CHAPTER 1B: THEORETICAL POSITIONING OF RESEARCH QUESTIONS

In Chapter 1A, I presented my research problem of culturally disempowering nature of teacher education and research practices with a narrow view of some technical interest of education in the context of Pakistan. In so doing, I came up with a host of research questions emerging from a diverse range of stories of my life worlds while excavating autobiographical vignette. Building on these emergent sets of questions and research agendas, in this chapter, I create a space for discussions on my research questions which give rise to five key themes of my inquiry. These themes are: *Dictating and communicating views of leadership; narrowly conceived traditional view of curriculum images; conventional and somewhat learner-centered pedagogies; assessment as 'of' and 'for' learning approaches; and objectivist and constraint pluralist research practices.*

Leadership as Dictating to Communicating and Then Transforming

'O my Lord! Increase me in knowledge'
(Surah Taha 20:114)

To explore my first theme of inquiry (i.e., dictating and communicating leadership approaches) and understand the essence of leadership with reference to teacher education, I begin to explore context specific studies, the praxis (the interaction of theory and my contextual practices as a leader) and well known studies on leadership such as studies of Ohio State University, the University of Michigan Studies and Black and Mount Managerial / Leadership Grid. This exploration helped me, to a great extent, in forming a theoretical perspective. Perhaps, it enabled me to make meaning of how my lived

experiences of leadership explains the approaches that I use, and in what ways that help and/or hinder the learning of self and others while exercising my role as a leader in different capacities.

In so doing, I have gone through extensive review of literature from within local/global context. I began to reflect on my own lived experiences as an educational leader (and possibly an administrator) (Roehl, 2000 in Bedi, 2015) through the lens of my own 'traits, behavior, skills, or styles of leadership' (Northouse, 2013, p.347). These reflections led me to realize that there seems no one fixed way to deal in all situations, and this view enabled me to think about situational leadership (Heresy& Blanchard, 1977: Heresy,

Principals and vice-principals occupy a vital role in … They hold politically and organizationally powerful positions to influence change and support educational reform. Roehl (2000) points out that one's practice of leadership is influenced by one's identity, thus knowing who administrators are is significant. Although understanding who our formal administrators are is still an emerging area of scholarly inquiry, most of the educational literature focuses on administrators … (Bedi, 2015, p.1).

Blanchard & Johnson, 2001; Qutoshi & Khaki, 2014) in which a leader can experience any shade of *lead-led-phenomena* depending on the *culture of organization* and nature of the people where such interactions occur.

To this end, I come to realize how important organizational culture is. Coming at this point of my inquiry, I begin to argue Trompenaars' (1994) classification of cultures into 'egalitarian' and 'hierarchical'. But in reality, I experienced a kind of mixed form in my situation. From this point of departure, I tend to favor five dimensional view of culture that seems a comprehensive view presented by Northouse (2013) such as- power distance, uncertainty avoidance, individualism-collectivism, masculinity-femininity, and long-term, short-term orientation as another way of looking at multiple dimensions of cultures to understand leadership in a wider perspective (p.387). Perhaps, leadership is a

complex phenomenon that varies from person to person, culture to culture and context to context, and one cannot fix one specific view of leadership. It seems a perceptional view that one sees from within his/her own stand point.

This perspective of looking at leadership from cultural dimensions took me to study 'multiple ways of knowing' (Guba & Lincoln, 2005) my own way of leading, for example, from the lens of Psychodynamic theory of leadership, which is a 'personality' type and seems different from trait, style, and situational leadership (Northouse, 2007; Stogdill, 1989), yet more close to Levi' (2011) view of team leadership, Greenleaf' (2002) view of servant leadership, Khaki's (2005) view of prophetic leadership, a mixed view of pedagogical and administrative leadership (Memon, 1998, 2000; Memon, Simkins, Sisum, & Bana, 2006) and authentic leadership (Northouse, 2013) approaches, to name a few. However, it appears to be an approach of diverse personality game, which is shaped according to the psyche of leader and led in different organizational cultures (e.g., diverse range of educational institutions).

Arriving at this point of exploration, I start thinking about the concept that one who leads is a leader, and thus, it puts huge moral and ethical responsibility on teachers and teacher educators as instructional and/or pedagogical leaders and principals as institutional leaders and calls to explore self/others in order to make meaning of the lives of people to whom they (these leaders at different levels) are engaged (Neil, Lisa, & Megan, 2006). This learning led me to come with my own personal-professional historical review with critical reflections on my different roles as student, teacher/educator, research supervisor and vice/principal to make meaning of this complexity.

Probably Working as an Authoritative Leader

I remember, when I was appointed as an assistant professor in a public university at the School of Education TU, I came to experience (as both a co-worker and/or leader) in a very traditional top down approach to control the affairs of the university. While experiencing my role as a teacher educator, or as cultural worker (Freire, 1998), during my probationary period, I could not even raise my voice against policies, practices and could not come with my own way of teaching, learning and research activities at different levels of educative endeavours (Shahid, 2007). While working in such a culture, I likely exercised a dictating role in my class.

