Third Space, Partnerships, & Clinical Practice:
A Literature Review

Lauren M. Laughlin

Old Dominion University

Third space theory has been applied with progressive frequency to teacher education, partnerships, and clinical practice. This review of literature addresses how the application of third space theory has manifested in partnerships, clinical practice, and the associated stakeholders. Since moving towards third space is a process, it requires a continual embracing of tensions. It is within these tensions related to the application of the principles of third space theory within partnerships and clinical practice that three themes came to the surface. They include (a) diffusing hierarchy, embracing collaboration; (b) rejecting binaries, embracing democracy; and (c) overcoming borders, spanning boundaries. I address implications for moving forward and furthering third space partnerships and provide recommendations regarding intentionality and future research.

Keywords: third space, partnerships, clinical practice

There have been numerous calls over the past few decades regarding the overhauling of teacher education, especially regarding clinical practice and increased partnerships. The earliest calls came from those such as The Holmes Group (1986) and Goodlad (1990). In 2010, the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) echoed its predecessors in continuing to recognize the necessity of this overhaul. Once again, the change revolved around making clinical practice a more substantive part of teacher education. Around this same time, Darling-Hammond (2010) also argued that the theoretical tools used by the university in coursework could not stand alone. She recommended that clinical practice must happen in conjunction with coursework to properly prepare teachers for the classroom.

In addition to the importance of clinical practice in teacher education, the necessity of clinical practice occurring within truly collaborative partnerships to improve teacher education has been stressed as a major component to incite change (Goodlad, 1990; The Holmes Group, 1986; NCATE, 2010; Zeichner, 2010). More recently, the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP; 2013) and the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE; 2018) took up the cause related to partnerships and clinical practice. While the effect of these various scholars' and organizations' calls led to some change, the transformation is a slow and complicated process (Sykes et al., 2010). Theory and practice regarding pedagogy, coursework, partnerships, and clinical practice are areas that needed and continue to need to be bridged. With many stakeholders involved, there is a need for a space that provides collaboration and the production of new ideas that authentically produce the profession-ready teachers whom schools need.

Third space (Bhabha, 1994) is one concept that could create this type of space for the continued transformation of teacher education through the intentionality of clinical practice within partnerships (Zeichner, 2010). Theoretically, third space has been applied in studies regarding partnerships and clinical practice (Grudnoff et al., 2017; Martin et al., 2011). It has also been recommended as an answer to poor collaboration in partnerships (Mutemeri & Chetty, 2011; Zeichner, 2010). Additionally, teacher education programs pursuing increased partnership work appear to be using or aspiring to the creation of a true third space (Beck, 2016; Hallman, 2012; Jackson & Burch, 2019; Klein et al., 2013). With the theory becoming progressively visible within this work, an examination of its application is needed. This will allow teacher educators to see how third space in partnerships and clinical practice currently appears and imagine how further application could look. Therefore, this question guides this review of literature:

1) How has the application of third space theory manifested in partnerships, clinical practice, and the associated stakeholders?

For the purposes of this review, third space is a theory with the potential to drive partnerships and clinical practice to more democratic ways of interacting to improve teacher preparation (Bhahba, 1994: Soja, 1996). However, this requires reflection, intentionality, and an embracing of the processes that change frequently demands. Therefore, there is a need to examine how the theory has been applied to continue forward movement. Consequently, the question guiding this literature review provides the opportunity to explore how third space and its principles have been applied to partnerships, clinical practice, and individual stakeholders. Since various systems and institutions are involved, numerous people and contexts are engaged in the process and pertinent to the development of prospective teachers. Additionally, the process is complex and full of tension. Thus, the purpose of this review is to examine literature that addresses third space partnerships and clinical practice with the intent of bringing to light the complexities and tensions of how its principles are applied. While this review will reveal issues that may need further negotiation, it will also reveal the benefits of pursuing third space partnership within teacher education, which will further substantiate its use and significance in producing well-rounded and profession-ready teachers for all contexts. Following the review, I make suggestions for moving forward. However, I will first provide a conceptualization of third space and discuss my method.

Third Space

This review is focused on the implementation of third space within the context of partnerships and clinical practice. Third space has roots in postcolonial thought. Traditionally, postcolonialism addressed the cultural hegemony of European knowledge and tried to counter the ideological stance that the East, or non-European world, was a foreign and uncivilized other (Ghandi, 2019; Said, 1978). Instead, postcolonialism aimed to "reassert the epistemological value and agency of the non-European world" (Ghandi, 2019, p. 44). Consequently, postcolonialism aspired to challenge European thought that was rooted in power, reclaim non-European knowledge, and confront the continuous reproduction and privileging of western knowledge about the East (Ghandi, 2019; Said, 1978). While these ideas of challenge, reclamation, and con-frontation are interpreted as a need for a complete reversal of colonial rule to that of native traditions, post-colonialism also offers a path that aligns with postnationalism (Ghandi, 2019). This course shies away from pure nationalism and is one of generosity, pluralism, mutuality, and collaboration as the mutual transformation of the colonizer and colonized is pursued. Ghandi (2019) wrote, "this gentler perusal of the colonial past produces a utopian manifesto for a postcolonial ethic, devoted to the task of imagining an inter-civilisational alliance against institutionalized suffering and oppression" (p. 125).

