus student teachers' knowledge in teaching. For instance, teacher education campuses who formulate more propositional learning objectives than procedural objectives have pointed out that theoretical propositions about teaching are more important than procedural, practical knowledge in teaching.

The conclusion reached in this paper is that the epistemological framework could be useful in discussions about (i) what student teachers should learn within school-based teacher education, and (ii) when learning objectives should be formulated.