Perhaps, this situation led me again to apply a style of an 'authoritative, traditional' university teacher educator while teaching/learning, and doing research practices. It was somehow similar to, sometimes, somewhere my early practices of leadership as school principal (Dake, 2011). Arriving at this stage of my inquiry, I began to realize- *How have I experienced a dictating leadership as a vice/principal (in schools) and a teacher educator/research supervisor (in university) in the context of Pakistan?* (See Chapter 2A).'

Probably Working as a Communicative Leader

My reflection on my role as an authoritative leader enabled me to look into the limitations of leadership, and its implications in different situations in schools and at the university (in the early days). With this view of conventional bureaucratic and top-down approach to leadership as a power exercise (Moos, 2013), I begin to think about how I can improve my practices (Whitehead, 1989, 2014) with a reformative agenda while

engaging with multiple roles in different contexts (at school as a principal and at university as a teacher educator/research supervisor).

This reflection enabled me to go back to 2003 where being an empowered community school principal with enough freedom, and guided by an intrinsic spirit of bringing improvement in the school and schooling, I started thoroughly exploring the school culture. This authority (with desirable level of freedom to take decisions independently) and responsibility to lead with spiritual dimension of service to the community (an intrinsic motivation) enabled me to involve key stakeholders, as my co-workers as well as my co-leaders, to develop a shared vision for bringing an *improvement in school* (Rizvi, 2010).

It took me enough time for working as a school leader particularly in planning to bring change in the school. As Heller and Til (1982) reminds me that the terms leadership and followership are interdependent terms, which need to be understood in relation to each other. Perhaps, developing a comprehensive understanding of the system (institutional setup, goals, rules and co-workers, etc.), areas for improvement, and important resources which I could use for initiating the change, was a new learning in my life as a communicative leader (Hart, 2009; Johansson & Begley, 2001; Shah, 2013).

Arriving at this stage of my inquiry, I begin to think that the relationship between leader and followers (co-workers) seems depending on the 'power' politics either a 'position power' which give rise to 'legitimate, reward and coercive' powers or 'personal power' that exhibits 'referent', and 'expert' powers which come with personality of the leader (Northouse, 2007, p.7). This view enabled me to reflect on my role, and understand in what ways my use of power contribute to create a culture where people

(including myself and influence of my role as a leader) interact with each other in performing their roles as professional teachers, teacher educators, section heads and vice principal (Rizvi, 2010).

This reflection led me to think about my roles at different times at university level, working as a research supervisors and teacher educator under agenda of reforms in teacher education and research practices. There, I came to realize that under reformative phase within a limited freedom, I could, to some extent, work towards more humanistic approach (as opposed to efficiency paradigm in case of informative phase) in my approaches to curriculum development activities, student centered teaching (Qutoshi & Poudel, 2014), assessing as for learning, and struggling to embrace a 'constraint pluralism' (B.C. Luitel, personal communication, October 10, 2015). Arriving at this point of inquiry I begin to ask- *How did I begin to act as a (possibly) communicating leader while still I was working as a school vice/principal, and later as research coordinator/educator at the University?* (See Chapter 2B).'

Envisioning a Transformative Leadership Practice

Reflecting on this question, I begin to excavate the role of communicative leadership (Hart, 2009) and the impact of shaping relations among co-workers including myself as a leader. I came to realize that in case of my role as a school leader, with enough freedom and authority to take independent decisions for school improvement was to some extent facilitative towards our common goals. Whereas in case of my role as teacher educator/coordinator, there I experienced a limited freedom under reforms to facilitate (lead) my student teachers. Hence, I begin to critique the limitations of reforms agenda for teacher education.

In my discussions about the limitation of reforms with Bal, my mentor, he said, 'look Sadruddin ji, reforms are like an externally planned activity that may not fit in every institutional contexts to fulfill diverse needs of different institutions.' Perhaps, reforms can help to disrupt a status quo and can lead towards a change. He continued, 'yes, reforms are necessary, yet it not sufficient to create a conducive teaching/learning environment necessary to develop conditions for transformative learning to occur' (B.C. Luitel, personal communication, November 10, 2015).

Reflecting on the issues of leadership associated with reformation of teacher education and my own limited visions with improving school, I came to realize that reforms in the context of Pakistan have been with closed visions. I argue that with a specific focus to improve physical resources, the agendas of reforms have been superficially overlooked into matters of how to develop awareness among real change agents, the teacher/educators, and what would be the effective ways to develop their capacities, which enable them to bring meaningful change in self and others (Caldwell & Spinks, 2007).

