Considering all our Relations:
A Proposed Hermeneutic Turn in S-STEP

Dawn Wiseman

University of Alberta
dwiseman@ualberta.ca

Abstract

For doctoral students engaged in the meta-shift from teaching to teaching about teaching, Self-Study of Teacher Education Practices (S-STEP) can offer a fruitful methodology for framing inquiries into personal teaching practices. However, S-STEP is somewhat limiting with respect to inquiries that attempt to account for the complexity and multiplicity of relationships in the classroom. These relationships may include, but are not limited to, relationships between teacher educator and students, teacher educator and classroom context, teacher educator and policy, and teacher educator and curriculum. Inspired by Indigenous understandings of all our relations, I suggest that the limitations of S-STEP might be addressed through a deeper theoretical engagement with the relationality emergent from ontological hermeneutics thereby improving the ability for doctoral students to consider the livingness at play in teaching about teaching.

Introduction

When Self-Study of Teacher Education Practices (S-STEP) was first discussed at the American Education Research Association (AERA) Annual Meeting in 1992, Mary Lynn Hamilton was one of the presenters (Loughran, 2004). She has subsequently spent more than two decades exploring reflection (individual and collective) on personal teaching practice, to become a leading voice in S-STEP as a field. Hamilton's (Hamilton, LaBoskey, Loughran, & Russell, 1998) inquiry into her own practice coincided with the beginning of her post-secondary teaching career when she asked, "How can I teach about teaching if I have not studied what I do?" (Mary Lynn section, para. 4). The question underlines the meta-shift–the process of moving from teaching to "teaching about teaching" (Loughran, 2006, pp. 2-3) in which many doctoral students in education are engaged. As doctoral students engaged in considerations of the ways in which we might take up teaching in universities, how we come to understand personal teaching experience so that we might support others as they begin to experience teaching is an important question.

I see the value of deep examination of my own practice. At the same time, as someone whose life and career has occurred in places where Indigenous[1] and Western ways of knowing, being and doing circulate together, I question whether S-STEP, as I currently read and understand it, is sufficient as a singular framework for inquiry into teacher education practice; the methodology appears to forget some of the complexifying relationships in practice, particularly the other-than-human. In this paper, I therefore pay "serious attention … to examining the possibilities inherent in indigenous ontologies" (Stewart-Harawira, 2005, p. 34) as a means of remembering other-than-human relationships at play in practice, and suggest that the relationality of ontological hermeneutics might "create space" (Kovach, 2005, p. 26) within S-STEP as a means of increasing engagement with the complex, multiplicity of relationships that must be negotiated in teacher education.

In this paper, I begin by positioning myself, then provide a brief overview of both S-STEP and my understandings of Indigenous conceptions of relationship. Next I consider S-STEP in relation to hermeneutics to conclude that, while both are concerned with livingness, S-STEP engages with a more limited, constrained version of it. Finally, I suggest that the hermeneutic notion of play, combined with Indigenous conceptions of relationship, might be helpful

in opening up the potential of S-STEP to more thoroughly account for the multiplicity of relationships at play in teaching and learning.

Positioning Myself

> Identifying, at the outset, the location from which the voice of the researcher emanates is an Aboriginal way of ensuring that those who study, write, and participate in knowledge creation are accountable for their own positionality. (Absolon & Willett, 2005, p. 97)

I am a white, Anglophone, Western woman from Montréal, Québec, Canada. For the last 20 years, a significant part of my life–personal and professional–has occurred alongside Aboriginal people, peoples and communities. My understanding of the context and relationships in which this paper–and all my work–is immersed emerges from my own experiences, stories that family, friends, and colleagues have shared, as well as research and reading I have undertaken in my own ongoing process of coming to understand. This experience includes coming up against racism and the legacy of residential schools during work with community; the stories of my husband's grandfather who was enfranchised and had to leave his home in the Mohawk community of Kahnawà:ke, Québec on the day he graduated from medical school; and work in Montréal, Québec at Concordia University's, Québec Native Access to Engineering Program with my long-time mentor Corinne Mount Pleasant-Jetté, a former professor in the Faculty of Engineering and Computer Science and member of the Tuscarora Nation from Oshweken, Ontario, Canada. It also includes lessons from my Aboriginal friends, family, and colleagues that, even after half a millennium of being treated in the worst possible manner by people who arrived from elsewhere with no knowledge of this place, it is possible to cultivate a generative inner power[2] (Gadamer, 1989) that still allows you to greet newcomers-who-do-not-understand in your own language as "my brother, my sister, my relations". Such power emerges from a deep, embodied understanding that "we are all related" (Cajete, 2006a, p. 56).

