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Executive Summary

Since the turn of the twenty-first century, research on teacher education has seen an explosion of conceptual and empirical research that references the phrase “practice based teacher education” or PBTE. While the phrase has become almost ubiquitous in research on teacher education, it is defined in a variety of ways and, at times, these definitions contradict one another. The purpose of this white paper is to provide an in-depth review of the scholarship on PBTE, with a particular focus on scholarship that offers definitions of PBTE and explores its theoretical underpinnings. The review explores both curricular and pedagogical strands of PBTE scholarship, discusses approaches to preparing teachers for practice that are not in alignment with PBTE, examines PBTE’s theoretical roots and considers critiques of the PBTE literature. The white paper concludes with recommendations for three future directions for PBTE scholarship:

1. Deepen commitments to educational justice;
2. Deepen connections between PBTE & novice teachers’ learning and experiences; and
3. Deepen connections between PBTE & K-12 student outcomes (broadly defined).
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While it is impossible to pinpoint the exact origins of twenty-first century PBTE, one frequently cited use of the phrase “practice-based” was in 1999, when Deborah Ball and David Cohen published Developing Practice, Developing Practitioners: Toward a Practice-Based Theory of Professional Education. In this piece, Ball and Cohen argue that teacher education needs to become “an agent of professional counter socialization” (p. 6) by “center[ing] professional inquiry in practice using real artifacts, records, moments, events, and tasks” (p. 24) as the curricular anchors of teacher education programs. Since their 1999 publication, many other scholars have built upon Ball and Cohen’s call by arguing that teacher education scholars need to supplement the field’s many examinations of the knowledge and belief systems that novice teachers need (Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2007) by conducting more investigations into how novice teachers can be supported to instantiate knowledge and beliefs within their classroom practice (Ball & Forzani, 2009; Grossman et al., 2009; Grossman & McDonald, 2008; Lampert et al., 2013).

When teachers begin working with children, particularly children who are owed a long standing debt after centuries of educational injustice (Ladson-Billings, 2006), those teachers must be fully prepared to do more than simply raise standardized test scores. Rather, they must be able to nurture their students as humans, as intellectuals, and as agents of change (Love, 2019). The role that early career teachers play in this work is particularly pivotal because in the United States, early career teachers are more likely than experienced teachers to work with Black and Brown children (Darling-Hammond, 2015; Goldhaber et al., 2015). Thus, in the current American educational landscape, early career teachers are the ones tasked with paying down the debt. This inequitable distribution of early career teachers means that questions about how best to prepare teachers are also questions about how best to promote justice (Brown & Brown, 2019; Darling-Hammond, 2015; Gutiérrez, 2019). While there is broad consensus about the fact that teacher preparation plays a role in campaigns for educational justice, there remains much debate about which approaches to teacher preparation are oriented in a just direction.

In recent years, these debates have focused on questions about what it means to base teacher learning experiences “in practice” and whether it is a good idea to do so. While these debates are current, wrestling with the concept of practice is certainly not new to scholarship on teacher education. In fact, such wrestling has been a central pastime of scholars of teaching and teacher learning for over a century (Dewey, 1904; Freire, 1972; Gage, 1963; Schön, 1983). Current scholarly conversations are informed by this history but are also uniquely of the moment and this white paper investigates them. In particular, the white paper engages with a twenty-first century phenomenon: the rise of what has come to be known as “practice-based teacher education” or PBTE. Database searches of EBSCO, Science Direct, and Scopus reveal that before the year 2000, the phrases “practice based teacher education” and “practice based” were used only sporadically in the teacher education research literature. In the years since, however, usage of these phrases has ballooned to the point that they are now almost ubiquitous.¹ This white paper aims to understand this twenty-first century phenomenon by examining how contemporary scholarly literature defines “practice-based teacher education” or PBTE, what its theoretical roots are, what debates about it have emerged, and where its growing edges might be.

¹ A search on Scopus for the search terms: (“practice based teacher education” OR “practice-based teacher education”) OR (“practice-based” AND “teacher education”) OR (“practice-based” AND “teacher education”) identified only 31 documents between 1960 and 1999. However, between 2000 and 2023 (a period half as long), the same search on Scopus identified 6,042 documents. A search for the same search terms on ScienceDirect identified 55 results between 1960 and 1999 as compared to 752 between 2000 and 2023. On EBSCO, the same search terms identified 20 results between 1960 and 1999 as compared to 1,035 results between 2000 and 2023.
This twenty-first century turn to practice in the teacher education literature emerged as conceptualizations of teaching and learning were undergoing radical shifts as well. A 2020 consensus study report from the National Academies of Sciences Engineering and Medicine describes how “what it means to be a teacher today—the expectations and demands placed upon teachers—has changed” (National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, 2020, p. 3) since the start of the twenty-first century. Reviewing the last two decades of literature on teaching and teacher education, the report’s authors describe how in previous eras teachers were often expected to support students to simply acquire knowledge, but that modern understandings of learning and culture have transformed teachers’ roles into something different. Teachers, they argue, are now expected to design and facilitate tasks within which students apply their existing funds of knowledge while enacting authentic scientific, mathematical, literary, historical, civic, and critical practices. The consensus report argues that these fundamental changes to teachers’ roles have occurred as the result of a variety of factors including, changing national standards, shifting student demographics, deepened commitments to equity and justice, and advances in the scholarship on teaching and learning. (National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, 2020).

The radical shifts in twenty-first century expectations on teachers make it unsurprising that teacher education scholars have spent the first two decades of the twenty-first century calling for transformations of how teachers are prepared to teach. However, it is not an easy task to prepare novices to enact versions of teaching practice that look different from what they have typically seen in classrooms (Behizadeh, 2023; Feiman-Nemser & Buchmann, 1985; Lortie, 1975). This is particularly true when novices are learning to teach in districts where the legacies of racism and classism have led district leaders to adopt curricula and policies that promote rote and decontextualized learning—policies and curricula that make it difficult for even the most well-prepared teachers to enact ambitious forms of instruction (Au & Gourd, 2013; Preus, 2012). Because of these barriers that stand in the way of instructional transformation, proponents of PBTE argue that supporting novices to make the shift to deeper learning approaches will require teacher educators to transform their practice as well (Forzani, 2014; Grossman et al., 2009; Janssen et al., 2015; McDonald et al., 2013). The transformation in teacher education that PBTE advocates call for is one that grounds novice teacher learning in thoughtfully-selected records of professional practice that illuminate what inquiry-driven teaching and learning can look like (samples of student work, video and audio recordings of lessons and conferences, curricular materials, lesson plans, etc.) (Ball & Cohen, 1999; Ball & Forzani, 2009; Grossman, Hammerness, & McDonald, 2009). Transforming teacher education to be centered on the practice of teaching would, however, represent a fundamental shift in the status-quo of pre-service preparation and calls for this transformation have recently become the locus of significant debate.