Arriving at this point of inquiry, I come to realize that this very aspect of focus on transformation, a meaningful change, in teachers, teacher educators and researchers seemed missing in reforms agenda (AKU, 2015). As a result of such reforms, teachers/educators appeared to be operating within fragmented change activities guided by reforms from time to time that can be means to contextual problems and issues of education in Pakistan (Ali, 2007; Huma, 2014). I argue that these cosmetic changes in practices through reforms with power over game can only be superficial improvements in teaching/learning and research in teacher

education, yet reforms could not address how to transform the 'most intellectual resource - teachers' (Caldwell & Spinks, 2007, p. xix), *as* important players for any change to be successful. More so, this aspect of development has been superficially dealt by policy makers throughout the history of this country through reforms efforts that could not help teachers/educators to prepare them how to engage with teaching, learning and research practices with an emancipatory view of education (Ali, 2014).

This means that we need to focus on the real change agents who can bring any kind of meaningful reforms at grassroots level. Perhaps, this would be possible through critical-creative pedagogies rather focusing on somehow student-centered (Ahmed, 2013; Weimer, 2002) teaching with use of technologies what reforms propagate. From an empowering view of education, perhaps, teachers/teacher educators/researchers need to play the role of facilitator and to convert the power over game of teacher-centered approach to power with and power from within paradigms in order to develop a critical-creative learning environment. This view of an emancipatory interest of education that looks beyond the agenda of reform enabled me to come with the question: *How can a transformative leadership enable me to move towards an empowering and inclusive view of teacher education and research practice in Pakistan? (See Chapter 2C)*

Curriculum as Textbooks to Experience to Currere and Montage

As curriculum is one of the key areas of the whole educative process that appears to demand careful considerations while developing it. Perhaps, curriculum developers need to come with critical reflections while working on it in terms of how to make better sense of curriculum that would be responsive to the needs and aspirations of individual learners in 21st century (Hramiak, 2015; Pinar, 2004, 2012). My experience in the context

of Pakistan with a conventional image of curriculum, moving into a reformative period for improving teacher education curriculum of ICT in Education shows different pictures.

Curriculum as Informing

An informative state of education *curriculum as textbooks* has been a narrow view of education and learning that was confined within prescribed course books, thereby giving the primacy of curriculum as subject matter. (Siddiqui, 2010; Schubert, 1986). My experiences show that this limited view confined teacher educators, teachers and student teachers to focus on texts books like sacred things rather contextualizing to make 'fine-tuning of the meaning' of text for learners to make better meaning for them (Fuchs, 2009, p.27). Perhaps, to bring any meaningful change not a 'superficial change' (AKU, 2015; Eisner, 1996; Shahid, 2007) in an existing situation of teacher education, curricular aspect remains central that needs much attention to make a significant contribution in teacher education. Whereas the existing view of curriculum seems limited to focus on ends-means notions of reproduction of knowledge and skills (Tyler, 1949).

Arriving at this stage, I begin to reflect on the view of curriculum as content or subject matter that seemingly focuses on topics to be covered within a given period of time without giving due considerations to learners needs and aspirations. It does not seem to care about other aspects of learning that a learner experiences rather having a limited view of means (using textbooks through teacher centered didactic) to get end results (Siddique, 2010).

Similarly, another image as set of discrete tasks and concepts also appears to focus on how to develop learners' mastery skills and knowledge of a particular concept and/or a task through *means-end* (here students' learning become ends and teaching as

means to accomplish those ends) *dilemma.* This limited view of education does not seem to look into how learners experience their own view of learning. It, rather looks into how to accomplish fixed end results.

With this view, I begin to reflect on my own learning experiences of my school, college and university time on one hand, and my professional experience as a teacher using a conventional approach to cover content from course books, on the other hand, which depict different examples of such kind of conventional view of curriculum as textbooks. Arriving at this stage, I begin ask question: *In what ways has the nature of informative curriculum been colonizing myself (and other teacher educators) in a narrowly conceived view of pedagogy and assessment?* (See Chapter 3A)

Curriculum as Reforming

I came to realize that, for a professional teacher, curriculum should serve like an *amplifier of his or her own ability* rather than a sacred script to follow as it is and/or a course book to serve the purpose of curriculum (Eisner, 1996; Siddiqui, 2010). To this end, I begin to think about how I can contribute in improving a conventional image of curriculum as subject matter, a set of discrete tasks and concepts, and cultural reproduction (Schubert, 1986) to a curriculum as cultural reconstruction and an experience(Dewey, 1938). Contrary to this view (curriculum as experience, cultural reconstruction and activities), I came to know that the reformative agenda of curriculum development was to focus on what and how contents are to be developed, what tasks are to be provided through which students are given limited opportunity to experience cultural reproduction with lower level of thinking skills.