While I cannot and do not claim the deep connections and understandings that come from extremely long-term relationships in and with the land, nor access to a language in which these understandings live, it has been impossible not to be profoundly impacted by the generosity, sense of humour, and teachings with which I have been gifted over the last two decades. My world and work has been opened up and changed by the people and places I have met. I have been taught the land is a living, breathing entity that teaches, and for this I am deeply grateful.

I am aware that in taking up this work I must always ask myself the questions Kovach (2005) says challenge non-Indigenous people in contexts such as my own, "Am I creating space or taking space?" (p. 26). The intention is always the first, but the second is potential. At the same time, Stewart-Harawira (2005) notes that "outside of indigenous scholarship itself, within academic circles little serious attention has been paid to examining the possibilities inherent in indigenous ontologies" (p. 34). As numerous authors (e.g., Brown & Strega, 2005; Smith, 1999; Wilson, 2008) underline, creating space for Indigenous ways of knowing, being and doing within the academy goes well beyond adding the work "Indigenous" to course titles or research; it is a political process and choice that requires serious and ongoing commitment to decolonizing and indigenizing. It is my hope that by sharing my own serious attention and commitment to such possibilities, I can give back to the people, peoples and communities who have given me so much over the last two decades, and in doing so contribute to the creation of an academy that is a place for all our relations. In what follows I offer some insight regarding how attending to deeper understandings of relationship can trouble and inform approaches to research.

Key Features of S-STEP

S-STEP is referred to as both a methodology and research stance. According to Hamilton and Pinnegar (1998a), S-STEP systematizes and formalizes deep reflection on teaching and the values brought to teaching as a way of aligning them in practice. For people who teach in places where different ways of knowing, being, and doing–and their attendant values–circulate together S-STEP thus appears as a practical means of consciously attending to whether they are creating or taking space (Kovach, 2005). I have found the approach helpful in questioning the ideologies and assumptions that inform and underlie my practice, in making explicit how these ideologies and assumptions manifest in my practice, and in considering how my practice might create space (Kovach, 2005) in

which Indigenous and Westerns ways of knowing, being and doing might circulate together. These kinds of inquiry are relatively common across S-STEP research (Lighthall, 2004).

Loughran (2004) states that, as a methodology, S-STEP has no particular methods but draws on a number of factors that help to define the space in which a study occurs and how it is communicated. These factors include commitments to reflection on personal practice, to seeking alternative perspectives on practice by creating a space in which teaching practice is questioned (or challenged) by colleagues and students, to calling into question that which you know, and to the "intertwining of teaching and researching … such that as one alters so does the other" (p. 24). Lighthall's (2004) review of 125 S-STEP studies identifies 14 "commonplaces" (p. 193) that emerged across the body of work. The six most frequent features appeared in 75% of the corpus. They are: collaboration, self-study of authors', students' or institutional practice, explicit use of self-selected methods, autobiography, reform as motivation and / or purpose of study, and development of theory from research. Lighthall points out that S-STEP is a flexible methodology in which features are deployed in a variety of ways by different researchers depending on the focus of their work. For instance, reform can be taken up as change in norms or practices, as change in culture of the academy, or as change in attitudes with respect to notions such as diversity and equity. It is, in part, the flexibility of S-STEP that I find productive, as it allows studies to be developed in response to specific, local contexts. However, with respect to teaching that tries to acknowledge the complex multiplicity of relationships in the teaching of teachers S-STEP seems a bit more limiting.

All Our Relations

D. S. Aoki (2008, 2011) takes up university teaching from a place in which Eastern and Western traditions circulate together. He (2011) suggests that from this perspective "if you think the world through teaching, teaching becomes a way of life", breaking down strict delineations between epistemology and ontology in a way which allows him to meaningfully reflect who he is as a second generation Japanese-Canadian. I come to teaching not through the qualification of a B.Ed., but rather in relationship with Aboriginal people, peoples and communities. The assumptions and values I bring to teaching are thus bound up in experiences of Canadian schooling, but also, and to a large extent, on understandings developed via experiences of teaching and learning based in Aboriginal ways of knowing, being, and doing. In these places I have learned to think the world through relationship and, like D. S. Aoki (2011), have found it is indeed a way of life.