In these scholarly debates about the role of practice in teacher education, PBTE has been characterized in a variety of different ways. Critics describe it as an approach to teacher education that focuses on “preparing teachers to reproduce/replicate practices deemed universally beneficial” (Beltramo et al., 2020, p. 25), while proponents describe it as “far from rote imitation of particular routines,” involving instead “the cultivation and orchestration of knowledge, relationship, skill, judgment, and understanding in context-specific enactment” (Grossman, Kazemi et al., 2019). These contradictory characterizations of PBTE have left the field with questions about the nature and purpose of contemporary PBTE. Is the twenty-first century practice-turn in teacher education a return to behaviorist approaches to teacher education that were prevalent in the 1960s and 1970s in which teachers were supported to replicate a set of static teaching behaviors? Or are calls for PBTE an attempt to reimagine professional preparation in ways that better support novices to make informed and principled in-the-moment decisions in complex and uncertain settings that cannot be planned out in advance? To answer this question, the purpose of this white paper is to provide an in-depth review of the scholarship on PBTE. The aim of this review will be to clarify for the field the nature and purpose of PBTE as it is described in the PBTE literature and to suggest avenues for future research.

To accomplish this goal, I will first unpack how scholars describe PBTE's central principles and discuss what distinguishes it from other approaches to teacher education. I will also discuss the variations that exist across different versions of PBTE and I will explore the theories of learning that undergird PBTE. Throughout, I will discuss what research has been done on PBTE to date and what critiques have emerged. Finally, I will discuss future avenues for research and practice.
Practice-Based Teacher Education (PBTE): An Overview

Practice-based teacher education (PBTE) is an umbrella term for a collection of approaches to pre-service teacher preparation and, to a lesser extent, designs for in-service teacher learning that aim to develop teachers’ ability to learn in and from practice (Matsumoto-Royo et al., 2021). Arguments for twenty-first century PBTE can be traced back to a widely-cited article by Ball and Cohen (1999) in which they argue that the complex and specialized knowledge base that teachers need can be best developed through learning opportunities grounded in practice. In this seminal piece, they call for professional education “centered in the critical activities of the profession—that is, in and about the practices of teaching” (p. 5).

Since the 1999 publication of Ball and Cohen’s article, scholars and practitioners have experimented with, studied, and collaborated around a variety of approaches to centering teacher learning activities on the practice of teaching. The result has been the development of an arena of scholarship and a domain of professional practice both of which have come to be referred to as PBTE.

While there is a wide diversity of approaches to PBTE that have arisen since the turn of the twenty-first century, these diverse approaches have several things in common. All PBTE approaches place the enactment of practice in the foreground of designs for teacher learning rather than seeing teaching practice as an assumed, subsequent outcome of teacher learning experiences (Forzani, 2014; Grosser-Clarkson & Neel, 2020; Grossman & Dean, 2019; Hauser & Kavanagh, 2019). Approaches to teacher learning that are not based in practice often focus on supporting teachers to build knowledge or to shift beliefs so that, subsequently, those teachers can apply what they have learned in their independent practice with children. Korthagen and Russell (1995) have called this the “application of theory model” of teacher education. Rather than seeing shifts in practice as a distal outcome of a professional learning experience, PBTE organizes teacher learning experiences around the practice of teaching, treating teaching practice as both a vehicle for learning and an outcome of learning (Grossman, 2018).

For example, a typical approach to supporting teachers to enact the principles of restorative justice in the classroom, one that is not practice-based, might be to read and discuss articles about the principles of restorative justice, to discuss how to apply these principles in the classroom, and/or to listen to guest speakers talk about how restorative justice approaches transformed their work with young people. The goal of these learning activities would be to build teachers’ knowledge about restorative justice and to convince them that they should apply its principles in their subsequent work with young people. In contrast, while a practice-based approach to teaching about restorative justice in the classroom might also include some of the same activities, it would need to also include other opportunities. Some of these might include opportunities for teachers to see examples of teachers leading restorative circles with students, opportunities to analyze the examples that they see, and opportunities to practice enacting practices associated with restorative justice with children and reflecting on the experience. In this way, witnessing, analyzing, enacting, and reflecting on practice become primary vehicles for teacher learning in a practice-based model. In PBTE, practice isn’t only treated as something that happens as a result of teacher learning, it is also treated as something that shapes teacher learning (Lampert et al., 2013; McDonald et al., 2013).

While there is variation in quality across teacher education programs and individual teacher educators, in the hands of accomplished teacher educators, PBTE foregrounds practice without abandoning the development of teachers’ beliefs, principles, ethics, knowledge, vision, and judgment (Grossman et al., 2019). Accomplished practice-based teacher educators use intentionally selected routines (e.g., number talks, restorative circles, interactive read alouds, parent-teacher conferences, text-based discussions) as central texts for teacher learning (Ball & Cohen, 1999). In different versions of PBTE, these routines are given different names (Matsumoto-Royo et al., 2021). Sometimes they are referred to as “teaching practices,” sometimes as “core practices,” sometimes as “high leverage practices,” and sometimes as “instructional activities”—each name signals a different grain size of practice and different assumptions about how teachers learn in practice and the ends to which that learning is directed. However, regardless of the PBTE approach and the terms used, all PBTE approaches are anchored in a core assumption: that by studying carefully selected teaching practices as one might study a text and by practicing these teaching practices in a community of learners and in a variety of contexts, teachers can develop their beliefs, principles, ethics, knowledge, vision, and judgment at the same time that they develop their ability to build relationships with and nurture the learning of children and youth (Hauser & Kavanagh, 2019).
Variations of PBTE

While proponents of PBTE share some central principles and perspectives, there is also significant variation in how researchers and practitioners define and enact PBTE. For example, some scholars studying PBTE have foregrounded the identification of teaching practices in their work. This arm of PBTE scholarship has tended to argue for practice-based transformations of teacher education curricula. Other scholars studying PBTE have focused less on the identification of teaching practices and instead have studied how teacher educators support novices to practice teaching. This arm of PBTE scholarship has focused less on curricular questions and more on pedagogical questions. While these scholars call on each other’s work frequently, each body of work rests on slightly different framings and assumptions and ultimately makes claims with nuanced differences.