I remember, when we (teacher educators including me from different universities of Pakistan) were engaged in developing a centralized new curriculum, directing the image of curriculum as set of different tasks within a subject matter (Chapter 3B), we discussed the following different theories of curriculum development and finally prepared content (that was the core agenda of reforms in curriculum with pre-specified objectives). In the workshop, I remember, before developing the new centralized curriculum, we discussed the classic or prescriptive model (Tyler, 1949), which is also considered as product model. Likewise, we discussed on Hilda Taba's (1962) model or interactive model which is more focused on instructional strategies model, Walker's (1971) descriptive model, which is also known as process model, and Hawes's (1979) student-centered model, to name but a few. Perhaps, the purpose was to somehow engage us with different models, and yet to come with content that best describe their predefined objectives that restricted me (and my colleagues as subject experts) to focus on generalized view of learning rather than contextual empowering view of learning.

Perhaps, as teacher educators it appeared an urgent responsibility on our shoulders to reform curriculum and pedagogy in order to change teaching and learning approaches in our practices at universities. Arriving at this point, I begin to ask- how we perceive the image of curriculum to prepare new generation. Could we really help new generation with developing a centralized new, yet directing a conventional image of curriculum as content, cultural reproduction and set of tasks and concepts (Schubert, 1986)? Did we really help teacher educators and student teachers with reforms agenda through focusing only on structural dimension of curriculum?

Perhaps, this view of curriculum development would not seem to serve a broader interest of education with a purpose of preparing learners to face the challenges of real life situation (Doll, 2008) while claiming to reform an existing limited view of technical interest of education (Bohman & Rehg, 2014; Habermas, 1972). This image of curriculum seems to focus more on tasks and concepts with *Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic and Time Bound* (SMART) objectives to accomplish through lesson planning rather responding to needs of learners and teacher by involving them to come with their own experiences as learning in order to make meaning of the world.

Arriving at this inquiry led me to study John Dewey' concept of curriculum as experience which challenges the idea of means-ends and advocates that both means and ends cannot be separated from each other as they are part of a process that gives an experience to the learners in terms of his/her active involvement in the whole process of meaning making. This view of curriculum gives importance to engage learners in re/construction of knowledge through their active involvement with learning activities. However, as said earlier, the reformative agenda with so called broader view of teacher education curriculum does not seem to address active learning in reality. With this view, I being to ask question: *In what ways has reformative curriculum helped myself (and other teacher educators) to embrace somewhat humanistic view of curriculum?* (See Chapter 3B)

Curriculum as Integrating Mind, Body and Soul

My experience of working with curriculum development informs me that we are still struggling around the structural dimension of curriculum and that we are far away from working on the agency dimension of curriculum, which talks about curriculum as

experience (Dewey, 1938), currere (Pinar, 2004, 2012, 2015), third space and dissolution

and cultural reconstruction (Luitel & Taylor, 2012). Perhaps, this agency view seems to

enable teacher educators and teachers to bring global wisdom

into local wisdom, and create contextualized need based

curriculum which Luitel calls 'glocalization' (Luitel, 2009) by

creating *third space*[10] and dissolving the borders of local and global into culturally

contextualized image that can better serve the needs and aspirations of learners. This

holistic view of curriculum image having both structural and agency aspect is termed as

'montage' (ibid).

As the purpose of an agency view of curriculum, of course, one needs a structural

view so as to provide basis for building agency of learners, is to make a difference in the

lives of learners by re/conceptualizing selves. With this line of thought, I argue that

reformation of teacher education curriculum, in the context of Pakistan, does not seem to

help teacher educators/teachers and learners to become as agents of change for social and

cultural reconstruction (to develop a balanced life capable of meeting all the challenges

of their time) rather limiting them with culturally disempowering (i.e., cultural

reproduction and limited learning outcomes) view of teacher education with superficial

changes. Perhaps with this limited view of curriculum, one cannot move beyond the

reformation of societies with justice oriented values, and yet enable learners to challenge

established views which are taken for granted.

Coming at this point of my exploration of curriculum images enabled me to

reflect on the notion of personal reconceptualization through autobiography- an approach

_____

[10] A space where both local and global values come together by complementing rather
contradicting with each other.

of curriculum as currere (Pinar, 2004, 2012). This image seems to empower learners through writing their own biography and sharing with others to experience their learning of self, others. Perhaps, this could enable learners to move into their future through reflecting on past and understanding the present. I begin to think about the concept of currere which Pinar and Grumet (1976) came with. It seems to generate different opportunities for learners to develop their self-consciousness that can lead learners to become aware of others and the world around. Perhaps, this notion of curriculum seems very powerful in terms of advocating for social transformation through self-transformation.

Though at that time I was not aware of contemporary images of curriculum as social reconstruction (Porfilio et al., 2015; Schubert, 1986), montage[11] and currere as/for 'awakening citizen' (Luitel, 2009), I thought that I had done a great job while participating in the curriculum development activity at national level to prepare a centralized curriculum under reforms in teacher education in Pakistan. However, arriving at this point of my inquiry, I begin to reflect on this liberating view of education as an empowering inclusive-holistic view of curriculum image that can provide learners with multiple opportunities for learning.