It is within this postcolonial idea of mutual transformation that Bhabha's (1994) concept of hybridity is found. Hybridity is "where the construction of a political object that is new, neither the one nor the other, properly alienates our political expectations, and changes, as it must, the very forms of our recognition of the moment of politics" (original emphasis; Bhabha, 1994, p. 36). The space in which hybridity occurs is thought of as a transitional space of negotiation. Bhabha (1994) specifically called this third space. This space affords the pursuit of something new, and this something new is transformational to polarized cultures as the colonized and the colonizer both undergo identity changes as binaries are deconstructed, opposing ideas are evaded, and othering is rejected. Instead, the space is democratic and inclusive of all stakeholders. Therefore, as various ideas and stakeholders come together in less hierarchal ways, collaboration, transformation, and innovation take place as meaning is formed and investigated through the voices of multiple stakeholders (Bhabha, 1994; Zeichner, 2010).

In addition to Bhabha's (1994) application of third space regarding cultures, others have theorized, applied, and embraced ideas of third space in other contexts. For instance, Soja (1996) applied third space theory to the production of space in geography. He wrote that it was a "space where all places are capable of being seen from every angle…a space that is common to all of us yet never able to be completely seen and understood" (p. 56). It is a lived space that is open, inclusive, and most importantly, lacks binaries while embracing the paradox. Like Bhabha, it is an alternative and innovative space that allows for something new as hierarchies, dualism, and power are questioned and resisted.

Additionally, third space theory has been applied in the literacy context. For example, Moje and colleagues (2004) emphasized the importance of the creation of a third space that allows for a student's home and community knowledge to intertwine with school

knowledge to make sense of texts. Gutiérrez (2008) also addressed third space in the literacy context, but her idea of the theory was more focused on a Vygotskian (1978) perspective where the space resembled a zone of proximal development which provided transition from one type of knowledge to another. She concluded that third space is a "transformative space where the potential for an expanded form of learning and the development of new knowledge are heightened" (Gutiérrez, 2008, p. 152). Therefore, third space within the literacy context provides an opportunity for the reorganization of concepts through the strategic arrangement of practices that result in transformation of knowledge and identity.

Finally, Zeichner (2010) was a key contributor to the conceptualization of third space within teacher education, specifically regarding partnerships and clinical practice. He conceptualized it as a hybrid space where democracy, inclusivity, and lack of othering between the school and university are essential for teacher education and the formation of knowledge. As a result, other scholars have utilized the theory of third space within partnerships and clinical practice. With the theory's use becoming more prominent in the research related to partnerships, clinical practice, and teacher education, it is imperative that its application and further utilization are considered because reflection reveals and encourages continued movement toward the ideals of third space. Therefore, it is pertinent that the literature associated with third space, partnerships, and clinical practice be reviewed. However, I will first provide further operationalization of partnerships and clinical practice within a third space.

Partnerships and Clinical Practice Within Third Space

In 2018, the AACTE (2018) published a report concerning clinical practice, partnerships, and lexicon. According to the AACTE, clinical practice should be embedded within the school's culture to support situated practice for teacher candidates, and coursework and clinical practice should be tightly woven together and inform one another. In addition, this practice should be supported by a school-university partnership. Within this kind of partnership, various stakeholders should be represented, which would include those defined as teacher candidates (TCs), university-based teacher educators (UTEs), and mentor teachers (MTs). There are also boundary spanning roles that are held by certain stakeholders situated within the university or the local school. While these terms are not directly stated in relation to third space partnerships, the AACTE (2018) clearly emphasizes and proclaims the importance of third space within clinical practice and partnerships. Therefore, while these definitions may need further refinement to completely align with third space, they provide a framework for third space partnerships and the defining of terms and roles within this kind of partnership. As a result, I will use the terms and definitions as they are conceptualized by the AACTE within the literature review (see Table 1).

Table 1

Demographic and Study Design Characteristics of Included Sample

Term	Definition
Boundary-spanning teacher educator	An individual (typically employed by a school district or college/ university) working in a hybrid role across school and university contexts. These individuals serve teacher candidates at any point along a professional continuum and are active participants in teacher preparation.
Clinical practice	Teacher candidates' work in authentic educational settings and engagement in the pedagogical work of the profession of teaching, closely integrated with educator preparation course work and supported by a formal school-university partnership. Clinical practice is a specific form of what is traditionally known as fieldwork.
Mentor teacher	A teacher who serves as the primary school-based teacher educator for teacher candidates completing clinical practice or an internship
Teacher Candidate	An individual enrolled in a teacher preparation program that leads to a recommendation for initial-level state licensure.
University-based teacher educator	An individual involved in teacher preparation whose primary institutional home is a college or university. University-based teacher educators are a specific type of boundary-spanning teacher educators who engage in evaluation, coaching, instruction, and partnership and assume expanded and multiple responsibilities within, and often across, each of these four domains.