A Curricular Vision of PBTE: Focusing on Teaching Practices

PBTE scholars who foreground practices and argue for a practice-based teacher education curriculum have tended to call, first and foremost, for a redesign of the teacher education curriculum to center on what some call “core practices” (Grossman, Hammerness, & McDonald, 2009) and what others call “high leverage practices” (Ball & Forzani, 2009). This type of curricular redesign would represent a marked shift from the curricular frameworks that govern most contemporary teacher education programs. Traditionally, the teacher education curriculum is undergirded by two binaries: the first is coursework/fieldwork and the second is methods/standards (Cochran-Smith et al., 2016). Traditionally, coursework is where novices learn about teaching and fieldwork is where they apply what they have learned. This traditional programmatic structure is grounded in Korthagen and Russell’s (1995) “application of theory” model of teacher education. The second binary that undergirds almost all teacher education programs is the foundations/methods binary. Traditionally, foundations courses are where novices learn “foundational” knowledge for teaching. These courses are typically designed to support novices to develop the conceptual frameworks that will guide their practice, such as constructivist theories of learning or anti-racist perspectives on schooling. Methods courses, on the other hand, have historically been the place where novices learn about practical tools for teaching. While the conceptual tools that novices acquire in foundations courses are designed to guide their decision-making, the practical tools that novices acquire in methods courses are strategies, routines, or activities that they might enact in a classroom, for example a Socratic seminar, guided reading, or a number talk (Cochran-Smith et al., 2016).

Curriculum-focused PBTE scholarship has highlighted two major problems with the coursework/fieldwork and foundations/methods binaries (Ball & Forzani, 2009; Grossman, Hammerness, & McDonald, 2009). First, these binaries separate knowledge from action, and second, they separate domains of knowledge from each other. Coursework tends to be organized around a broad span of bodies of knowledge for teaching (e.g., knowledge about society and schooling, content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, knowledge about child and adolescent development, knowledge about theories of learning, knowledge about the communities that teachers serve). When domains of knowledge become the organizing feature of a curriculum, these domains become separated from one another in the minds of novices. This means that novice teachers tend to learn about educational justice in a separate curricular space from where they develop specialized content knowledge for teaching (Ball et al., 2008) or knowledge about child development. The consequence of this is that in many teacher education programs, the onus of tying together these bodies of knowledge is placed almost entirely on the novice, who, proponents of PBTE argue, are not developmentally prepared to do this kind of complex synthesis work without support.

To address the problem of fragmented curricular frameworks in teacher education, scholars and practitioners calling for practice-based curricular reform argue for using practices as the highest level of a curricular framework for learning to teach rather than grounding curricular frameworks in domains of knowledge (Ball & Cohen, 1999; Ball & Forzani, 2009; Grossman, Hammerness, & McDonald, 2009). The argument undergirding this curricular reimagining is rooted in sociocultural theories of social practice. If practice is a socially, culturally, and relationally mediated way of simultaneously knowing, being, and doing in context (Scribner & Cole, 1981), developing a curricular framework that keeps knowing, being, doing, and context connected, rather than separating them, might support novices’ development as practitioners. As Grossman, Hammerness, and McDonald (2009) suggest:

We propose a different solution—to reorganize the curriculum around a set of core practices and then help novices develop professional knowledge, and skill, as well as an emerging professional identity around these practices. The practices of teaching would provide the warp threads of the professional curriculum, while the knowledge and skill required to enact these practices constitute the rest.

A curricular reorganization like this would require a reimagining of the curricular relationship between bodies of knowledge for teaching and practices of teaching. Rather than knowledge leading to practice, knowledge would be developed in, through, and for practice. For example, if a curricular unit for novice teachers were organized around a practice like facilitating discussion, novice teachers would be expected, within that unit, to engage with a variety of domains of knowledge all in service of an authentic teaching activity. The idea is not to replace attention to professional knowledge-bases. In fact, scholarship on PBTE is deeply intertwined with scholarship on pedagogical content knowledge (Ballock et al., 2018; Kavanagh et al., 2019; Millican & Forrester, 2018; Stroupe, 2016) and specialized knowledge for teaching (Ball et al., 2008). Rather the goal is to give the knowledge bases that are addressed in teacher education coursework a purpose. In this way, PBTE is similar to approaches to teaching in K-12 like project-based learning where key knowledge is always taught in the service of authentic real-world projects (Grossman et al., 2021).
Over the past decade, a diverse array of teacher education programs have attempted practice-based curricular redesigns. Redesigned programs have ranged from early-childhood (Vartuli et al., 2016) to K-12 (Anagnostopoulos et al., 2018), from pre-service (Davis & Boerst, 2014) to in-service (Grossman, Pupik Dean et al., 2019), from special education (Billingsley et al., 2019) to general education (Windschitl et al., 2012) and from domestic (DeMink-Carthew et al., 2016) to international (Janssen et al., 2014; Jenset, 2018). A significant number of self-studies have emerged out of these redesign projects and have contributed knowledge to the field about the promises and pitfalls of practice-based curricular designs for teacher education.

In tandem with practice-based curriculum redesign efforts, researchers have worked to develop measures of teaching practice aligned to teaching practices. These efforts have resulted in studies that are able to more closely tie learning opportunities in pre-service programs to novice teachers’ subsequent practice (Capobianco et al., 2018; Kang & Windschitl, 2018). In one mixed methods study of two groups of first-year science teachers (one who had completed a practice-based program and one whose program did not feature a core practice approach), Kang and Windschitl (2018) found that graduates of the practice-based program were significantly more likely to engage students in active sense-making about scientific phenomena during classroom discourse. In addition to PBTE scholarship that illustrates relationships between how practices are taught in coursework and how novices enact those same practices in K-12 schools, research on PBTE curricular redesigns have also examined how school-university partnerships have arisen around the development and refinement of core or high-leverage practices (Maheady et al., 2019) and what challenges researchers and practitioners have faced in their attempts to develop sets of these practices (Cohen, 2015). However, while the work of identifying practices that can anchor curriculum redesign frameworks has been widespread in the last ten years, it is only one part of a larger body of PBTE scholarship.