For example, William Pinar (2004) explains how currere works. He describes 1) regression a 'discursive practice of truth telling … to oneself' (p.55) as first step that serves the basis to remember a past event to provide data sources. This stage enable learners to question 'What happened in that particular educational experience?' and this

---

[11] Montage in Urdu can be termed as 'Aamezah- a mixture that contains different elements without losing their own identity'. Thus, montage is an aamezah of conventional as well as contemporary images of curriculum.

is the question that enables to look into personal, professional, social and/or political events of one's past (p.125); and 2) 'progressive step', which offers possibilities for the future with two modes of exploration- 'stylistic experimentation …to become other' as one imagines about his/her life possibilities for upcoming future whereas 'thematic imagining' mode explores a 'future subject … in hopes of dissolving what blocks us from moving forward toward a future not yet present' (pp. 125-127). To me, these two steps can provide the basis towards transformation in ones' old held assumptions and enable one to create a state of doubt in existing and searching for new perspectives (Mezirow, 1978).

The 'analytical step' generates a 'subjective space of freedom from the present' and this 'critical self-examination' of one's past and present enable to understand multiple facets of one's educational experience (p. 36). And finally, 'synthetical step' that involves re-entering the present based on the knowledge gained during the previous steps and asking question of the kind, 'What is the meaning of the present (p.37)?' This question enables learners to gain insights from his/her life in past, look into present and possible future by engaging with building transformed educational environments. Arriving at this point of inquiry, I ask the question: *How have I been working to develop a curriculum as a montage, which can be conceive as a basis for an inclusive holistic view of education?* (See Chapter 3C)

Pedagogies as 'Re/telling/Transmitting' to 'Co-learning' and 'Critical-creative'

Discussing on nature of curriculum reforms enabled me to think about and reflect

on the state of teaching situation. I agree with Eisner's

(2005) view about the close relationship between the

two that 'if curriculum is the systole of the education,

> "Improving one's practice benefits the larger broader purpose of the advancement of knowledge about teaching and the educational system" (Samaras & Freese, 2006, p. 14).

teaching is the diastole of it…no intended curriculum can be followed by the teachers as

a script; the classroom is too uncertain a place to recipes' (p. 12). Here, I come to realize

that we have given less focus towards how, *why* and *who* to teach in addition to the

importance of what to teach (Palmer, 2007), as I discuss it below.

Teaching as Loading on Learners

My experience as a learner during school, college and university life shows that I

encountered teachers as loaders of their teaching responsibility through telling the stuff in

one directional mode of transferring to us (as learners), which

indicates that teaching has been a traditional endeavour in the

context of developing countries including Pakistan (Barman,

2013). Similarly, when I look back at my early stages of

my teaching as a teacher and teacher educator with a focus

to complete my course content within limited time periods

(mostly 35-50 minutes teaching time in class) with large

classes (in size) lead me to say I had been a traditional

teacher-centered 'pedagogue' in my life. Benade (2015,

p.3) cautions me that a 'traditional teaching, including 40-

> Dupin-Bryant (2004) defines learner-centered teaching style as "a style of instruction that is responsive, collaborative, problem-centered, and democratic in which both students and the instructor decide how, what, and when learning occurs" …. On the other hand, teacher-centered teaching style is considered as "a style of instruction that is formal, controlled, and autocratic in which the instructor directs how, what, and when students learn" (p.42).

minute periods and teacher control' can no longer make a sense to help learners rather pushing them to do what we want them to reproduce(Duckworth (2009). Taking into account this view of teaching, Dupin-Bryant (2004, p.42) defines it as 'a style of instruction that is formal, controlled, and autocratic in which the instructor directs how, what, and when students learn' basically exhibit the interplay of 'behaviors that a teacher comfortably used consistently over time, situation, and content' that is taught in class (Elliott, 1996 in Ahmed, 2013, p.2).

Arriving at this point, I begin to think about teacher's dominative approach to pedagogy, what Eisner calls 'structural violence' that indirectly makes learners voiceless and passive receivers of information through telling and transferring mode of teaching in a very formal setting. This view of my teaching and those of the others in the context of my country led me to ask question of the kind- *How have I encountered key facets of definitional/informing pedagogies that disempower learners to develop a broader view of learning to understand real life situation?* (See Chapter 4A)

Teaching as Releasing Tension

Whereas the learner-centered and/or *student centered approach* to teaching focuses on activity based, collaborative, problem based, and participatory approaches with use of CTs to improve practices (Begum & Khan, 2012; Qutoshi & Poudel, 2014), and focus on students learning which is acclaimed in research and practice for addressing personalized needs of learners (Chapman et al., 2014; Weimer, 2002). This transition from a teacher centered (Harden & Crosby, 2000) to student centered learning approach enabled me to think about how a teacher educator like me can play role in building this

critical link between curriculum and pedagogies, and provide opportunities to make meaning of their learning through student center approach to teaching (Benade, 2015).

