Navigating Educational Shifts: A Comparative Analysis of Teacher Education in South Africa and Sweden

Sarita Ramsaroop
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2437-4229

Sandra Jederud
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0503-7350

Abstract

One of the enduring challenges in teacher education is achieving a coherent integration between theoretical coursework and school-based practical experience. This often leads to a misalignment in student teachers' learning, where either theoretical or practical knowledge may be disproportionately emphasised to the detriment of the other. Moreover, the perspectives of teacher educators – who play a crucial role in guiding this integration – are not sufficiently understood in diverse educational contexts like South Africa and Sweden. This study delves into the transformative trends that have shaped teacher education methodologies over the past two to three decades, focusing on the 'university/research turn,' 'accountability turn,' and 'practice turn.' These shifts advocate for extended immersion in classroom settings as a means to enhance teacher preparedness. At the institutions involved, student teachers spend two to three days per week in school-based practice, balancing this with campus-based theoretical coursework. Employing qualitative methods and adopting the framework of boundary crossing, the study investigates how teacher educators in South Africa and Sweden perceive and support student teachers in navigating the interplay between these dual learning environments. The findings underscore the positive impact of workplace learning in both contexts, where some student teachers can seamlessly connect theoretical knowledge to practical application and vice versa. However, a critical observation emerges regarding the potential prioritisation of practical

knowledge at the expense of theoretical understanding – a contention often raised as a criticism of the practice turn. Notably, the study sheds light on the intricate balance required for effective reflective learning, as teacher educators observe a tendency among student teachers to align more closely with their workplace. This phenomenon resonates with Bruner's (2009) conceptuali-sation of an epistemological divide between school and university concerning the definition of valid knowledge in teacher education. The study highlights the nuances involved in bridging the gap between academic and practical realms, underscoring the need for a symbiotic relationship that facilitates the seamless integration of theoretical principles and work-integrated learning. Moreover, it is crucial to evaluate curriculum restructuring needs in professional higher education to effectively facilitate these transform-ative changes. The study offers insights that extend beyond the contexts of South Africa and Sweden by contributing to identifying best practices, systemic gaps, and to a more nuanced understanding of effective teacher education within diverse global contexts.

1. Introduction

In a fast-changing world, teaching is becoming increasingly complex, and the demands of teacher education (TE) institutions equipping prospective teachers with multi-faceted knowledge and skills to function effectively in the classrooms are increasing. Predetermined technical skills and experiential knowledge are inadequate for the complex problem-solving required in most contemporary teaching contexts (Willegems *et al.* 2017). Cultivating epistemic reflexivity to empower teachers to navigate complex teaching contexts and enhance their practice is crucial (Dean 2023). Epistemic rigor and intentional, situated practice are not innate abilities; they must be developed at the intersection of theory, evidence, and practice (Florian *et al.* 2017). Unfortunately, recurring critiques highlight that TE programmes are overly theoretical and disconnected from practical application (Darling-Hammond & Baratz-Snowden 2005; Resch, Schrittesser & Knapp 2022). Furthermore, these programmes often fail to equip student teachers with the essential knowledge required for effective teaching or provide effective methods for imparting this

critical knowledge and skill set (Darling-Hammond & Baratz-Snowden 2005; Pivovarova & Powers 2022).

The literature overwhelmingly cites the theory-practice divide as the primary reason TE programmes fail to adequately prepare teachers for the profession's demands (Cochran-Smith & Fries 2005; Darling-Hammond *et al.* 2017; Gravett *et al.* 2011; Resch, Schrittesser & Knapp 2022). Evidence supports this claim, showing that many beginning teachers find the profession excessively demanding and stressful, resulting in high attrition rates in countries such as the USA, Netherlands, Austria, Spain, and Norway (Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek 1999 cited by Stokking *et al.* 2003; Mitani, Fuller & Hollingworth 2022). Novice teachers struggle with classroom management, learner diversity, assessment, organising classroom activities, and communication with parents (Stokking *et al.* 2003), indicating inadequate preparation. Furthermore, scholars argue that new teachers often enter the profession with unrealistic expectations, leading to significant culture shock and a struggle to survive once they begin teaching (Korthagen *et al.* 2006; Pivovarova & Powers 2022; Stokking *et al.* 2003).

Efforts to improve TE recognise the necessity of transcending traditional boundaries. Key strategies include integrating high-quality clinical work, extending practical experiences in schools, and combining these with intentional learning during coursework. Traditionally, theoretical knowledge was imparted through university courses, while practical experience took place in schools. However, the increasing demand for more extensive practical experiences has led to a shift toward practice-based, practice-focused, or practice-centered TE. This shift suggests that TE now centres around core teaching practices (McDonald, Kazemi & Kavanagh 2013) and includes extensive student placements in schools for observation and hands-on practice (Forzani 2014). It acknowledges that effective teaching requires both theoretical understanding and practical competence (Ball & Forzani 2009; Zeichner 2012), with scholars advocating for an expanded curriculum that emphasises what they actually do in the classroom and not only what they know (Grossman *et al.* 2009). Student teachers are thus spending more time on practice within TE programmes, often referred to as work-integrated learning (WIL). Although WIL is well recognised as a practice, the starting point of work-based activities and programmes disputably began with cooperative education, or the 'integration of classroom work and practical industrial experience in an organised program' (Armsby 1954:1).

Cooperative education is claimed to have its origin in the late 1800s in

the United Kingdom, in the early 1900s in the United States, and in the mid-1900s in Canada (Reeve 2004). The omnipresence of cooperative education, or WIL, is also referred to by many different names. These include practicum, work-based learning, work-related learning, authentic experiences, real-world learning, experiential learning, work experience, workplace learning, and practice-based learning, among others. These diverse names are embraced by various countries and universities, each reflecting nuanced perspectives on the intersection of work and learning. Mostly, descriptions of WIL comprise student learning linked in some way with organised work (Billett 2009; Patrick *et al.* 2009). Opposing a united definition, Patrick *et al.* (2009:6) refer to WIL as an 'umbrella concept' for 'a range of approaches and strategies that integrate theory with the practice of work within a purposefully designed curriculum'. However, there are critics who caution against reducing teaching to visible behaviours alone, emphasising the need for nuanced examples that address responsiveness and adaptive decision-making (Kennedy 2016; Zeichner 2012). While the workplace is increasingly highlighted as a critical component for learning the teaching profession, with calls for greater emphasis on practical experience in TE, there is a risk of overvaluing workplace learning and neglecting the significance of university-based education (Caspersen & Smeby 2021). This leads to a shift of positions for involved stakeholders, challenging teacher educators, who must adjust academic language, encourage reflective pedagogy and balance scientific goals with the immediate needs of WIL student teachers in order to effectively bridge theory and practice (Jederud 2024). Instead, to promote professional development effectively, it is essential to maintain a balance between university coursework and workplace learning (Håkansson & Olsson 2017).