Tewa curriculum scholar Greg Cajete (2001) explains that most Indigenous communities and nations have an equivalent to the Tewa saying which translates to English as "we are all kernels on the same cob" (p. 629). In Mi'kmaw, it is *Msit No'kmaq* or "all my relations"; in Lakota, it is *mitakuye oyasin* or "we are all related" (Cajete, 2006a, p. 56). My understanding is that the "we" should be interpreted broadly. It includes all things that in Western worldviews would be classified as living and non-living. So, along with animals (both the human and the other-than-human) and plants, "we" includes the air, the water, the rocks, and the soil. It includes the planet as a whole, and extends out from it to include everything in the universe. It applies at the individual level, where a person is a relationship of intellect, physicality, spirit, and emotion; at the social level, in families, in classrooms or other communities; and, at the extreme micro or macro levels, in the interplay of proteins in a cell or the dance of stars in a galaxy. This understanding of "we" suggests a deeply interconnected reality in which any action has the potential to impact all of creation. As such, even in situations where an action appears to have little impact beyond the individual taking the action, there is an implicit responsibility to weigh and consider the potential for more widespread effects. Relationship conceived in this manner tasks us all with ethical action in everything we do. It is in this way that I take up, or attempt to take up, the term relationship.

Cajete (e.g. 1994, 1999b) underlines that this understanding of relationship is both explicit and tacit in Indigenous education. Tacit here is similar to the sense suggested by Polanyi (1969), in that it refers to knowledge and knowing not easily explained via language. For Cajete (1994, 2001), such tacit knowledge is embodied in the living experience of community Elders. Cajete (2006b) suggests that in Western education, with its abstraction of subjects from one another, and often from living experience, deep understanding of relationship and its accompanying ethics are largely forgotten except perhaps in environmental and ecological education (see also Naess & Jickling, 2000) and in the application of complexity theory to education (Davis & Sumara, 2006; Davis, Sumara, & Luce-Kapler, 2000). It is in these areas where Cajete (1999b, 2006a) senses complementary understandings between Western and

Indigenous traditions. In turn, Davis, Sumara and Luce-Kapler (2000) stress Cajete has been instrumental in identifying and criticizing Western concepts of knowing as a "dispassionate academic exercise" (p. 11) and creating a space for opening up the concept of knowing[3] as relationship between identity and action immersed in and emergent from multiple, overlapping contexts. Here, epistemology emerges from ontology in specific contexts, and subsequently maps back onto it. Here, the relationships in which practice is immersed extend significantly beyond the human.

Relationship in S-STEP: The Need to Move Beyond the Human

There are connections to relationship in S-STEP. Loughran (2006) suggests pedagogy is about relationship between teaching and learning, between teachers and students. He writes that the forging of relationships is fundamental to the nature of teaching, that "without building relationships the purpose of teaching is diminished" (p. 86).

Pinnegar and Hamilton (2009) also invoke relationship in their explanation of the self in self-study not as individual but rather as "*self and the other in practice*" (p.12). Lighthall (2004) identifies relationship as one of the 14 commonplaces of S-STEP, albeit a minor one; relationship appears in just under 10 per cent of the corpus he reviewed. When relationship is taken up in S-STEP it appears most often in collaborative work and sometimes in theory-building around ideas such as "biography of relationships" (p. 218), power, ethics, and voice.

The relationships found in S-STEP, however, seems to be overwhelmingly limited to those between self and (human) other in practice (see for example Alderton, 2008; Bullough Jr., 2008; Loughran, 2006) and / or between self and self with regard to beliefs, values, and self-understandings (see for example Alderton, 2008; Berry, 2009; Schulte, 2005). There is no question these relationships are important, but they are not the only relationships which impact the primary focus of self-study and the ongoing response and adaptation of teacher educator practice to life as it occurs in the classroom (Loughran, 2004, 2006; Pinnegar & Hamilton, 2009). What seems to be forgotten in S-STEP is explicit exploration of relationships emergent between teacher educators and subject matter, between students and subject matter, and between subject matter and different ways of knowing, being, and doing. Without remembering such relationships, Jardine, Friesen, and Clifford (2006) suggest subject matter loses its livingness.

"All our relations" (Cajete, 2006a, p. 56) reminds me that classroom life and teaching practice involve relationships with other (sometimes other-than-human) entities: that is, they are intimately bound up with the content to be taught / learned and the context in which the teaching / learning occurs. According to T. T Aoki (2005), practice involves multiplicity and emerges in the spaces between curriculum-as-plan (as laid out in policy, programs of study, or written lessons), curriculum-as-lived (as played out in the 'messiness' of classroom life), and the manifold relationships that exist between them, teachers and students within any classroom. Practice is thus complex, and to look at it only from the perspective of human relationships minimizes that complexity.