A Pedagogical Vision of PBTE: Focusing on Practicing Teaching

Another arm of scholarship on PBTE has focused less on identifying teaching practices for the purposes of curricular redesign, focusing instead on how teacher educators support novice to practice teaching. Scholars doing this work have been less interested in curricular questions, focusing instead on pedagogical questions about the practices of teacher educators who prepare novices for practice. In particular, this scholarship focuses on exploring how teacher educators design opportunities to interact with representations of practice, opportunities to decompose practice into its constituent parts, and opportunities to approximate practice (Grossman, Compton et al., 2009). In the PBTE literature, these opportunities are called “practice-based pedagogies” and without at least one of them present in a teacher learning experience, it would be difficult to call that learning experience an example of PBTE. The representation/decomposition/approximation framework was developed out of a study by Grossman, Compton and their colleagues (2009) in which researchers studied how professionals prepared for practice across three professions: clergy, clinical psychology, and teaching.

According to Grossman, Compton et al. (2009), the phrase “representations of practice” refers to the various ways that professional practice is represented, or made visible, to novices entering a profession. Different representations make different aspects of practice visible. For example, a video representation of a classroom discussion might show what student-to-student talk can look like in an authentic classroom setting, but it might not show a teacher’s decision-making processes about when and how to respond to students. Alternately, a teacher educator who models discussion facilitation in the teacher education classroom and pauses strategically to unpack their thinking is making their decision-making visible, but is not making visible what discussion among children looks like because there are no children present. While teacher educators use different types of representations for different purposes, all representations of practice are opportunities for novices to see aspects of teaching practice in action. Some common forms of representation are K-12 classroom visitation, audio/video recording and/or transcripts, and modeling in the teacher education classroom.

A body of research on representations of practice has emerged since the introduction of the Grossman, Compton et al. (2009) framework was introduced. Within this body of scholarship, researchers have investigated a variety of questions. Some have investigated the relative utility of different types of representations. In two studies by González et al. (2016) and Herbst and Kosko (2014), researchers found no significant differences in how novice teachers made sense of animations of classrooms versus actual footage of classrooms. González et al. also studied whether and in what ways, when engaging novices with representations, teacher educators’ facilitation moves influence teachers’ opportunities to learn. In answer to this question, they found that by sustaining an inquiry stance when facilitating novices’ engagement with representations of teaching, participating teacher educators expanded novices’ opportunities to learn from those representations. Other researchers have investigated different forms of representations.

In a different study, Pulvermacher and Lefstein (2016) examined the relative affordances and constraints of narrative representations of practice and found that teacher educators engaged in a variety of forms of mediation of such representations including non-exploration, explication, and discussion. They concluded that to use narrative representations of practice to meaningfully support novice teacher learning, teacher educators needed to intentionally design for how they would mediate novices’ sense-making of the representations. Other researchers have investigated
the ways that some teacher educators co-construct representations of practice with novice teachers within rehearsals and role plays (Schutz & Danielson, 2019). However, while there has been a great deal of research on representations of practice in teacher education, it is only one part of Grossman, Compton et al.’s (2009) framework of pedagogies of practice.

The second arm of the Grossman, Compton et al. (2009) framework is “decomposition of practice.” This phrase refers to the work that teacher educators do to break practice up into constituent parts for the purposes of teaching and learning. Teacher educators are engaged in decomposing practice when they make decisions about how to bound practices in particular ways, to define what a practice refers to and what it doesn’t, to chunk practices into smaller parts, or to identify specific decision-points or moves within a practice. Teacher educators are engaging in the decomposition of practice when they differentiate “recitation” from “discussion” or “modeling” from “thinking aloud,” or when they introduce a set of distinct “talk moves” or “trauma-informed de-escalation strategies,” or when they say that they want to focus on approaches to “launching a task,” or “norming for talk.” When teacher educators decompose practice, they are selecting specific parts of the work of teaching to focus on for the purpose of novice learning.

As researchers have studied how teacher educators decompose practice, they have wrestled with a wide array of questions. In one study of teacher educators’ practice, Danielson (2019) unpacks the variety of ways that teacher educators decompose practice, examining those that are more general to those that are highly specific and from those that are purely conceptual to more practical decompositions. Other researchers, including Janssen et al. (2015), have explored the relationship between decomposition and recomposition. They argue that while novice teachers can build skill by working on decomposed parts of practice (e.g., eliciting student thinking or representing student ideas), any decomposed skill building eventually has to be placed back into the context of complex, multilayered practice. They suggest that while decomposition is a necessary part of PBTE, the work of recomposing practice should receive more attention in the PBTE scholarship. Other researchers investigating how teacher educators decompose practice have conducted analyses in which they offer highly detailed decompositions of a particular practice. One example of this is Sleep’s (2012) identification of seven central tasks of “steering instruction towards the mathematical point.” Taken as a whole, the research on how and to what ends teacher educators decompose practice helps illustrate the complexity of the seemingly simple task of identifying bounded components of teaching that can be leveraged for the purpose of novice teacher learning.

While there is a significant amount of research on how teacher educators represent and decompose practice, the last decade has seen more research into the final construct in the Grossman, Compton et al. (2009) framework: approximation. The phrase “approximations of practice” refers to opportunities to attempt enacting practice in settings of reduced complexity. Some approximations of practice are very authentic, like attempting a practice (e.g., discussion facilitation) in a classroom of K-12 students while a cooperating teacher is there to offer support. Others are less authentic, like rehearsing a practice when there are no children present. Sometimes approximations are inauthentic by design. In intentionally inauthentic approximations teacher educators are attempting to reduce the complexity of classroom practice so that novices can focus all of their attention on one complex aspect of the work of teaching. Take for example, the complex work of listening to and responding to students’ emergent ideas. For novices it can be very difficult to put aside the many demands on their attention in a busy classroom to listen to one student’s thinking and to thoughtfully respond in a way that illustrates care and connection while also prompting an expansion in thinking. To practice this kind of close listening and thoughtful responding, a teacher educator might use an intentionally inauthentic approximation like adapting a transcript of a teacher/student conference. While teacher educators working in the PBTE tradition design approximations in different ways for different purposes, all PBTE approaches keep approximations of practice at the center of teachers’ learning experiences.