2. Background

This research initiative reports on a comparative analysis of TE between a University in South Africa and a University in Sweden. At the University in South Africa, the four-year Bachelor of Education (BEd) programme in Foundation Phase (FP) teaching was introduced online in 2021 in collaboration with selected schools. The rationale for wanting to offer this programme online was to extend the contact-mode FP TE model, which incorporates a teaching school, to provide wider access and to contribute to in-service teacher development (see Gravett *et al.* 2019; Ramsaroop *et al.* 2020). The School-Based Student Teachers (SBSTs) follow the same BEd curriculum as their

contact-mode counterparts. Students in this programme graduate to teach all subjects in the Foundation Phase curriculum (ages 6-9), namely, numeracy, literacy, and life skills. Although the coursework is fully online, the programme is not a typical distance learning setup. Instead, it allows student teachers to benefit from rich teaching experiences with skilled mentors. As such, the Memorandum of Agreement (MoA) entered into between the University and the partners requires, amongst others, that the partner schools provide the SBSTs with the equivalent of two school days for coursework studies (Ramsaroop *et al.* 2024).

The Swedish WIL TE referenced in this study, implemented in 2018, matches the standard campus-based TE programme in Sweden regarding academic content. This programme leads to a teaching certificate for primary school grades and consists of three components: subject studies/subject didactics, educational science, and teaching placement. WIL student teachers study at 75 % of the standard full-time pace during the autumn and spring semesters and at 50 % during the summer semester, totalling 5.5 years. From day one of their WIL TE, they are also employed 50 % as teachers at specific schools. The WIL education is structured so that student teachers attend academic studies at the University three days a week and teach at a school two days a week. Including the 20 weeks of teaching placement spread over the entire period, WIL student teachers spend more than twice as much time in schools compared to student teachers in standard TE programs. In WIL TE programmes, student teachers combine studies with paid work, ideally under the supervision of experienced teachers (Swedish Government 2020). However, the level of supervision can vary significantly, ranging from student teachers being solely responsible for a class with an experienced teacher as a mentor to sharing a class with another teacher (Fornberg, Faculty Programme Director, personal communication, June 11 2021).

In the 'practice turn,' the importance of linking theory and practice throughout the TE programme to make sure that the theoretical studies do not remain separate from the practice of teaching is key. In Finnish TE, the 'practice turn' and 'research turn' complement each other. Their joint purpose is to educate student teachers as pedagogically reflective practitioners who can conceptualise teaching practice comprehensively and approach it in an inquiring manner while also actively engaging in research (Toom & Husu 2021). The 'accountability turn' focuses on how these programmes are evaluated. As such, these 'turns' shape the landscape of TE, influencing how it is structured, delivered, and evaluated. Focusing on the 'university/research

turn,' 'accountability turn,' and 'practice turn' as delineated by Cochran-Smith (2016) and Reid (2011), this study aims to explore the perspectives and experiences of teacher educators regarding student teachers navigating between workplace settings and campus-based courses.

3. Boundary Crossing to Unleash Student Teachers' Learning Potential

The framework of boundary crossing is used in this study to illuminate student teachers´ potential for learning across both university and work-based settings. The integration of university and workplace-based learning has been conceptualised from various perspectives (Tuomi-Gröhn & Engeström 2003). Among these, more individual-centered perspectives draw upon the ´transfer metaphor´ in which learning is perceived as mainly a one-way process where student teachers obtain knowledge in vocational school and somewhat unproblematically 'apply' it at the workplace (Guile & Young 2003:64). On the other hand, the sociocultural standpoint views learning as a social process predisposed by the contexts where it takes place, that is, a construction of a learning that is ´situated´ (Lave & Wenger 1991). Given this perspective, the concept of ´boundary crossing´ is preferable to the concept of 'transfer', as it rather defines the process in which a student teacher moves and interrelates through different contexts and their 'boundaries' (Guile & Griffiths 2001). This process of boundary crossing, where student teachers engage with unfamiliar contexts, necessitates their continuous creation, association, and renegotiation of meaning. The outcome is a hybrid knowledge that becomes relevant in novel situations and contexts (Engeström, Engeström & Kärkkäinen 1995). In contrast to the notion of transfer, where transitions are unidirectional, boundary crossing entails interactions across contexts. Recognising the potential for learning is crucial, especially in discovering how to integrate the differences between contexts when crossing boundaries (Akkerman & Bakker 2011). While learning typically occurs within well-defined settings, it can also take place as individuals engage with and move between various environments (Akkerman & Bakker 2011). For example, this can be seen when higher education student teachers transition between campus and workplace settings (Tuomi-Gröhn, Engeström & Young 2003).

The present study recognises that all learning across and moving between the distinct contexts of campus and workplace settings involves boundaries (Akkerman & Bakker 2011). However, these boundaries do not

necessarily hinder learning; they can also serve as resources for continuity (Akkerman & Bakker 2011). In exploring the potential for continuity, we utilise the four learning mechanisms, namely, *identification*, *coordination*, *reflection*, and *transformation*, as proposed by Akkerman and Bakker (2011). The first learning mechanism of reciprocal *identification*, concerns where people are involved in defining or redefining the way that intersecting practices, here university studies and workplaces, either differ from each other (othering) or how they can justifiably coexist. The second learning mechanism, *coordination*, involves individuals working to establish a communicative connection between contexts, thus generating reliable and consistent routines. Attention is central to coordination – it integrates patterns that belong together, not only based on past connections but also through the discovery of new, creative associations. The third learning mechanism, *reflection*, involves examining the various perspectives that arise from intersecting practices and considering others' viewpoints to better understand and visualise one's own practice. The fourth learning mechanism, *transformation*, pertains to observable changes in existing practices or the emergence of new intermediary practices. Understanding these four learning mechanisms is crucial because engaging in both university and workplace contexts enables student teachers to acquire a broad range of competencies and integrate them effectively. This integration would not be possible if TE were confined solely to either the university or the workplace. Consequently, student teachers' professionalism can develop and improve through their active participation in and transition between these diverse contexts. Essentially, the substantial disparities between these contexts serve as the primary catalyst for professional growth (Tuomi-Gröhn & Engeström 2003).