The Hermeneutic Turn

In order to consider practice in a manner that attempts to allow for a complex, multiplicity of relationships and "a fuller account of the nature of self-knowledge" (Gadamer, 1989, p. 228), I propose a hermeneutic turn to S-STEP based on the philosophical hermeneutics of Gadamer (1989). According to Jardine (2006), hermeneutics provides a means of interpreting and coming to understand a "living world" (p. 269) caught up in the ongoing process of renewal; it is a way "to re-think what we experience in our day to day lives as teachers, what we understand teaching to be" (p. 269). In Gadamer's (1989) tradition of hermeneutics, the process of coming to understand is relational. Moreover, it is itself embedded in a web of relationships that is defined particularly by the culture, history, historical moment and place in which the interpreter is immersed. It is only from within the complex multiplicity of these preexisting relationships, or "prejudices" (p. 271) that the interpreter comes to understand. These prejudices are not to be understood in a negative sense, but rather as the ways in which we have been taught to understand, which we carry with us, and through which we attempt to make sense of the world: they are the ways of knowing, being and doing through which we teach. In addition, prejudices are essential to furthering and deepening understanding, as they are the thing against which the new, the different, the as-yet-to-be understood bump up and make us take notice. They are the means by which we are able to recognize a relational "we" (Gadamer, 2004), which is

attempting to find common ground and the recognition that "I am more than me. I am connected to you. I am a member of we" (Stanley & Loy, 2013, p. 40). I interpret "we" in this sense with the depth suggested by "we are all related" (Cajete, 2006), which extends relations well-beyond the human to offers an existence whereby we might not only come to a more intimate self-knowledge (Gadamer, 1989) but also come to understand our own places within the whole.

I recognize that the proposal I offer is insufficient in terms of fully making space (Kovach, 2005) for Indigenous ways of knowing, being, and doing in the academy. Kovach (2009) and Stewart-Harawira (2005) consider hermeneutics a methodology which might be "allied" (Kovach, 2009, p. 34) with Indigenous ways of knowing, being, and doing. However, as Stewart-Harawira (2005) points out, it is still a "reduced form, of concepts and understandings that have always existed in indigenous epistemological and ontological thought" (p. 46). The proposal is thus offered as a starting point for further exploration and conversation.

Few Explicit Connections between S-STEP and Hermeneutics

A review of the S-STEP literature reveals relatively few explicit connections between S-STEP and hermeneutics and where they do exist, they tend to be brief. Hamilton and Pinnegar (1998b), for example, understand and articulate S-STEP as "undertaking a hermeneutic study of self" (p. 240), where the self and classroom practices of the self provide the texts which form the basis of an interpretive study aimed at understanding. The conception of text expressed by Hamilton and Pinnegar is taken up by Samaras and Freese (2006) in a primer about self-study for classroom teachers that includes a brief definitional description of hermeneutics as an approach to research by which relationships and meaning are revealed through careful and iterative reading and (re)reading of texts. In examining their own observations of practice in each other's classrooms, Schuck, Aubusson, and Buchanan (2008) increasingly articulate and emphasize the relationship between hermeneutics and S-STEP. They draw on Van Manen's (as cited in Schuck et al., 2008, p. 218) idea of phenomenological hermeneutic observation which requires researchers to get caught up in close relationship with the focus of study and simultaneously maintain the ability to step back and consider the focus within a broader context.

Pinnegar and Hamilton (2009) have recently acknowledged "that fundamentally establishing self-study as a methodology centers on a look toward ontology. The basic question is actually more about *what is* than about claims to know" (p. 2, emphasis in original). However, in terms of illustrating the richness of hermeneutics as an ontological stance which moves beyond mere methodology (Jardine, 2006), very little work appears to currently exist within the field of S-STEP. There are, however, two exceptions.

Brown and Farrell (2010) consider hermeneutics as a means of exposing their own prejudgements within a changing teaching context and move beyond mere examination of context as a separate text in order to place themselves firmly within the practice as active participants who both contribute to and are impacted by its ongoing re/creation. Whitehead (2004) takes up Gadamer's (1989) philosophical hermeneutics approach directly and suggests that the significance of Gadamer's work with respect to S-STEP lies in his persistent focus on questions that address our own being and living, which, if acknowledged, "preserve one's openness to the possibilities which life itself permits" (p. 888). That life, of course, may absolutely take place in the classroom.