While researchers have investigated a wide variety of forms of approximation, one that has received a significant amount of research attention in recent years has been rehearsal, a kind of teaching simulation that differs from a straight run-through in that it involves opportunities to pause and discuss instructional decision-making and pedagogical dilemmas as they arise. In studies of rehearsals, researchers have investigated many ways that novice teachers and teacher educators work together to unpack and understand practice during rehearsals. In one widely cited study, Lampert et al. (2013) found that within a given rehearsal, teacher educators and rehearsing teachers often worked together on a wide variety of elements of teaching simultaneously, rather than isolating only one skill. In addition, they found that, while rehearsing, novice teachers had opportunities to develop their specialized knowledge and their moral and ethical commitments as well as their technical skill. In another study of approximations, Kavanagh, Metz et al. (2020) found significant variations in how tightly or loosely teacher educators constrained the approximations that they led with teachers. The authors argue that by tightly constraining approximations, for example, by selecting anchor texts and tasks in advance, teacher educators can focus approximations more specifically on particularly complex teaching practices, like being responsive to students’ emerging ideas during discussion. In another study of approximations of practice, Schutz et al. (2019) investigated variations in the tools that teacher educators used during approximations to focus novice teachers’ attention on particular features of teaching.
practice. While some scholars worry that the approximation literature focuses on preparing teachers to reproduce static teaching behaviors with fidelity to a predetermined ideal instantiation (Beltramo et al., 2020, p. 25), there is a significant amount of research on approximations that is oriented towards understanding how to design opportunities to practice using professional judgment in uncertain contexts while maintaining commitments to a set of underlying principles.

While much of the PBTE scholarship on teacher education pedagogy has been anchored in the Grossman, Compton, et al. (2009) representation/decomposition/approximation framework, several influential adaptations to the framework have emerged, including McDonald et al.’s (2013) learning cycle and Lampert et al.’s (2013) cycle of investigation and enactment. Taken together, it is possible to argue that these three frameworks have become signature pedagogies for PBTE. The concept of signature pedagogies is drawn from Shulman’s (2005) study of professional education and refers to modes of teaching in professional education programs that are not idiosyncratic to individual professional educators and are instead shared across an entire field.

One highly recognizable example is clinical rounds in medical education. Every attending physician, regardless of the teaching hospital where they work and teach, conducts clinical rounds. In addition, clinical rounds have a routine structure that is, at least at a basic level, common across almost all hospitals. Exactly what is being taught within clinical rounds is dependent on the uncertain conditions that present themselves on any particular day, but the pedagogical activity of learning from those conditions remains constant and routine. The structure of clinical rounds, although far from perfect, is the pedagogical infrastructure with which the profession of medicine has attempted to respond to the complex task of professional preparation: supporting novice professionals to call on professional knowledge and ethics when using their judgment about how best to respond to conditions that are both complex and uncertain.

Unlike medicine, the profession of teaching has not historically had signature pedagogies for the preparation of teachers. There are pedagogies that are common in teacher education coursework (e.g., lecture and seminar style discussion). However, these pedagogies are neither specific to teacher education nor are they what Shulman (2005) calls “pedagogies of uncertainty,” learning experiences that are designed to slow down and support the process of making professional judgments in uncertain environments. Over the past half century, the field has experimented with different pedagogical possibilities (e.g., microteaching and case methods). However, at the end of each of these pedagogical experiments, the general consensus among teacher educators and scholars of teacher education has not been favorable. Teacher educators have tended to view pedagogical innovations of the past as compromised pedagogies—ones that do not balance attention to “the intellectual, the technical, and the moral” (Shulman, 2005, p. 58).

Thus, as a field, teacher education has historically lacked a shared pedagogical infrastructure for developing novices’ ability to use sound judgment in environments of uncertainty. While there are many individual teacher educators doing sophisticated pedagogical work, as a field, we lack the kind of pedagogical consensus necessary for the development of a field-level pedagogical infrastructure. The closest that teacher education comes to having a signature pedagogy that works in the way that clinical rounds works in medical education is that, across most teacher education, novice teachers engage in “student teaching.” Student teaching, however, has very few field-level supports to ensure it is a meaningful learning experience for novices. In most cases it is entirely dependent on the particular mentor teacher with whom the novice is placed to make the experience a worthwhile one and in most cases mentor teachers receive little to no compensation, training, or support, let alone a pedagogical infrastructure designed to support novice teacher learning (Shulman, 2005).

This pedagogical problem has been a central one for PBTE researchers and practitioners. For these researchers and practitioners, Grossman, Compton et al. (2009)’s representation/decomposition/approximation framework, McDonald et al.’s (2013) learning cycle framework, and Lampert et al.’s (2013) cycle of enactment and investigation have each begun to serve as slightly different versions of a signature pedagogical approach. They have come to act as a shared pedagogical infrastructure around which researchers and practitioners have designed programs, research studies, and projects focused on teacher learning. While these frameworks are by no means field-level signature pedagogies, within small communities of teacher educators they serve as a pedagogical infrastructure supporting teacher educators to expand beyond seminar and lecture style courses and to put the practice of teaching at the center of learning to teach.

**Drawing Definitional Boundaries Around PBTE: Unpacking Theoretical Underpinnings**

In addition to variations within approaches to PBTE, there are also approaches to preparing teachers for practice that fall outside of the definitions of PBTE put forth in the scholarly literature. It is important to discuss these approaches to preparing teachers for practice because they have frequently been compared to PBTE and understanding the distinctions between the two is helpful for understanding where the boundaries of PBTE are. While defining the boundaries of a field of study is always an inexact science, one way to draw definitional boundaries is by looking to the definitions that are most frequently cited by others. In an early article on PBTE that has been cited upwards of 2000 times, Grossman, Hammerness, and McDonald (2009) present a list of criteria that they argue all
Education program should share. Their list includes the following six criteria:

- Practices that occur with high frequency in teaching,
- Practices that novices can enact in classrooms across different curricula or instructional approaches,
- Practices that novices can actually begin to master,
- Practices that allow novices to learn more about students and about teaching,
- Practices that preserve the integrity and complexity of teaching, and
- Practices that are research-based and have the potential to improve student achievement.

This list of criteria is frequently used by scholars as a definitional tool when identifying what counts as PBTE and what does not. For example, McDonald and colleagues (2013) argue:

Criteria for identifying core practices challenge scholars to avoid a reductionist approach in which core practices become nothing more than the simple selection of specific moves or a list of best practices comparable with the Seven Habits of Highly Effective People or a way to name effective teaching techniques like Lemo’s (2010) popular Teach Like a Champion (p. 380).