However, it must also be taken into consideration that two types of sociocultural differences can be expected in learning processes at the school-work interface. First, there is a difference in epistemic culture, where school and work are distinct practices with unique attitudes toward knowledge and knowledge claims (Cetina 1999). Student teachers have acknowledged that university studies often rely on abstract and disciplinary knowledge, whereas workplaces focus on applied, implicit, and practical knowledge (Lave 1988; Smith 1999). The challenge from a boundary-crossing perspective is to interrelate these different epistemologies to benefit the apprentice's learning process (Guile & Griffiths 2001). Secondly, scholars within boundaries and boundary crossing highlight that school and work also invoke different identity positions. Student teachers are in an ambiguous position, simultaneously being

students learning and professionals expected to know and act (Akkerman & Meijer, 2011). Tanggaard (2007: 460) describes apprentices in trade vocations as marginal strangers who 'sort of belong and sort of don't.' Student teachers are at the periphery of both practices, facing a neither/nor and both/and situation of belonging to communities (Akkerman & Bakker 2011). This ambiguous position can lead to insecurity but also provides the potential to act as brokers, introducing elements of one practice into another (Wenger 1998).

In relation to boundary crossing (Akkerman & Bakker 2011), the knowledge transfer between the two contexts of university studies and workplaces can be described in terms of moving from 'knowledge-for-practice' to 'knowledge-in-practice' and vice versa (Cochran-Smythe & Lytle 1999:250). 'Knowledge-for-practice' refers to the formal knowledge and theories generated by researchers for student teachers to apply in order to enhance their practice. This knowledge must then be transformed into 'knowledge-in-practice' (Cochran-Smyte & Lytle 1999). A key challenge in this process is establishing meaningful connections between theoretical and practical knowledge – specifically, how to effectively integrate and balance 'knowledge of' (theory) with 'knowledge to' (practice) (Hasselbladh 2020).

Further, Dewey (1999) emphasises the importance of experience in all learning processes. To facilitate knowledge acquisition, experience must be coupled with reflection. Experience involves active engagement in transformative activities, and when these changes are critically examined, they gain deeper significance, leading to the creation of new knowledge (Dewey 1999). Schön (1983) expands on this idea, highlighting reflection as the crucial point where theoretical concepts intersect with lived experiences, ultimately shaping an individual's repertoire of knowledge-in-action.

4. Research Methodology

This study employed an interpretive qualitative research design to understand participants' experiences in a specific environment and the meanings they associated with those experiences (Patton 2002). This approach enabled us to explore and compare the views, assumptions, and experiences of teacher educators regarding student learning in the programme and at schools within two TE progammes in Sweden and South Africa. This research design is based on the idea that meaning and reality are constructed through various social entities, as 'there is no single, observable reality' (Merriam & Tisdell 2016:9). Empirical data gathered from Sweden and South Africa centers on a WIL TE

structure wherein students are immersed in schools as student teachers while concurrently engaging in university coursework. In the UJFE program, these student teachers are referred to as SBSTs, and in Sweden, these student teachers are referred to as WIL student teachers.

The data collection method aligns with a qualitative research paradigm, comprising semi-structured interviews for the data collected in Sweden (n=6) and South Africa (n=5). The sample was purposively selected to focus on the perspectives of teacher educators rather than student teachers. This aligns with the research aims of exploring and comparing the views, assumptions, and experiences of teacher educators regarding student learning in the programme and at schools. We made this deliberate choice because there is a notable gap in the literature concerning research from the perspective of teacher educators. By concentrating on this group, we aim to significantly contribute to this relatively underexplored area. The teacher educators selected for the study had been teaching at the university level for 5-25 years in Sweden and 6-12 years in South Africa. All participants had experience teaching in the practicum/WIL and other modules within the programmes at higher education institutions. Additionally, they had practical experience working as teachers in schools. There is no simple way to determine the right size of data set for a particular study (Braun & Clarke 2022). However, we found an adequate amount of 'information power', that is the respondent specificity data provided enough information in alignment with the aim of the study, the use of the established theory, the quality of dialogue and the analysis strategy (Malterud, Siersma & Guassora 2016). Credibility was established through data triangulation, as described by Merriam and Tisdell (2016), by comparing data from various participants and identifying patterns across different data sets. Additionally, a detailed audit trail was maintained. The authors also cross-checked and verified codes and categories from South Africa and Sweden to ensure consistency in data analysis across the two contexts. This approach enabled a thorough examination of the trustworthiness and validity of the findings of the study. The data was analysed abductively by constructing codes, categories, and themes best suited to address the aim of the research as it explores the meaning that is identified in the data (Kiger & Varpio 2020). Using the constant comparative method and the thematic analysis approach to analyse the data, the following themes were generated. Expressions such as '*I feel that I can plan teaching on another level*' and '*There is more weight in the discussions concerning, for example, didactic issues and didactic analysis*' were categorised under the theme '*Teacher educators as brokers between the*

school and the university.' Expressions such as *'I'm a teacher already. Practically, by the end of the second year, that's the kind of insight I get from them'* and *'I am not minimising what they are doing in the schools and their teaching, but they are not teachers'* contributed to the theme *'I'm already a teacher' versus 'not a teacher yet' – implications of a lopsided identification for WIL student teacher learning.'*

All ethical considerations were followed, as specified by the institutions in both South Africa and Sweden. In South Africa, ethical approval for the research was obtained from the faculty of education, in line with the Declaration of Helsinki. As the study did not involve the processing of sensitive or personal data, obtaining approval from a human research committee was not required in Sweden. This aligns with the ethical guidelines established by the Swedish Research Ethical Authority. To ensure the well-being of participants, particular attention was given to maintaining anonymity, preventing the identification of individuals in both contexts. This was especially important, as expressing critical views on WIL, TE could potentially conflict with their employers' expectations. Before the interviews, all participants received an informed consent form – either via email or in person – detailing the study's purpose and providing contact information. The form clearly stated that their identities would remain anonymous, emphasised the voluntary nature of participation, and assured them of their right to withdraw from the study at any time

The respondents in South Africa are referred to as T1 – T5, and the respondents in Sweden are referred to as T6 – T12.