Implicit Connections and Meeting Places

Despite the paucity of explicit connections between S-STEP and hermeneutics in the S-STEP literature, hermeneutics can definitely be read into the work. To begin, both methodologies are without strict fixed methods (Jardine, 2006; Loughran, 2004). Both, however, require that the researcher look carefully at the assumptions (Loughran, 2006) or prejudgements and prejudices (Gadamer, 1989) the practitioner brings to the situation under study. Prejudice and prejudgements, in Gadamer's view, are not negative attributes, but rather they are an open and honest lens through which the researcher views the world and the related subjective realities therein. Loughran's (2006) call for teacher educators to be explicit about their practice. That is, to explain what teacher educators are doing and why they are doing it reflects the sense of experience leading to tacit knowing that may present as prejudice. For example, in my own case, I am explicit with students that because I teach from a place in which Western and Indigenous ways of knowing, being, and doing circulate together within the teaching of science. I do

not ever think that a system can be isolated for study by itself. Our studying of a system is always in relation to and impacting on the system.

In the teaching of teachers, placing assumptions and prejudices out on display allows for the development within a class of a "shared language" (Loughran, 2006) or the move towards a common "horizon" (Gadamer, 1989), a place from which conversation may begin. As Jardine (2006) points out, the sharing of assumptions, of prejudice, of tacit knowing does not just expose them but also opens them up to the world "letting the potential distortions of subjectivity work themselves out in a worldly territory that can confront and contain and cultivate and limit and, sometimes, humiliate them" (p. 280); for teaching is nothing if not an exercise in humility.

Another area where S-STEP and hermeneutics seem to meet is in the interplay between whole and part, the dance between the particularity of the individual experience and "the undeniable sense of kinship we experience in hearing [a specific] teacher's tale" (Jardine, 2006, p. 276). While less poetic than Jardine (2006), Loughran (2006) also underlines the relationship between whole and parts. He points to work by scholars who identify descriptors such as *program principles*, *axioms*, or *assertions* to label lists of general statements, each arising from multiple instances of individual teaching experiences which, over time, allow a person to say something more broadly about teaching.

More interplay and overlap occurs in the mutually informing relationship between episteme–abstract knowledge often associated with schooling–and phronesis–practical wisdom often associated with experience–in the teaching of teachers. Jardine (1998) refers to the tension between these two ways of knowing for beginning teachers through the story of a student who asked for a measurable quantity of the number of times she should be making eye contact with the students in the class in which she was placed for her practicum. He laments her question–her misreading of the relationship between theory and practice–to open broader discussion of why in teacher education the focus is often on episteme rather than phronesis, when both are required. While he and Loughran (2006) both conclude episteme is easier to assess, neither is satisfied with this state of affairs because it does not reflect the *livingness* of what goes on in classrooms. S-STEP and hermeneutics are both focused on that *livingness* and on understanding how it is constituted. This place of meeting is precisely the place where I posit S-STEP becomes less satisfactory than hermeneutics as a methodology or stance for examining practice.

Dealing More Fully with Livingnes*s: Remembering Play*

While S-STEP is interested in the *livingness*, it seems to be a more constrained version of life than both that of hermeneutics, particularly the ontological hermeneutics as expressed by Jardine and colleagues (see for example Friesen & Jardine, 2009; Jardine, 1998, 2006; Jardine & Batycky, 2006; Jardine et al., 2006), and that of "we are all related" (Cajete, 2006). This potential constraint might arise in part because S-STEP largely limits itself to human relationships and appears to forget the complex multiplicity of relationships which T. T. Aoki (2005) describes as present in the classroom. In this constraint, I sense the forgetting of a key tenet of hermeneutics: play. Play in this sense has "a special relation to what is serious … 'for the sake of re[/]creation'" (Gadamer, 1989, p. 102), or ongoing renewal. Jardine and colleagues (2006) suggest this type of forgetting, active or otherwise, is endemic in "regimes of scarcity" (p. 6) where people are required to justify their position and existence. Tensions around validity do seem to be at play in S-STEP.