Here they argue that organizing teacher education around “specific moves” or “best practices” (such as “giving praise” or “getting students’ attention”) is not an example of PBTE because such practices do not align with all of Grossman et al.’s (2009) PBTE criteria. While such discrete moves may adhere to some of the PBTE criteria (they occur with high frequency and novices can begin to master them) they do not adhere to other criteria (they do not allow novices to learn more about students and teaching nor do they preserve the integrity and complexity of teaching). As Forzani (2014) puts it, “because ‘teaching’ is now more widely understood as interactional, improvisational work in which students’ ideas and beliefs are critical resources, the practices that are viewed as important” in PBTE are ones that help novices consider and navigate through “complexity and uncertainty” (p. 360).

The scholarly literature on PBTE consistently criticizes approaches to teacher education grounded in fine-grained lists of competencies, discrete moves, or “best practices” (Forzani, 2014; Grosser-Clarkson & Neel, 2020; Grossman, Kazemi et al., 2019; Kavanagh, Conrad, & Dagogo-Jack, 2020; Kavanagh, Metz et al., 2020; McDonald et al., 2013; Metz et al., 2020; O’Flaherty & Beal, 2018; Von Esch & Kavanagh, 2018; Windschitl et al., 2012). However, such approaches to preparing teachers are still in use and, in extreme cases, can take the form of replacing coursework with “60 modules, each focused on a different teaching technique” (Otterman, 2011). While such approaches to preparing teachers for practice are particularly prevalent in alternative pathways into teaching, they can also be found in teacher education programs housed within traditional institutions of higher education, both in the United States and around the world (Horn & Arnet, 2017; Ismail et al., 2009).

It is important to draw distinctions between ways of working on practice that center on “interactional, improvisational work with students” (Forzani, 2014) and ways of working on practice that center discrete moves and strategies that are determined a priori. This is because in contemporary scholarly debates about PBTE the two approaches are frequently conflated. While this is understandable—it is, in fact, entirely possible to represent, decompose, and approximate practice in ways that are informed by behaviorist assumptions about how people learn—conflating the two approaches ignores the theoretical underpinnings of each. This is why it is imperative that scholars of PBTE continue to consistently tie their pedagogical frameworks to sociocultural theories of learning (Grossman, Compton et al., 2009; McDonald et al., 2013; Lampert et al., 2013). In the next section, I describe the sociocultural underpinnings of PBTE, but first offer a short history of how various theories of learning have influenced pedagogical reforms in teacher education over the last half century. My hope is that understanding the theoretical foundations of PBTE in their historical context will offer insight about the reasons that some scholars and practitioners have been arguing for a turn to practice.
PBTE in Historical & Theoretical Context

Current approaches to and conceptualizations of PBTE were preceded by many different waves of curricular and pedagogical approaches in teacher education. Each of these earlier waves were shaped by then-prevailing theories of learning. Because contemporary PBTE evolved as a result of and reaction to earlier waves of reform, understanding the theoretical foundations of twenty-first century PBTE requires situating the current scholarship in a historical context. While it would certainly be possible to trace this historical context as far back as the Aristotelian conception of praxis (ca. 350 BCE/Aristotle, 2009) or Deweyan discussions of the relation of theory to practice (1904), for the sake of brevity I will stay focused on recent history. Because PBTE is often compared to the competency-based teacher education (CBTE) movement of the 1960s and 1970s (Philip et al., 2018; Zeichner, 2012) this era is an appropriate starting point.

CBTE became popular in the 1960s at a time when educational researchers and teacher educators primarily ascribed to behaviorist theories of learning. During this time, researchers, such as Nathaniel Gage (1963), sought to understand teacher learning through conceptual models that viewed education as a process of behavioral modification. This led to the identification of specific and fine-grained teaching moves (for example, “giving praise”). These moves were then included on extensive lists of teaching “competencies.” Guided by these competency lists, teachers were encouraged to hone their skill through “microteaching” sessions, where they repeated and refined each item on a list of competencies individually, receiving feedback on how closely their attempts adhered to an ideal enactment (Ralph, 2014).

While this approach to teacher learning is experiencing a resurgence in some contemporary circles, behaviorist approaches to professional preparation mostly shifted in the 1980s as the theoretical underpinnings of research on teaching shifted towards cognitivist perspectives (Roediger, 2004). Cognitive psychologists viewed learning as a change in mental processes, not a change in behaviors. This shift in understanding led teacher educators to reject the practice of supporting teachers to rigidly apply predetermined teaching behaviors in uniform ways absent attention to the situation of their use (MacLeod, 1987). This shift gave rise to a new research paradigm, one that saw teaching as a series of decisions that required teachers to utilize their extensive knowledge of both content and students (Erickson, 1982). Within this paradigm, Shulman (1987) introduced his work on pedagogical content knowledge and Lampert (1985) began writing about teaching as decision making. As conceptualizations about teaching and learning changed, so too did teacher educators’ pedagogical practices: microteaching fell out of favor and case-based methods and reflection (re)emerged as the predominant teacher learning activities in teacher education. Novices were no longer asked to practice and re-practice discrete behaviors as they had been in Nathaniel Gage’s (1963) process-product work, instead they were asked to reflect on complex cases and practice and use their specialized knowledge to make informed teaching decisions (Grossman, 2005).

In the same way that previous waves of teacher education reform have been rooted in the prevailing theories of the time, the rise of PBTE is rooted in contemporary sociocultural assumptions about the nature of learning. In particular, work on PBTE is rooted in sociocultural perspectives on practice, which are motivated by frustrations with Cartesian dualisms like thought/action and mind/body. From this perspective the practice of teaching is neither a string of behaviors nor a string of decisions. Instead, it is a culturally mediated way of simultaneously knowing, being, and doing (Scribner & Cole, 1981). When grounded in integrated sociocultural perspectives on social practice, microteaching on its own was an insufficient professional preparation tool, as was reflecting on cases. Microteaching emphasized behavior without considering thought, while reflective case-based methods emphasized decision-making without taking into embodiment into account. Acknowledging these limitations led to the development of PBTE, which aimed to overcome the either/or, binary approach to behavior and cognition (Kavanagh, 2022).