Reflecting on this sort of situation, and a transition from traditional to modern paradigms of teaching, led me to look at how 'student centered approach to teaching is conceived as an instructional philosophy and modern pedagogical approach, which is opposite to teacher centered approach' (Qutoshi & Poudel, 2014, p.3). This view of learner centered and/or student centered approach to teaching caution me to think on our critical and creative views of teaching/learning while organizing such kind of participatory engagement through cooperative and collaborative teaching approaches. At the same time, it let me to ask- do we use such approaches only to show (as part of the reforms agenda) we are learner centered (Aslam et al., 2012; O'Sullivan, 2004)? Arriving at this point of my inquiry helped me to ask: *How have I worked through reforms in teacher education as means for implementing somehow student centered approach to teaching?* (See Chapter 4B)

Teaching as Liberating

My critical reflections on reformative agenda of somehow student centered pedagogies enable me to see alternative ways that can better help learners to come with their own imaginative, creative and critical views of learning as meaningful experiences in their lives out of the educative engagements. Arriving at this stage of my inquiry, it enables me to think about critical-creative pedagogies as approaches to bring transformative learning in teacher education classes so that student teachers would become more responsible, independent, self-managed, free learner to accomplish an emancipatory interest of education (Samaras & Freese, 2006).

This view of learner as more responsible for his/her independent and self-managed learning and the role of "active participants in learning and co-constructors of knowledge" demand creativity and critical thinking (Meece, 2003, p. 111). Coming to this reflection, it enables me to critique a limited view of student centered approach to teaching under reforms agenda (Barman, 2013), thereby envisioning a liberating view of pedagogy that can enable learners to liberate not only from the structural views of education rather liberate him/her from self-contained and/or taken for granted views of learning. With this vision I begin to ask question of the kind, '*How have I been working towards developing critical-creative pedagogies to enable my students as active and creative teachers?*

Assessment as 'of' Learning to 'for' and 'Through' Learning

Perhaps, Peter Taylor seems very right saying that 'assessment is the Holy Grail of transformative education (personal communication, October 14, 2015), and it is very important' to rethink about it in a radical way. In my experience, assessment practices in Pakistan are

> because teachers have knowledge, they should exert political authority in a directive way, making all decisions for their students as to what they should study and how they should study it... to enforce rules and carry out assessment of student learning; to dictate when, how, why, where and who should learn (Vettraino, Linds& Goulet, 2013, p.9).

considered as a tool for testing only whether learners have acquired the knowledge that is imparted to them in their class or not rather to see where learners need more support. This means that we have ignored the importance of assessment as means to learning rather only tools for testing and to focus on an add-on activity (Luitel,

> 'in context of Pakistan... examination plays a vital role in determining approaches to teaching and learning and that teachers face great pressures from various stakeholders to gear their teaching to prepare students for passing examinations with good grades. Students are also expected by teachers and parents to sharpen their latent potentials in rote memorizing factual knowledge and reproducing it in the examination. There is little emphasis on testing children's understanding of what they learn and on higher order skills' (Rehmani, n.d.).

2009), which is done after the completion of teaching and learning activities. Though, it

is one of the most critical aspect of teacher education, it is limited to just labeling as pass or fail and all these decision ultimately impact on learning of learners (Vettraino et al., 2013).

Assessing as Labeling ('of' Learning)

As learning is highly linked with the ways of teaching, teacher educators, in the context of developing countries including Pakistan, mostly rely on traditional ways of teaching and ultimately assessment tools they use lead them to focus on lower order thinking skills (Benade, 2015; Siddiqui, 2010). Some of these tools of assessment are end of unit, course and/or semester written tests to check whether students have memorized or need interventions for more drilling (Qutoshi & Poudel, 2014; Taylor, 2000, 2007). I think such situations seem to lead teachers/educators to consider assessment as an add-on activity rather an integral part of teaching/learning. Because we (I and other teacher educators/curriculum developers) do not use assessment results to think about our roles and improve our practices based on the assessment results (Gibbs, 2006; Rehmani, n.d.).

My own experience informs me that in the context of Pakistan, it rarely happens that teacher educators apply assessment as a process to get information about their work to improve and build on the areas where they are doing better and where they need to change their practices where they are not performing better (Ahmed, 2013). Because assessment as exam was (and is) taken very narrowly i.e., exams as labeling to pass/fail through paper pencil test once annually. I argue that this limited view of assessment as oral and written exam seem to create conditions for mastering lower order thinking skills (e.g., rote learning, defining, recalling, imitating, copying, test-taking) in learners.