In 1996, Northfield observed that researchers who take up S-STEP are frequently and continually challenged to justify reflective self-study as a valid form of research. At an AERA preconference in 2011, S-STEP sessions (Berry, Hamilton, Gudjonsdottir, & Pinnegar, 2011; Tidwell, Sowea, Bullock, East, & Fitzgerald, 2011) indicated that little has evolved in this regard. Presentations at the pre-conference focused on how S-STEP can, might, and / or should be justified as a means of educational research and learning within post-secondary institutions and, more specifically, to funding bodies in the United States that significantly privilege quantitative research (Berry et al., 2011; Tidwell et al., 2011). Some of the conversations focused on the tensions between subjectivity and objectivity (Tidwell et al., 2011); others focused on the self and individual practice as a valid site for research (Berry et al., 2011). Overall, key thinkers in the field appeared to be making rather broad and rigid claims regarding what does and does not constitute S-STEP (Berry et al., 2011). In doing so, they seemed to be moving away from Loughran's (2004) position of S-STEP as a methodology responsive to context towards a more limited and limiting conception of S-STEP as a methodology with more fixed methods.

In forgetting play, either through a focus on purely human relationships and / or in reaction to the context in which many researchers find themselves, S-STEP loses the sense that "the object under consideration … *is* its possibilities, its fluidity, its living overflow into an as yet unforeclosed future" (Jardine et al., 2006, p. 9, emphasis in original). In focusing on beings (humans) or on being (survival), S-STEP appears to forget that classrooms are spaces and practice is an action of being with or amidst: being with students, being with colleagues, being with ideas, being with content, being with context, being with and amidst multiplicity (T. T. Aoki, 2005) and finding the *livingness* in it.

Conclusion

For doctoral students engaged in the meta-shift from teaching to teaching about teaching, S-STEP provides a meaningful place from which to begin inquiring into their own practices. However, when considering the complex multiplicity of relationships in living practice, S-STEP, in and of itself, may prove insufficient in opening up consideration of practice to "all our relations" (Cajete, 2006a, p. 56).

This article proposes a greater theoretical foundation for S-STEP in ontological hermeneutics informed by Indigenous conceptions of relationship, as a means of "creating space" (Kovach, 2005, p. 26) for and remembering the multiple human and other-than-human relationships in teaching about teaching. In entering into a deeper consideration of "all our relations" (Cajete, 2006a) as a part of reflection on practice there is the potential to move beyond the anthropocentric to get caught up in the *livingness* of the pre-service education classroom, and thus to be present so that when "in some 'magical' way, something remarkable from the life world of the classroom … present[s] itself ", it is possible "to take up this particular event and care for this message, so that the beauty of its dailiness [is] gently uncovered and honored" (Jardine & Batycky, 2006). In suggesting that we find ways to remember such relationships, this article is intended as a means of taking seriously "the possibilities inherent in indigenous ontologies" (Stewart-Harawira, 2005, p. 34), and offering graduate students, teacher educators and researchers a beginning place for further explorations and conversations regarding the decolonization and indigenizing of the academy.

Acknowledgements

References

Absolon, K., & Willett, C. (2005). Putting ourselves forward: Location in Aboriginal research. In L. Brown & S. Strega, *Research as resistance: Critical, Indigenous and anti-oppressive approaches* (pp. 97-126). Toronto, ON: Canadian Scolars' Press.

Alderton, J. (2008). Exploring self-study to improve my practice as a mathematics teacher educator. *Studying Teacher Education, 4*(2), 95-104.

Aoki, D. S. (2008). Teaching as killing the self or why professors deserve to be beaten. In A. Fidyk, J. Wallin, & K. den Heyer (Eds.), *Democratizing educational experience: Envisioning, embodying, enacting* (pp. 25-35). Troy, NY: Educator's International Press.

Aoki, D. S. (2011, April). *Break out session.* Curriculum at the edges II. University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB.

Aoki, T. T. (2005). Humiliating the cartesian ego. In W. F. Pinar & R. L. Irwin (Eds.), *Curriculum in a new key: The collected works of Ted T. Aoki* (pp. 291-301). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Barnhardt, R. (2008). Creating a place for Indigenous knowledge in education: The Alaska Native Knowledge Network. In D. A. Gruenewald & G. A. Smith (Eds.), *Place-based education in the golden age: Local diversity* (pp. 113-135). New York, NY: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Berry, A. (2009). Professional self-understanding as expertise in teaching about teaching. *Teacher and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 15*(2), 305-318.

Berry, A., Hamilton, M. L., Gudjonsdottir, H., & Pinnegar, S. (2011, April). *Making the turn to self.* Paper presented at the Invisible College for Research on Teaching, AERA pre-conference, New Orleans, LA.