5. Presentation and discussion of the findings
5.1 Teacher Educators as Brokers between the School and the University

From the perspectives and experiences of teacher educators in both South Africa and Sweden, spending extended time at schools while completing coursework presented many expanded learning opportunities for student teachers. In South Africa, learning is evident when student teachers are placed in well-functioning schools alongside mentors who serve as excellent role models. Teacher educators experience how some student teachers bring together their learnings in coursework with their classroom experiences, as follows:

> *The great part is that the theory that they are learning now, they actually see it at school (T4).*

> *They are in practice; they are part of the school. They are in the children's lives. There's the pedagogy and the teaching becomes part of them. I do see the link where they would bring the experiences from the classroom into discussions (T3).*

> *Their reflections after every session were insightful. They reminded me of the reflections we would have with qualified teachers. Whenever we asked them to reflect or comment on something, all of them were keen to share their thoughts (T5).*

Similarly, in Sweden, teacher educators are of the view that some student teachers can coordinate and participate in both contexts, enhancing their understanding of how theory can be put into practice. Excerpts from the data to support these views are:

> *It facilitates teacher educators to illustrate such points of contact between the contexts. It is positive in many ways. They have a prior understanding, and I feel that I can plan teaching on another level, as I have most of the students with me, while I can be criticised at the same time, of course (T11).*

> *There is more weight in the discussions concerning, for example, didactic issues and didactic analysis. Campus-based students, they contemplate and say, 'Well, I don't know what it's going to be like in my future teaching, but I can imagine that it would be like this', whereas WIL students, they tested [things] straight away and then came back and said, 'When I did this, things worked well, but when I did this, it didn't work at all. How come?' Another type of reflection takes place (T12).*

Thus, teacher educators perceive that some student teachers in WIL are engaged in transformative activities, where they reflect upon their experiences and critically examine changes, leading to the creation of new knowledge (Dewey 2009). The student teachers are perceived to establish meaningful connections between theory and practice and make use of the knowledge

transfer between 'knowledge-for-practice' to 'knowledge-in-practice' (Cochran-Smyte & Lytle 1999).

However, even if WIL education provides the potential for coordination processes to be established, teacher educators note that WIL student teachers can be divided into two groups based on their identification with the different contexts and their ability to coordinate the two. The key difference appears to be whether student teachers adopt a mindset of 'not a teacher yet, ' which we address in theme 2. Those who do are able to avoid forming a biased identification with one particular context and can go beyond mere identification and engage in perspective-taking, or 'look through the eyes of others at their own practices' (Bakker & Akkerman 2017:7).

The data suggests that when student teachers navigate boundaries as they move between the university and school learning contexts, it serves as a resource for continuity (Akkerman & Bakker 2011) when learning and experiences from one context are introduced into another. In this case, teacher educators observed student teachers integrating their school-based learning into coursework discussions. This process involves reciprocal identification, where student teachers redefine how intersecting practices in coursework and school settings either diverge (othering) or coexist. In the following example, the different perspectives that arise from intersecting practices to better understand and visualise one's own practice are facilitated by the teacher educator, serving as a broker between the two worlds:

> *I have interrogated a bit why they made the decisions that they made when they taught these lessons to see whether or not they're able to actually draw on the theory and the coursework in the module. And I was surprised to find that all of them could actually give a really good reason for the decisions that they made based on the theory that they learned in the coursework (T4).*

Student teachers demonstrate coordination by integrating related patterns, draw-ing from both past connections and new associations. Crossing boundaries can lead to novel insights, as it prompts reflection on differences, encourages explanations of one's understanding (perspective making), and fosters the ability to see oneself from others' viewpoints (perspective taking) (Fortuin *et al.* 2024; Nelson & Parchoma 2018). When individuals encounter discontinuities, they enter a 'third space' conducive to reflective learning and expanded learning opportunities, demonstrated by the following examples:

> *In their first year, they were reluctant to express themselves. In their fourth year, they sounded like qualified teachers to the extent that they would even make recommendations to us for future practice (T5).*

> *When I observe their teaching in schools, I always think about whether or not learning is taking place, and in all of the lessons that I observed, I could very clearly see that the students paid a lot of attention to what learning needs to take place, and how do I get the children to actually learn this content? And that's something that I think even teachers with a few years of experience sometimes don't even consider (T4).*

Research on individuals' multiple participations has shown that different forms of participation can be isolated and even conflict with each other, leading to experiences of discontinuities or boundaries that can hinder further engagement (Akkerman & Bakker 2011:13). Interestingly, this boundary also represents a space of both sameness and continuity, where two or more sites are relevant to each other in a specific manner. In both South Africa and Sweden, teacher educators perceive that some student teachers can see the differences, but they also see the need for co-existing and collaborating to make meaning across different contexts (Fortuin *et al.* 2024). However, some student teachers are perceived to face a challenge as they become the object of 'othering' while remaining in the workplace. They are perceived to mostly adhere to the distinct epistemological approaches to learning in the workplace and take a distant approach to the coursework as they spend more time at school, learning alongside mentor teachers. These observations echo views on the epistemological divide between school and university (Bruner 2009; Cetina 1999).