Out of this interest in integrated approaches to teacher learning have come the introduction of rehearsals of teaching (Lampert et al., 2013), approximations of teaching (Grossman et al., 2009), mediated fieldwork (McDonald et al., 2014; Zeichner et al., 2015), studio days, and learning labs (Gibbons et al., 2017). These approaches were designed to integrate work on embodiment with work on decision-making by creating opportunities for guided and collective reflection within opportunities for enacted practice. While this decision to step away from the thought/ action binary is distinctly contemporary in many ways it also picks up the century old Deweyan argument for integrated approaches to theory and practice (Dewey, 1904). There are, however, other ways of viewing PBTE. While some see PBTE as a rejection of Cartesian dualisms, critics of PBTE argue that the practice turn does not represent a departure from the cognitivism/behaviorism binary (Kennedy, 2016; Philip et al., 2018; Zeichner, 2012). Thus, questions remain about whether PBTE is simply a change in direction of a static pendulum or a rejection of the pendulum model altogether. To better understand this question and its possible answers, I will discuss a few critiques of PBTE that have emerged in recent years and examine possible pathways forward for research and practice.
Open Issues and Future Directions for PBTE

Deepening Commitments to Educational Justice

A number of scholarly critiques of PBTE have recently emerged. Some scholars, such as Philip et al. (2018) and Souto-Manning (2019) have suggested that grounding teacher education in practice pushes issues of educational equity and justice to the periphery of teacher education programs. Their arguments echo earlier questions raised by Zeichner (2012) and Bowman and Gottesman (2013) about whether PBTE reforms will divert the attention of teacher education programs away from building novice teachers’ commitments to educational justice to focus disproportionately on building their technical skill. While critics of PBTE have been the primary voices asking these questions, some scholars engaged with PBTE research and practice have wrestled with these questions as well. Dutro and Cartun (2016), scholar/practitioners who study and enact versions of PBTE (Alston et al., 2018; Grossman, Kazemi et al., 2019), argue that while there is value in selecting specific teaching practices on which to focus novices’ attention, teacher educators should be aware that decisions to center practices always also establish peripheries for those practices. They call, therefore, for teacher education broadly, and PBTE in particular, to treat teaching practice as complex and multifaceted. This call for complexity is a common refrain in the PBTE scholarship (Ball & Cohen, 1999; Grossman, Hammerness, & McDonald, 2009; McDonald et al., 2013) and an area of PBTE inquiry unto itself (Lampert, 2013). The consistent presence of arguments about the complexity of practice in the PBTE literature indicates that proponents of PBTE share a concern with PBTE’s critiques—a worry that without complex visions of practice, PBTE may get taken up in troubling ways. This concern was discussed at length in a critique of PBTE from Horn and Kane (2019) in which, among other criticisms, the authors suggest that “second-generation attempts” (p. 20) at PBTE have the potential to simplify the practice of teaching and to obscure both the contextual and the political nature of teaching. Both of these possibilities mean that there is potential for PBTE to further exacerbate educational inequities rather than contributing to campaigns for educational justice.

To engage with these questions and critiques, the field needs investigations into whether and how practice-based designs for teacher learning can keep commitments to the advancement of social justice and equity central. Scholars hoping to pursue this line of inquiry might look to the emerging scholarship in this area that has begun to investigate related questions (Cuenca, 2021; Kavanagh, 2017; Peercy et al., 2022; Schiera, 2019, 2021). In a 2019 case study, Kang and Zinger interrogated the relationship between PBTE and outcomes related to critical consciousness about systemic, structural inequities and to systemic racism in particular. Their study built on a previous mixed-methods study conducted by Kang and Windschitl (2018) which found that novices who had experienced practice-based preparation were more likely to engage K-12 students in active science sense-making during classroom discourse. When, in their follow-up case study, Kang and Zinger followed three of these teachers through their first two years of teaching, they found that while these teachers’ practice-based preparation had supported them in designing and implementing lessons rich with active science sense-making opportunities, their practice-based preparation in many ways did not support them in adopting approaches to teaching that reflected critical consciousness.

While Kang and Zinger’s (2019) study underscores the necessity for further research on the relationship between practice-based preparation and the development of critically conscious teaching practice among early career teachers, it stops short of answering questions about what transformations to PBTE might be necessary to support it to better embody commitments to educational justice and equity. Some emerging scholarship has begun to engage with this question, but much more is needed.

One study by Kavanagh and Danielson (2020) investigated the relationship between how novice elementary teachers were prepared by teacher educators in a practice-based program to conduct read alouds designed to support K-5 students’ critical consciousness development. Additionally, the authors investigated how participating novice teachers subsequently enacted these read alouds with children. Their findings were two-fold. First, as teacher educators prepared novice teachers to facilitate discussions about read aloud texts with children, they frequently attended to the ways that cultural representation, cultural knowledge, and critical consciousness play out in read alouds (e.g., attending to how and whether texts selected represented minoritized social groups, attending to how children’s sensemaking about text is influenced by cultural knowledge, attending to how and whether texts selected for read alouds support students in deepening their critical consciousness). However, while the teacher educators frequently attended to issues related to culture, power, and oppression, when they did so they tended to step away from practice-based pedagogies (e.g., representation, decomposition, approximation (Grossman, Compton et al., 2009) in favor of more typical teacher education pedagogy (e.g., seminar-style discussion, lecture, etc.). Second, the authors found that subsequently, when novice teachers reflected on their subsequent read alouds, they rarely brought up issues of culture, power, and oppression, focusing instead on the topics that had been represented, decomposed, and approximated in their teacher education classroom.

Taken together, Kang and Zinger’s (2019) and Kavanagh and Danielson’s (2020) findings suggest that while PBTE holds promise for shaping novice teachers’ practices, to
more bridges need to be built between PBTE approaches to teacher learning and justice-oriented goals for teachers’ practices. Towards this end, Calabrese-Barton et al. (2020) have introduced a framework of high leverage practices for justice-oriented teaching. Using a critical, participatory design-based approach, the authors worked in partnership with three middle school teachers to identify patterns-in-practice among these teachers that might point to promising “justice-oriented high leverage practices” (p. 477). They argue that, while there is promise in focusing on specific practices to support novice teacher development, which practices teacher educators focus on matters. Without identifying practices that are specifically justice-oriented, PBTE may stop short of challenging or disrupting the power-structures that contribute to systemic oppression in K-12 schooling.