Brown, N., & Farrell, J. B. (2010). *Confessions of two technophobes: A self-study of two teacher educators' efforts to understand and develop a participatory culture within a technological environment.* . Paper presented at the 8th International Conference on Self-Study in Teacher Education Practices, Brigham Young University, Provo, UT.

Brown, L., & Strega, S. (2005). *Research as resistance: Critical, Indigenous, and anti-oppressive approaches*. Toronto, ON: Canadian Scholars' Press.

Bullough, Jr., R. V. (2008). Teaching and reconsidering the social foundations of education: A self-study. *Studying Teacher Education, 4*(1), 5-15.

Cajete, G. A. (1994). *Look to the mountain: An ecology of Indigenous education*. Skyland, NC: Kivaki Press.

Cajete, G. A. (1999a). *Igniting the sparkle: An Indigenous education science education model*. Skyland, NC: Kivaki Press.

Cajete, G. A. (1999b). Reclaiming biophilia: Lessons from Indigenous people. In G. A. Smith & D. R. Williams (Eds.), *Ecological education in action: On weaving education, culture and the environment* (pp. 189-206). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Cajete, G. A. (2000). *Native science: Natural laws of interdependence*. Santa Fe, NM: Clear Light Publishers.

Cajete, G. A. (2001). Indigenous education and ecology: Perspectives of an American Indian educator. In J. A. Grim (Ed.), *Indigenous traditions and ecology: The interbeing of cosmology and community* (pp. 619-638). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Cajete, G. A. (2005). American Indian epistemologies. *New Directions for Student Services, 109*, 69-78.

Cajete, G. A. (2006a). It is time for Indian people to define Indigenous education in their own terms. *Tribal College Journal, 18*(2), 56-57.

Cajete, G. A. (2006b). Western science and the loss of natural creativity. In Four Winds (Ed.), *Unlearning the language of conquest: Scholars expose anti-Indianism in America* (pp. 247-259). Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Davis, B., & Sumara, D. (2006). *Complexity and education: Inquiries into learning, teaching and research*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Davis, B., Sumara, D., & Luce-Kapler, R. (2000). *Engaging minds: Changing teaching in complex times*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Ermine, W. (1995). Aboriginal epistemology. In M. Battiste & J. Barman (Eds.), *First Nations education in Canada: The circle unfolds* (pp. 101-111). Vancouver, BC: UBC Press.

Friesen, S., & Jardine, D. W. (2009). On field(ing) knowledge. In B. Sriraman & S. Goodchild (Eds.), *Relatively and philosophically speaking earnest festschrift in honor of Paul Earnest's 65th birthday* (pp. 147-172). Missoula, MT: Information Age and the Montana Council of Teachers of Mathematics.

Gadamer, H.-G. (1989). *Truth and method*. London: Continuum.

Gadamer, H.-G. (2004). *Philosophical hermeneutics* (D. E. Linge, Trans.). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Hamilton, M. L., LaBoskey, V., Loughran, J., & Russell, T. (1998, August). *Have five years of self-study changed teacher education?: Artifacts of our personal development as teacher educators*. Paper presented at the Self-Study of Teacher Education Practices Second International Conference, Herstmonceux Castle, East Sussex, UK. Retrieved from http://educ.queensu.ca/ar/sstep2/5years.html

Hamilton, M. L., & Pinnegar, S. (1998a). Introduction: Reconceptualising teaching practice. In M. L. Hamilton, S. Pinnegar, T. Russell, J. Loughran & V. LaBoskey (Eds.), *Reconceptualising teaching practice: Self-Study in teacher education* (pp. 1-4). London: Falmer Press.

Hamilton, M. L., & Pinnegar, S. (1998b). Conclusion. In M. L. Hamilton, S. Pinnegar, T. Russell, J. Loughran & V. LaBoskey (Eds.), *Reconceptualising teaching practice: Self-study in teacher education* (pp. 235-246). London: Falmer Press.

Hampton, E. (1995). Toward a redefinition of Indian education. In M. Battiste & J. Barman (Eds.), *First Nations education in Canada: The circle unfolds* (pp. 5-46). Vancouver, BC: UBC Press.

Jardine, D. W. (1998). *To dwell with a boundless heart: Essays in curriculum theory, hermeneutics and the ecological imagination*. New York, NY: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc.