Their engagement in coursework, therefore, appears secondary to prac-tice, often limited to completing assessments, and not always under-standing the 'why' of practice, echoed by the following sentiments of teacher educators:

> *I find that their attention to the content is almost secondary to what they experience in school .... Students that have engaged with content and have engaged with articles, you can see that discussion happening ... And there's a generally good discussion; I do see the link where they would bring in the experiences from the classroom into discussions, but when you ask them where do you see the links with the content,*

> *then it's like verbatim quoting from what you've given them. It's bookwork that they just took up (T1).*

> *The quality of the engagement is often waiting for information rather than engaging in conversation …. they're not kind of engaging with the rigorous kind of levels of conversation that I think would be ideal (T3).*

> *Those who become too much of a teacher too fast, they become so practice- oriented that their studies become something that they have to rush through. Yes, it becomes something that they just have to do, instead of being something that will enhance their learning (T6).*

Further, due to their daily duties in the school context, WIL student teachers are perceived to require support from teacher educators limited to procedural rather than conceptual knowledge and the need for 'hands-on' material aimed at effectively managing their work situations:

> *This was the biggest difference, then. They also requested a lot of practical learning. They wanted feedback regarding things like 'What textbook can I use?', 'What web pages are there?', or 'What film should I show?' They want a lot of concrete suggestions, like 'How do I go about this? How do I conduct this teaching?' (T6)*

> *They want any additional notes and they want the online recordings for them, it's almost like if I've got that, it's enough….there's no urgency or priority to engage in a discussion around what is my own thinking about the content, never mind the practice for them. The content, they appreciate it, but they need it because they want to do an assignment... to write a quiz or test and you can see that because they just simply don't engage in discussions (T1).*

The above teacher educators face challenges in encouraging these WIL student teachers to take their university (i.e., academic) courses seriously and to recognise the legitimacy and importance of this learning context. Instead, the student teachers tend to engage in 'othering' (Akkerman & Bakker 2011), where they have already decided how different practices relate, or fail to relate, to one another. They define one practice in terms of another, highlighting the differ-

rences between them rather than integrating them. This engenders a situation where various identities associated with school and university settings are in flux, leading to contention and negotiation. Such circumstances frequently lead to conflict rather than harmonious integration. Consequently, the dichotomy between being acknowledged as a member of the school community and feeling alienated at the university has undermined student teachers' ability to reconcile the disparate practices and identities encountered in these two contexts. On the flip side, it is also important for teacher educators to reflect on the pedagogies they utilise to actively engage student teachers in the learning process and their relevance in developing the necessary competencies for the classroom (Hernández-de-Menéndez *et al.* 2019). In this case, boundary crossing can be positioned as a form of active learning that draws on real-life classroom challenges (Fortuin *et al.* 2024). Teacher educators would need to serve as intermediaries, utilising boundary objects like shared discourses to promote meaningful interaction and reflection (Veltman, Keulen & Voogt 2024). By engaging in real-life classroom problem-solving processes, teacher educators can identify' blind spots and effectively act as brokers (Veltman *et al.* 2024). Therefore, it is crucial to implement pedagogical strategies that promote student teachers' ability to navigate and learn across boundaries when addressing real classroom challenges (Wei *et al.* 2020). Additionally, these strategies should consider the specific contexts and tensions that student teachers experience (Noordegraaf *et al.* 2019).

5.2 'I'm already a teacher' versus 'not a teacher yet' – Implications of a Lopsided Identification for WIL Student Teacher Learning

The data further suggests that student teachers spending extended periods at schools develop a teacher identity from their first or second year of the programme. In South Africa, teacher educators' experiences with student teachers gave the impression that:

> *I'm a teacher already. Practically, by the end of the second year, that's the kind of insight I get from them (T1).*

> *The students, because of the time that they spend in school and with their mentor teacher, start to act more like teachers from as early as their first year (T2).*

> *So things like classroom management, you can see that from their first year, the SBSTs already have a much better grasp of how to manage a class during a lesson, how to introduce a lesson, and how the introduction progresses into the body or into the consolidation phase... they are starting to act more like teachers from as early as their first year (T4).*

The data suggests that the development of a teaching mindset may be facilitated by prolonged engagement with experienced teachers, as such immersion appears to accelerate enculturation into teaching practice more effectively than limited school-based experience during WIL**.**

Many teacher educators in Sweden observe that WIL student teachers' strong identifications as ready teacher entails an adoption of positions different from student teachers in regular TE programmes. While some teacher educators acknowledge the positive aspects of this, they all recognise certain challenges. The positive aspects are that some teacher educators perceive WIL student teachers to be more 'mature' than campus-based student teachers. Teacher educators can relate to this group of student teachers, establishing a sense of legitimate coexistence. They are recognised as members of the teaching community (Lave & Wenger 1991) and are seen as insiders to some extent. Evidence from the data:

> *Most of them were mature, so actually I thought it was more positive to have these students. You can talk with them as colleagues or ready teachers more than you can with students that come straight from upper-secondary school.... These students seem much more mature, actually (T9).*

Similarly, in South Africa, teacher educators did acknowledge the maturity, independence and confidence of SBSTs in their engagements.

> *I think that the practice that they have in the classroom certainly gives them more confidence to teach...In the fourth year, they have a full-time teacher disposition... the way that they would engage with me almost felt like I was talking to someone who was already a teacher in practice (T2).*

> *They were a bit more independent; I don't know if it is because maybe*

they are at school, so they see certain principles or concepts being applied in the classroom. So, they feel they know this, I can do it (T4).

During my interactions with them, I noticed that they behaved like qualified teachers. Their insights about the education system and experiences at school were informative and intense. They reminded me of the reflections we would have with qualified teachers (T5).

It seems as if student teachers are in the process of identification, where they are identifying themselves as teachers and defining the intersecting practice of the workplace. This leads to transformation learning processes where observable changes take place within university studies, that is, student teachers are changing their university practices in response to their work placements (Akkerman & Bakker 2011; Fortuin *et al.* 2024). A form of knowledge integration is perceived (Akkerman & Bakker 2014). The acquisition of the above traits appears to be a consequence of sustained collaboration with experienced educators and mentors. Consequently, this proximity may encourage them to seek guidance from mentors and establish stronger bonds with fellow educators within the school. Immersion in the educational setting naturally fosters a perception among student teachers of being part of the teaching staff at school. Prolonged engagement with pupils and inclusion in school activities have culminated in their assimilation into the school's community of practice.