The view that teachers have the authority leads them to control their students and their learning. So, they 'carry out assessment of student learning, to dictate when, how, why, where and who should learn' (Vettraino et al., 2013, p.9). My experiences caution me that teachers/educators are tend to assess limited learning based on classroom teaching only and rarely makes links with remembering, applying, analyzing, synthesizing and creating of knowledge levels of Blooms' revised taxonomy with regard to lower, middle and higher order thinking (Krathwohl, 2002; Gibbs & Simpson, 2004; Rehmani, n.d.). Coming at this stage, I begin to ask question: *How have I lived with key features of assessment as an add-on activity that force learners to acquire lower order thinking skills?* (See Chapter 5A)

Assessment as 'for' Learning

Another important factor that seems impacting learning of learners can be 'the relationship between the person being assessed… activities in the environment' that we create for teaching/learning and assessment which seem to be 'key features of the assessment' (Carr, 2006, p. 184). In my experience assessment practices are deeply rooted in the perceptions of 'teachers regarding assessment of learning, both for graded and non-graded group activities' (Qutoshi & Poudel, 2014, p.10). However, activities inside and/or outside classroom can be used for improving students' learning (formative assessment) seem limited, yet more focusing on assessment for grading purpose (Gibbs, 2006).

After embracing the agenda of reforms in teacher education in Pakistan, I began to focus more on assessment as for learning[12] activities with changes in curriculum from

---

[12] Assessment for learning is termed as formative assessment and the purpose is to focus on student teachers' improvement in learning. These approaches to assessment are non-graded.

subject matter to somehow experience (Dewey, 1938), and such emerging set of different activities enabled me to think about my teaching approaches to revisit. This realization helped me think about a *participatory approach to assessment* (an approach that is mutually well informed about purpose, process and role of assessed and assessor) that can be more beneficial for improving student learning. I support the views of Land, Meyer and Baillie (2010) regarding the assessors' confusions and lack of clarity about the process of assessment on 'how we might construct a meaningful assessment process for students for whom, in many instances, what is to be assessed' and how to use 'new and creative methods of assessment and alternative ways of rendering learning' (p.18). Arriving at this point, I start to question: '*How have I experienced assessment as 'for' learning with reform in teacher education?* (See Chapter 5B)'

Assessing as 'Through' Learning

To develop a clear understanding between both the assessor and assessed regarding the learning outcomes, I argue that just asking questions and providing assignments for learning do not necessarily reflect the essence of assessment for learning. Qutoshi and Poudel (2014) suggested that 'teachers need to focus on sharing and communicating the assessment criteria with learners as well as their expectations about their learning' to make better sense of both teaching/learning for the purpose of improving learning outcomes. In so doing, teachers can create 'an egalitarian classroom environment' that can build a conducive learning environment in which 'if a child does not come up to the mark or to the set standard' (p.4) the teachers do not treat the child 'as a failure; rather the teacher considers what can be done to enable this child to learn' better (Law, 2007, p. 226). Perhaps, this seems to be one of the key facets of transformative

assessment that is not only focusing on assessment as 'of' as a summative, 'for' as a formative but also assessment as 'through' learning approaches to enable learners to develop their knowledge, skills, dispositions and positive behaviors to make better sense of their learning in their real life situations.

Coming to this realization, I start reflecting that we need a transformative assessment as an inclusive holistic (i.e., providing a synergistic view of all possible ways to assess), yet *authentic-developmental* (i.e., a gradual moment towards learning outcomes through a process based learning approach to assessment). With this view, I came with yet another question '*How can transformative assessment be enabling for my learners to demonstrate their potential as creative future teachers?*' (See Chapter 5C)

Teacher Education Research and Practice as Proving to Probing and Transforming

A teacher education research (and practice), without any doubt, is the most critical component of the whole educative process, yet it is guided by the post/positivist agenda under the epistemic singularity (the absolutist view) in the context of many developing countries including Pakistan (Nawaz, 2012; Nawaz & Kundi, 2010). Such kinds of practices give rise to a culture of research and practice as way of knowledge creation through 'proving and testing' (Luitel, 2009).

Nonetheless, the reformative agenda have provided a limited space to embrace epistemic plurality with multiple modes of conducting research and related practices. As such, there has been an open space unoccupied and to explore the innovative *inclusive-holistic paradigms of research and practices* in the context of teacher education in Pakistan with a view to creating an empowering learning environment for future teachers.

Teacher Education Research as Proving

As positivist agenda of research focuses on researcher's independence from the research processes, and keeps researcher separate from his/her subjective views and involvement as a research participant. In such practices, it seems impossible to capture subjective realities of practitioners engaged with the process of teaching, learning and research (Nawaz, 2012). Arriving at this point of reflection, I begin to think about my own practices as a research supervisor and come to realize that I have been very much objectivist in my view of research as proving.