Jardine, D. W. (2006). On hermeneutics: "Over and above our wanting and doing". In J. Kincheloe & K. Tobin (Eds.), *Doing educational research: A handbook* (pp. 269-288). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Jardine, D. W., & Batycky, J. (2006). Filling this empty chair: On genius and repose. In D. W. Jardine, S. Friesen & P. Clifford (Eds.), *Curriculum in abundance* (pp. 213-225). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Jardine, D. W., Friesen, S., & Clifford, P. (2006). *Curriculum in abundance*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Kovach, M. (2005). Emerging from the margins: Indigenous methodologies. In L. Brown & S. Strega, *Research as resistance: Critical, Indigenous and anti-oppressive approaches* (pp. 19-36). Toronto, ON: Canadian Scholars' Press.

Kovach, M. (2009). *Indigenous methodologies: Characteristics, conversations and contexts*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.

Lighthall, F. F. (2004). Fundamental features and approaches to the S-STEP enterprise. In J. Loughran, M. L. Hamilton, V. Kubler LaBoskey & T. Russell (Eds.), *International handbook of self-study and teacher education practices* (pp. 193-245). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Press.

Loughran, J. (2004). A history of self-study of teaching and teacher education practices. In J. Loughran, M. L. Hamilton, V. Kubler LaBoskey & T. Russell (Eds.), *International handbook of self-study of teaching and teacher education practices*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Loughran, J. (2006). *Developing a pedagogy of teacher education: Understanding teaching and learning about teaching*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Meyer, M. A. (2013, December). *Mana moana! Pasifika rises!* Idle No More Webinar. Retrieved from http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DQi62rEYo-8.

Naess, A., & Jickling, B. (2000). Deep ecology and education: A conversation with Arne Naess. *Canadian Journal of Environmental Education, 5*, 48-62.

Northfield, J. (1996). *Is it navel gazing or the real fruit? Examining the appeal of self-study*. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association conference, New York, NY.

Pinnegar, S., & Hamilton, M. L. (2009). *Self-study of practice as a genre of qualitative research*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Polanyi, M. (1969). *Knowing and being*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Ritter, J. K. (2009). Developing a vision of teacher education: How my classroom teacher understandings evolved in the university environment. *Studying Teacher Education, 5*(1), 45-60.

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

Schuck, S., Aubusson, P., & Buchanan, J. (2008). Enhancing teacher education practice through professional learning conversations. *European Journal of Teacher Education, 31*(2), 215-227.

Schulte, A. (2005). Assuming my transformations. *Studying Teacher Education, 1*(1), 31-42.

Smith, L. T. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and Indigenous peoples*. London: Zed Books.

Stanley, J., & Loy, D. (2013). At the edge of the roof: The evolutionary crisis of the human spirit. In L. Vaughn-Lee (Ed.), *Spiritual ecology: The cry of the Earth* (pp. 37-46). Point Reyes, CA: The Golden Sufi Centre.

Stewart-Harawira, M. (2005). *The new imperial order: Indigenous responses to globalization*. London: Zed Books.

Tidwell, D., Sowea, P., Bullock, S. M., East, K., & Fitzgerald, L. (2011, April). *Methods for self-study*. Paper
      presented at the Invisible College for Research on Teaching, AERA pre-conference, New Orleans, LA.
Whitehead, J. (2004). What counts as evidence in self-studies of teacher education practices. In J. Loughran, M. L.
      Hamilton, V. Kubler LaBoskey & T. Russell (Eds.), *International handbook of self-study and teacher
education practices* (pp. 871-903). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
Wilson, S. (2008). *Research is ceremony: Indigenous research methods*. Halifax, NS: Fernwood Publishing.

---

[1] I recognize that terms such as "Aboriginal", "Western", and "Indigenous" are very broad and do not reflect the locatedness and complexities of epistemological and ontological relationships with the world. At the same time, working within the current literature and for ease of understandings I use these broad terms. In this work, "Aboriginal" is used as a collective term within the Canadian context to refer to First Nations, Métis and Inuit peoples and their epistemologies / ontologies. "Indigenous" is used a broader term than "Aboriginal" to cover contexts beyond Canada. "Western" is used as a collective term to refer to the ontologies / epistemologies arising from European Enlightenment traditions.

[2] Gadamer (1989) equates this type of power with freedom.

[3] This sense of knowing as something beyond the epistemological is expressed by many Indigenous scholars (see for example Ermine, 1995; Hampton, 1995; Meyer, 2013).