However, the perceived positioning of WIL student teachers as ready teachers when they attend university studies also entails challenges. One such challenge is that these student teachers adopt a different hierarchical position than traditional programme student teachers. These WIL student teachers tend to see themselves as teachers rather than student teachers, leading to a lopsided identification. As a result, teacher educators perceive that these student teachers do not critically view themselves as learners, and their ambition to develop their knowledge is not as strong as that of ordinary TE student teachers. Their ability to reflect critically is compromised in terms of both perspective-making and perspective-taking. This means they struggle to clarify their own understanding and knowledge of a particular issue, as well as to view themselves from the perspective of others (Veltman *et al.* 2024). In South Africa, experience in the school has much more influence over student teachers than does their learning at the university, as they were '*seeing practical examples of what they are actually doing, so in their minds, they don't need it as much. They have it all figured out' (T3).*

Teacher educators contend that the student teachers' adoption of a qualified teacher's identity, rather than that of student teachers aspiring to teach, influences how they internalise and engage with their learning in the coursework. In the context of legitimating coexistence (Lave & Wenger 1991), sensitivity plays a crucial role for those involved. Typical in these identify-cation processes is the encounter and reconstruction of boundaries between practices (Akkerman & Bakker 2011), and the repercussions when WIL is prioritised, as per the following utterances:

> *I am not minimising what they are doing in the schools and their teaching, but they are not teachers. There is too much learning that needs to still take place, and respectfully, their mentor teachers are very qualified. They are in excellent schools, some of them, and they are seeing really good practice, but that doesn't necessarily mean that you yourself are now a teacher. You could be just assisting in the class. The narrative needs to change for them in terms of what is a qualified teacher.*
>
> *I am a teacher in practice, although I am interning. I am in the classroom every day, but I still need to develop my skills as a teacher. I am not yet a teacher. This is my title when the teacher refers to me in the classroom, but internally and professionally, I know that I still have a lot to learn (T1).*

Further, some teacher educators perceive that student teachers do not always see the value of coursework, which has led teacher educators to experience a sense of epistemological competition with mentors over the legitimacy of knowledge. This often culminates in the disregard of coursework learning in favor of exclusive reliance on learning in and from practice at schools. Student teachers are defining the way that the intersecting practices of university studies and workplaces differ from each other (othering) and have difficulties in seeing how they can coexist. Thus, they seem to struggle to reflect upon how making use of the perspectives from university studies can enhance their understanding of their practice in the workplace (Akkerman & Bakker 2011).

Such a trend is concerning as it hinders the development of a critical inquiry approach to teaching. It is a tension-filled process that involves continuous negotiation, acting as a broker between the two systems, which takes time. The following excerpts from the two countries highlight these challenges:

> *Competition with the mentor, feel like u have to continuously justify …. cos my teacher does it this way…. It is only in the 3rd-year the reality check comes in …. develop trust in lecturers that they have the experience to guide your learning … Start to shift (T1).*

> *For those who couldn't accept that they were not teachers yet, for them it became quite difficult, and from them there was perhaps more questioning regarding 'Why should we learn this? (T6)*

Student teachers often value their daily classroom experiences but not always understanding the 'why' of practice can lead to misconceptions and compromise student understanding of how children learn. Criticisms and guidance are frequently perceived as attacks, requiring careful handling to improve understanding and recognising the mentor's expertise and structured approach. Learning at the boundaries also requires coordination, 'even in the absence of consensus' (Akkerman & Bakker 2011:143). Coordination requires the establishment of a communicative connection between differing practices or perspectives; coordination also requires 'translation between the different worlds' (Akkerman & Bakker 2011:144).

Here, it is important to recognise that identification initially emphasises differences or 'othering' when one practice is defined in relation to another (Akkerman & Bakker 2011:142). This approach requires teacher educators to engage in a dialogical process, such as questioning the intersecting systems, including the roles, functions, and uniqueness of each system. Bringing coursework and practice together is important but challenging, as expressed by TE1 as follows:

> *Whatever reflections or whatever positive criticism you attempt to give, they always take it as an attack. These are the kinds of critiques and criticisms that you have to work with, and we discuss, and we kind of work better through it when we discuss (T1).*

> *You see the mentor, but you don't see how the mentor pulls children into the lesson, calms them, and continues with a well-planned structured learning episode. Be careful about your interactions with the children because they might look engaged, but they actually do not listen carefully, and then it's like, but my teacher also does that in the class and not understanding the expertise and the years of practice that*

> comes with it. This is what happens when you are learning to be a
> teacher (T1).

Different perspectives on teaching practice were keenly felt by T1, who
believed that the influence of the school environment or culture on student
practice is powerful, although not always for the better. She stated that the role
of teacher educators is to build a bridge between the two learning environments
so that different perspectives can be identified and utilised as a basis for student
teacher (and mentor teacher) learning. This can be due to student teachers being
in an ambiguous position, simultaneously being student teachers learning and
teachers expected to know and act (Akkerman & Meijer 2003), who 'sort of
belong and sort of don't' (Tanggaard 2007:460). Also, WIL student teachers
are in a specific position where they are mainly within the epistemic culture of
workplaces with distinct attitudes toward knowledge and knowledge claims
(Cetina 1999), which influence their attitude towards the epistemic culture of
university settings. The role of teacher educators as brokers in encouraging
self-reflection and epistemic reflexivity among student teachers is crucial. To
achieve this, intentionally introducing elements of one practice into another
(Wenger 1998) by incorporating student teachers' practical knowledge and
real-world classroom experiences into their coursework is needed. Without this
guidance, student teachers might miss out on developing the critical thinking
skills essential for effective teaching.

6. Conclusion

This comparative study highlights how teacher education in both South Africa
and Sweden is shaped by the global shift toward practice-based learning.
Despite contextual differences – such as online versus campus-based
university engagement – student teachers in both countries face similar
challenges in navigating diverse classrooms and integrating academic and
practical knowledge. Teacher educators in both contexts observe that while
workplace learning strengthens the link between theory and practice, it also
risks reinforcing an epistemological divide, where practical knowledge is
perceived as more valuable than theoretical understanding. As Gustafsson
Nyckel *et al.* (2020) note, workplace norms often structure learning in ways
that limit critical reflection. This underscores the need for curriculum
restructuring that balances academic and practical learning, supporting the
integration of knowledge, skills, and values essential for professional practice

(Sheppard, Macatangay, Colby & Sullivan 2008). Drawing on Ulrich and Eppinger's (1995) structured design approach, curriculum development should prioritise essential competencies to ensure coherence between educational goals and workplace demands.