While Calabrese Barton et al. (2020) argue that PBTE holds promise for justice-oriented preparation if attention is paid to whether and in what ways core or high-leverage practices reflect justice-oriented concerns, other scholars are less sure. In an essay that wrestles with many of the same questions as Calabrese Barton et al.’s (2020) study, Daniels and Varghese (2020) conclude that the task of identifying core or high-leverage practices reflects, at its heart, a lack of attention to teacher subjectivity. Their critique points to a central challenge for PBTE: while there may be promise in organizing teacher education around the practice of teaching, who decides which practices should be central to a transformed curriculum for learning to teach? As is true of most other academic fields, teacher education scholarship carries a history of institutionalized and individual patterns of whiteness. Therefore, any attempt to transform teacher education curriculum, pedagogy, or structure has to wrestle with the mechanisms through which the field consistently “centers, ‘invisibilizes’ (Lipsitz, 1998), and reinscribes whiteness” (Daniels & Varghese, 2020, p. 5).

Herein lie important future directions for research on PBTE. While there is a small body of emergent research into how PBTE might be used to prepare teachers to challenge the systemic oppressions prevalent in K-12 schools, much more research is needed. Any future research in this area must contend with the ways that whiteness (as well as heteronormativity and the many other social norms that intentionally render themselves invisible in social discourse) influence the identification of focal practices, the development of curricula, the pedagogy of teacher educators, and the design of research. While the principles of PBTE may support the field in transforming the design of curricula and pedagogy in ways that allow teacher education to more reliably shape the practice of K-12 educators, the field needs to direct these principles to the explicit work of dismantling of white supremacy, settler colonialism, and cis-heteropatriarchy in K-12 schooling. Without an explicit justice-focused orientation, PBTE implementation will fall short of supporting the field to pay down the education debt (Ladson-Billings, 2006).

Deepening Attention to Novice Teacher Learning

Along with developing greater clarity about the equity and justice commitments undergirding PBTE scholarship and practice, another important next step for PBTE scholarship is to broaden its attention to novice teacher outcomes and experiences. While arguments for PBTE tend to hinge on sociocultural perspectives about novice teacher learning, there is surprisingly little PBTE literature that presents findings about novice teacher learning. This is in part because a significant amount of PBTE research has been conceptual (Ball & Cohen, 1999; Ball & Forzani, 2009; Grossman, Hammerness, & McDonald, 2009; Lampert & Graziani, 2009; McDonald et al., 2013; Reisman et al., 2018; Windschitl et al., 2012). It is also because a large portion of empirical PBTE research focuses on data about teacher educators or programs (Kavanagh, Metz et al., 2020; Kazemi et al., 2015; Lampert et al., 2013) rather than data on novice teachers’ beliefs, practices, or experiences. While this is a growing base of PBTE scholarship connecting designs for teacher education and the pedagogy of teacher educators with their impacts on novice teachers, more research is needed.

A number of researchers have investigated what the practice of novice teachers looks like after they engage in practice-based learning opportunities (Cohen et al., 2016; Kavanagh & Rainey, 2018; Reisman et al., 2019). Most of these studies rely on video data of novice teachers practice. While these studies rarely compare outcomes for novice teachers who have been prepared in PBTE programs with novices who have not, there are exceptions (see Kang & Windschitl, 2018). Aside from observational research on novice teachers’ practices, other novice teacher-level data that PBTE researchers have investigated include how novice teachers reflect on their practice after experiencing PBTE (Kavanagh & Danielson, 2020), how they plan lessons after experiencing PBTE (Kang & Windschitl, 2018), and how they analyze student work after experiencing PBTE (Windschitl et al., 2011). While these studies make up a burgeoning knowledge base connecting PBTE and novice teacher outcomes, much more research is needed. In broadening the knowledge base about the impact of PBTE on novice teachers, the field would benefit from analyses of a broad variety of novice teacher-level data. Our knowledge base would benefit from data that offers insight not only into novice teachers’ classroom practices, but also into their beliefs about children and about learning, their critical consciousness, their content knowledge, and their persistence in the profession.

Deepening Attention to K-12 Student Learning

While scholarship on PBTE is beginning to build a reservoir of evidence about the relationship between teacher educators’ practices and novice teachers’ practices, there are very few studies that connect teacher education coursework and pedagogy with K-12 students’ experiences and learning. Cochran-Smith at al. (2016) argue that this gap likely exists because the traditional purview of pre-service
teacher education is teacher learning rather than student learning. They argue, however, that “the lack of attention in the teacher preparation research to student learning exacerbates the long-perceived (and long-critiqued) disconnect between university-based teacher preparation and the schools” (p. 516). Without attention to K-12 student-level data, it is likely that PBTE research, much like most teacher education research as a whole, will be marginalized from efforts to inform state and/or federal policies and practices as they related to teacher professional learning, as well as pre-service teacher education and credentialing.

While PBTE scholarship would benefit from deepening the attention it pays to K-12 students’ experiences and outcomes, this does not mean that it should adopt a narrow achievement-focused lens on K-12 students that boils down their experiences to standardized test scores. Rather, the field would benefit from a richer understanding of the relationship between practice-based learning experiences for teachers and student-level outcomes related to student engagement, conceptual understanding, critical consciousness, civic participation, and positive identity development just to name a few. There is promising recent research that builds attention to students’ experiences into measures of teacher practice by attending to elements of student participation and engagement in measures designed to capture qualities of teachers’ discussion facilitation. While these studies do not include what is typically considered student-level data, they do offer early glimpses of what we might be able to learn by exploring student-level outcomes in studies of PBTE (Cohen & Grossman, 2016; Cohen et al., 2016; Kang & Windschitl, 2018).

In light of contemporary debates about the role of practice in teacher education, the purpose of this white paper is to clarify how practitioners and scholars writing about PBTE since the start of the twenty-first century have characterized both its nature and its purpose. Additionally, this piece aims to identify the most promising growing edges of the existing body of PBTE scholarship, to identify open questions in the field, and to suggest avenues for future research. What the review makes clear is that as the field of PBTE scholarship grows, its ability to influence teacher education policy and practice to move in just directions will likely rest on how closely it stays focused on the reasons why practice is a significant theoretical construct in the first place. Practice is the site where socially, historically, and culturally mediated knowledge, identity, and action are integrated (Gutiérrez & Rogoff, 2003). The extent to which PBTE researchers can hold this tenet of sociocultural theory at the center of their work may be a determining factor in how well PBTE research is able to bend the arc of teacher education research in the direction of educational justice.
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