This reflection enable me to look at other practices in teacher education in the context of Pakistan and come to know that teacher educators/research supervisors seem to limit themselves within conventional research methodologies inspired by positivism that does not seem to encourage them to focus on lived experiences of teachers (Huma, 2013; Rehmani, n.d.). I come to realize that perhaps such canonical views to research seem dominating the minds of teacher educators/research supervisors. Perhaps, these limited views seem to confine me (and other teacher educators/research supervisors) within a dualist view of quantitative versus qualitative methodologies with a Western Modern Worldview[13] (WMW) of knowledge creation (Luitel, 2009; Taylor et al., 2012). And this view of *research as proving* further seems impacting on our approach to supervising student teachers, who are engaged with pre-service education programs. Arriving at this stage of my inquiry, I begin to ask: '*In what ways has epistemic singularism confined me to operate within an objectivist agenda of research and practice?* (See Chapter 6A)'

---

[13]The concept that knowledge is generated through scientific ways of research using laws of science is the only right knowledge and the knowledge coming from other sources including Eastern Wisdom traditions which do not follow objectivist notion of knowledge claims makes no sense.

Teacher Education Research as Probing

I come to realize that to explore and explain multiple ways of knowing realities, regarded in emotions, perceptions, beliefs, views and practices of teachers and researchers, we need multiple ways to research. To this end, paradigms of interpretivism along with other innovative ways to research can better help teacher educators to understand their practices by looking beyond this dualist view of quantitative versus qualitative approaches (Luitel & Taylor, 2009). Because this dualist view of research as proving and somehow probing, which uses methodologies of quantitative and qualitative may not represent multiple paradigms and are limited to provide multiple ways of knowing. Nevertheless, multi-paradigms (i.e., positivism, postpositivism, interpretivism, criticalism, postmodernism and integralism etc.) can offer researcher different alternatives to knowing. Arriving at this point of my inquiry I begin to ask question of the kind, '*How does reformist agenda of constraint pluralism help me to think about multiple ways of doing research?* (See Chapter 6B)'

Teacher Education Research as a Process of Morphing Myself

I came to realize that 'epistemological pluralism recognizes that, in any given research context, there may be several valuable ways of knowing, and that accommodating this plurality can lead to more successful integrated study' (Miller, Baird, Littlefield, Kofinas, Chapin & Redman, 2008, p.1). Nonetheless, reflecting on this state of research culture in the context of TU, I came to know that I (and many of my colleagues and others) have been operating within tested methodologies and methods of inquiries (i.e., quantitative and qualitative). Having such kind of exposure, I had developed my doctoral research program under post/positivist agenda to carry out my

research. Later on, I realized that to walk on a path of transformative learning journey, a research paradigm within an epistemic singularity could not support my aim. I begin to think that I need epistemic pluralism and beyond to make better understanding of complex nature of my research problem of culturally disempowering nature of teacher education and research practices in the context of Pakistan.

This realization enabled me to reflect on my purpose of research that guides me to search for more suitable research paradigms and worldviews that would facilitate and accommodate my agenda of research and myself as a researcher and/or practitioner in the field of teacher education. My exploration through rigorous reviews of literature (on pluralism and beyond) and discussions with my mentor and other faculty members enable to acclimatise within a transformative research paradigm under MDS that facilitate 'person-sensitive methods of … research to 'look into' the hearts and minds of teachers and students' in order to transform them (Taylor, 2014, p.10). Such an innovative method of research can be 'one of the most powerful tools for fostering transformative learning' that can enable me 'with learning experiences that are direct, personally engaging and stimulate reflection upon experience (King 2004 cited in Taylor, 2007, p.10).

Building on the notions of such kind of a morphing view of inclusive-holistic paradigm of research, I embraced a *multiparadigmatic research design* space (Taylor, Taylor & Luitel, 2012) not only for my doctoral study purpose but also to transform my practices as part of my agenda of culturally empowering teacher education in Pakistan by using auto/ethnography as key methodological referent (Taylor et al., 2012). With this in mind, I came with question of the kind, '*In what ways can a multiparadigmatic design*

enable me to promote inclusive and empowering research practices in teacher education in Pakistan?' (See Chapter 6C)

I begin to reflect on three research paradigms (positivism guided by informative view, and postpositivism guided by reformative view inspired by epistemic singularism/absolutism, and MDS inspired by holism) in teacher education research and practice. With this reflection, I come to realize that an informative view of teacher education research with a narrow interest, gave rise to reformative agenda with somehow a broader view of teacher education research (and practice), thereby envisioning a *morphing view of teacher education* so as to provide more freedom to learners (teacher educators/researchers and student/teachers) with more responsibility for self/others' learning (Habermas, 1972). To this end, my *emergent soulful enquiry* within MDS guide me towards a stage where I remained engaged with *frequent back and forth virtual travelling* and *mental catharsis* over informing and reforming state of narrowly conceived view of culturally disempowering teacher education and research practices to understand with different *lenses, angles and filters* (Saldana, 2015, p.4).

In this chapter I extensively engaged with extent literature to position myself with five key thematic areas to create space for exploration and explanation at my subjective level. Thus, theoretical positioning enabled me to come with research questions for three different phases of my inquiry as informing, reforming and transforming. In the next chapter, I have presented a methodological sketch based on the nature of multi-dimensional aspect of my research problem.