The study suggests that extended practice placements at schools risk becoming work-based learning unless supported by reflective academic components. A phased curriculum – beginning and ending with university-based learning, with integrated employment in between – could foster deeper reflection, as advocated by Tynjälä *et al.* (2003). This is especially important in today's dynamic classrooms, where teaching practices are no longer static or easily transferable (Rorrison 2008). Student teachers need structured opportunities to reflect on foundational questions such as the purpose of education and their role within it. Ultimately, this north–south collaboration reveals that effective teacher education requires a shared responsibility among universities, schools, and student teachers. Boundary crossing should be conceptualised not as a one-way transition but as a reciprocal process that reshapes both academic and workplace practices. These findings offer valuable insights for international teacher education reform, emphasising the need for integrated, reflective, and context-responsive approaches.

References

Akkerman, S.F. & A. Bakker 2011. Boundary Crossing and Boundary Objects. *Review of Educational Research* 81,2: 132 - 169.
http://rer.sagepub.com/content/81/2/132
https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654311404435

Akkerman, S. & P. Meijer 2003. A Dialogical Approach to Conceptualizing Teacher Identity. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 27,2: 308 - 319.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2010.08.013

Bakker, A. & S.F. Akkerman 2014. A Boundary-crossing Approach to Support Students' Integration of Statistical and Work-related Knowledge. *Educational Studies in Mathematics* 86, 2:223 - 237.
https://doi.org/10.1007/s10649-013-9517-z

Ball, D.L. & F.M. Forzani 2009. The Work of Teaching and the Challenge for Teacher Education. *Journal of Teacher Education* 60,5: 497 - 511.
https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487109348479

Braun, V. & V. Clarke 2022. *Thematic Analysis*. London: Sage Publications Ltd. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-69909-7_3470-2

Bruner, J.S. 2009. *The Process of Education*. Revised Edition. USA: Harvard University Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvk12qst

Caspersen, J. & J.C. Smeby 2021. Placement Training and Learning Outcomes in Social Work Education. *Studies in Higher Education* 46,12: 2650 - 2663. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2020.1750583

Cetina, K.K. 1999. *Epistemic Cultures: How the Sciences Make Knowledge*. USA: Harvard University Press.

Cochran-Smith, M. & K. Fries 2005. Researching Teacher Education in Changing Times: Politics and Paradigms. In Cochran-Smith, M. & K.M. Zeichner (eds.): *Studying Teacher Education.* The Report of the AERA Panel on Research and Teacher Education. New York: Routledge.

Cochran-Smith, M. & S.L. Lytle 1999. Relationships of Knowledge and Practice: Teacher Learning in Communities. *Review of Research in Education* 24,1: 249 - 305. https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X024001249

Darling-Hammond, L. & J. Baratz-Snowden 2005. *A Good Teacher in Every Classroom. Preparing the Highly Qualified Teachers our Children Deserve*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Darling-Hammond, L., D. Burns, C. Campbell, A.L. Goodwin, K. Hammerness, E.L. Low, A. McIntyre, M. Sato & K. Zeichner 2017. *Empowered Educators: How High-Performing Systems Shape Teaching Quality around the World*. San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons.

Dean, B.A. 2023. The Value of Work-Integrated Learning for Preparing the Future Teaching Workforce. In Loughland, T., M. Winslade & M.J. Eady (eds.): *Work-integrated Learning Case Studies in Teacher Education: Epistemic Reflexivity.* 1st Edition. Cham, Switzerland: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-19-6532-6

Dewey, J. 1999. *Experience and Education: The Kappa Delta Pi Lecture Series.* Simon & Schuster.

Engeström, Y., R. Engeström & M. Kärkkäinen 1995. Polycontextuality and Boundary Crossing in Expert Cognition: Learning and Problem Solving in Complex Work Activities. *Learning and Instruction 5*,4: 319 - 336. https://doi.org/10.1016/0959-4752(95)00021-6

Feucht, F.C., J. Lunn Brownlee & G. Schraw 2017. Moving beyond Reflection: Reflexivity and Epistemic Cognition in Teaching and Teacher Education. *Educational Psychologist* 52,4: 234 - 241. https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2017.1350180

Fortuin, K.P.J., J.T. Gulikers, N.C. Post Uiterweer, C. Oonk & C.W. Tho 2024. Developing a Boundary Crossing Learning Trajectory: Supporting Engineering Students to Collaborate and Co-create across Disciplinary, Cultural and Professional Practices. *European Journal of Engineering Education* 49,2: 212 - 235.
https://doi.org/10.1080/03043797.2023.2219234

Forzani, F.M. 2014. Understanding 'Core Practices' and 'Practice-based' Teacher Education: Learning from the Past. *Journal of Teacher Education* 65,4: 357 - 368.
 https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487114533800

Gravett, S., N. Petersen & S. Ramsaroop 2019. A University and School Working in Partnership to Develop Professional Practice Knowledge for Teaching. *Frontiers in Education* 3: 118.
https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2018.00118

Griffiths, T. & D. Guile 2003. A Connective Model of Learning: The Implications for Work Process Knowledge. *European Educational Research Journal EER* 2,1: 56 - 73.
https://doi.org/10.2304/eerj.2003.2.1.10

Grossman, P., K. Hammerness & M. McDonald 2009. Redefining Teaching: Re-imagining Teacher Education. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice* 15,2: 273 - 290.
https://doi.org/10.1080/13540600902875340

Guile. D. & T. Griffiths 2001. Learning through Work Experience. *Journal of Education and Work* 14,1: 113 - 131.
https://doi.org/10.1080/13639080020028738

Gustafsson Nyckel, J., R. Lander & P.-O. Thång 2020. Fragmented Boundary Zones between Theory and Practice in Preschool Teacher Education in Sweden. *Journal of Praxis in Higher Education*, 2,20: 87 - 112.
https://doi.org/10.47989/kpdc86

Hasselbladh, H. 2020. Lärarutbildning – styrning och professionalisering. [Teacher Education – Governance and Professionalisation.] In Bejerot, E. & H. Hasselbladh (eds.): *Professionalisering av lärarutbildningen. [Professionalization of Teacher Education.]* Örebro University School of Business.

Hernández-de-Menéndez, M., A. Vallejo Guevara, J.C. Tudón Martínez, D. Hernández Alcántara & R. MoralesMenendez 2019. Active Learning in Engineering Education. A Review of Fundamentals, Best Practices and

Experiences. *International Journal on Interactive Design and Manufacturing (IJIDeM)* 13,3: 909 - 922.
https://doi.org/10.1007/s12008-019-00557-8

Jederud, S. 2024. University Teachers' Perceptions of the Impact of Work-integrated Learning Placement on Students' On-campus Learning. *International Journal of Work-Integrated Learning* 25,3: 401- 416.

Kiger, M.E. & L. Varpio, L. 2020. Thematic Analysis of Qualitative Data: AMEE Guide No. 131. *Medical Teacher* 42,8: 846 - 854.
https://doi.org/10.1080/0142159X.2020.1755030
PMid:32356468

Korthagen, F., J. Loughran & T. Russell 2006. Developing Fundamental Principles for Teacher Education Programs and Practices. *Teaching & Teacher Education* 22: 1020 - 1041.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2006.04.022

Lave, J. 1988. *Cognition in Practice: Mind, Mathematics and Culture in Everyday Life*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511609268
PMCid:PMC4192915

Lave, J. & E. Wenger 1991. *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511815355

Malterud, K., V.D. Siersma & A.D. Guassora 2016. Sample Size in Qualitative Interview Studies: Guided by Information Power. *Qualitative Health Research*, 26,13: 1753 - 1760.
https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732315617444

McDonald, M., E. Kazemi & S.S. Kavanagh 2013. Core Practices and Pedagogies of Teacher Education: A Call for a Common Language and Collective Activity. *Journal of Teacher Education* 64,5: 378 - 386.
https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487113493807

Merriam, S.B. & E.J. Tisdell 2016. *Qualitative Research. A Guide to Design and Implementation.* 4th Edition. [ebook]. San Francisco, CA, Jossey-Bass.

Mitani, H., E.J. Fuller & L. Hollingworth 2022. Attrition and Turnover among Beginning Teachers in Texas by Preparation Program. *Teachers College Record* 124,4: 3 - 34.
https://doi.org/10.1177/01614681221093011

Nelson, D. & G. Parchoma 2018. Toward Theorizing Spatial-cultural 'othering' in Networked Learning and Teaching Practices. In *Proceedings*

of the 10th *International Conference on Networked Learning*. https://doi.org/10.54337/nlc.v11.8737

Noordegraaf, M., S. Douglas, K. Geuijen & M. van der Steen 2019. Weaknesses of Wickedness: A Critical Perspective on Wickedness Theory. *Policy and Society* 38,2: 278 - 297. https://doi.org/10.1080/14494035.2019.1617970

Patton, M.Q. 2002. *Qualitative Research & Evaluative Methods*. 3rd Edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Pivovarova, M. & J.M. Powers 2022. Staying or Leaving? Teacher Professional Characteristics and Attrition in Arizona Traditional Public and Charter Schools. *Education Policy Analysis Archives* 30,19: n19. https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.30.6459

Ramsaroop, S., N. Petersen & S. Gravett 2020. Work-integrated Learning and Teaching Schools. The University of Johannesburg Teaching School Experience. In de Beer, J., N. Petersen & H.J. van Vuuren (eds.): *Becoming a Teacher: Research on the Work-Integrated Learning of Student Teachers*. Cape Town: AOSIS. https://doi.org/10.4102/aosis.2020.BK215.04

Reid, J.A. 2011. A Practice Turn for Teacher Education? *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education* 39,4: 293 - 310. https://doi.org/10.1080/1359866X.2011.614688

Resch, K., I. Schrittesser & M. Knapp 2022. Overcoming the Theory - Practice Divide in Teacher Education with the 'Partner School Programme'. A Conceptual Mapping. *European Journal of Teacher Education* 47,1: 1 - 17. https://doi.org/10.1080/02619768.2022.2058928

Rorrison, D. 2008. *Jumping through Spinning Hoops. Stories of the Secondary and Middle School Practicum.* Cengage: Sense Publications.

Sheppard, S.D., K. Macatangay, A. Colby & W.M. Sullivan 2008. *Educating Engineers: Designing for the Future of the Field.* 1st Edition. San Fracisco: Jossey-Bass

Stokking, K., F. Leenders, J. de Jong & J. van Tartwijk, J. 2003. From Student to Teacher: Reducing Practice Shock and Early Dropout in the Teaching Profession. *European Journal of Teacher Education* 26,3: 329 - 350. https://doi.org/10.1080/0261976032000128175

Toom, A. & J. Husu 2021. Analyzing Practice, Research, and Accountability Turns in Finnish Academic Teacher Education. In Mayer, D. (ed.): *Teacher Education Policy and Research: Global Perspectives.* Cham, Switzerland: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-16-3775-9_6

Tuomi-Gröhn, T. & Y. Engeström 2003. Conceptualizing Transfer: From Standard Notions to Developmental Perspectives. In Tuomi-Gröhn, T. & Y. Engeström (eds.): *Between School and Work: New Perspectives on Transfer and Boundary Crossing*. Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Tynjälä, P., J. Välimaa & A. Sarja 2003. Pedagogical Perspectives on the Relationships between Higher Education and Working Life. *Higher Education* 46,2: 147 - 166. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1024761820500

Ulrich, K.T. & S.D. Eppinger 2016. *Product Design and Development*. New York: McGraw-Hill Inc.

Wei, C.A., M.L. Deaton, T.J. Shume, R. Berardo & W.R. Burnside 2020. A Framework for Teaching Socio-Environmental Problem-Solving. *Journal of Environmental Studies and Sciences* 10,4: 467 - 477. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13412-020-00603-y

Wenger, E. 1998. *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning and Identity.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511803932

Willegems, V., E. Consuegra, K. Struyven & N. Engels 2017. Teachers and Pre-service Teachers as Partners in Collaborative Teacher Research: A Systematic Literature Review. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 64, 3: 230 - 245. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2017.02.014

Williams, J. 2014. Teacher Educator Professional Learning in the Third Space: Implications for Identity and Practice. *Journal for Teacher Educ*ation 65: 315 - 326. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487114533128

Zeichner, K. 2012. The Turn Once again Toward Practice-Based Teacher Education. *Journal of Teacher Education* 63,5: 376 - 382. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487112445789

Sarita Ramsaroop
University of Johannesburg
South Africa
saritaram@uj.ac.za

Sandra Jederud
Mälardalen University
Sweden
sandra.jederud@mdu.se