Note. (AACTE, 2018, pp. 11-12)

Methods

This review was based on a systematic search of peer-reviewed, scholarly journals. The following databases within EBSCOhost were chosen: Academic Search Complete, Education Research Complete, Education Source, and ERIC. The databases were searched using the terms third space, partnerships, and preservice teach* or student teach* or field experiences. The inclusion and exclusion criteria for this literature review were rooted in the three categories of search terms. Therefore, to be included there needed to be a clear partnership between the university and schools or the university and community organizations that provided a third space for TC learning within clinical practice. See Figure 1 for additional information.

The outcome of the initial database search resulted in 27 articles. After applying the initial inclusion and exclusion criteria, there were a total of 20 articles. In addition, upon noticing the integral work of Zeichner (2010) missing from the search, I consulted an expert who has published on topics associated with third space, partnerships, and clinical practice for additional sources. This resulted in 14 additional articles. These were also examined, and two additional exclusion criteria were added. The result after applying all the inclusion and exclusion criteria was 9 articles added to those from the databases, which resulted in 29 total studies that contributed to this literature review.

Step 1: Systematic Search
- Used Academic Search Complete, Education Research Complete, Education Source, and ERIC databases to search for articles.
- Search terms included *third space, partnerships, and preservice teach* or student teach* or field experiences.*

Step 2: Inclusion Criteria
- The article contained theory of third space, partnerships, and clinical practice.
- The article included how third space had been applied (practically and/or theoretically) in partnerships and clinical practice.
- The clinical practice within the article aligned with the AACTE's (2018) definition of clinical pratcice.

Step 3: Exclusion Criteria
- Articles that (a) addressed digital third space (e.g, Moran, 2018) or (b) were not related to teacher candidates in partnerships and clinical practice (e.g., Passy, 2018) were excluded.

Step 4: Expert Consulted
- An expert who has published on third space, partnerships, and clinical practice was contacted for additional articles.
- These articles were also vetted using the inclusion and exclusion criteria.
- FInally, additional exclusion criteria were added. Articles that focused on (a) research design and data collection (e.g., Beck 2018) or (b) were not related to partnerships and clinical practice (e.g., Routledge, 1996) were excluded.

Figure 1. Methods Used for Literature Review

Once the final articles were selected, they were read and placed in a chart to record and provide overarching information about each study. The examination that followed the reading aligned with thematic analysis, specifically a theoretical thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006). According to Braun and Clarke,

> a 'theoretical' thematic analysis would tend to be driven by the researcher's theoretical or analytic interest in the area, and is thus more explicitly analyst-driven. This form of thematic analysis tends to provide less a rich description of the data overall, and a more detailed analysis of some aspect of data. (p. 84)

Therefore, the analysis was guided by the research question and by looking through the theoretical lens of third space. When considering the theoretical lens of third space, aspects related to its principles, such as hierarchy, power, collaboration, co-construction, knowledge, boundaries, and borders, emerged and resulted in three themes that are discussed in the following review.

Literature Review

Third space is a utopian idea, making it idealistic and full of tension as its pursuit is challenging (Klein et al., 2013). While there are many benefits to third space when it genuinely occurs, challenges and tensions threaten authentic pursuit due to competing ideas from stakeholders (Taylor et al., 2014). Therefore, when progress occurs, the opposite is frequently present. For example, while all parties may be working towards a mutual environment of inclusivity, power struggles may be present between the different stakeholders (McDonough, 2014; Taylor et al., 2014; Williams, 2015). However, this does not mean that third space and its principles should not be pursued. Instead, it should be seen as a process that embraces tension rather than a product to be achieved through expedience. Therefore, it is within these tensions that the research question for this review is answered because the tensions bring to light how the application of third space theory has manifested in partnerships, clinical practice, and the associated stakeholders. The following three themes will be explored: (a) diffusing hierarchy, embracing collaboration; (b) rejecting binaries, embracing democracy; and (c) overcoming border, spanning boundaries. Then, I conclude with recommendations for practice and research moving forward.

Diffusing Hierarchy, Embracing Collaboration

To create a genuine third space, there should be a lack of hierarchy amongst stakeholders, which leads to the dispersing and then sharing of power. However, as UTEs and other participants try to navigate partnerships and clinical experiences, this inequitable distribution of power manifests in various ways. For instance, the university traditionally holds the power in teacher education, and this remains a tension in partnerships (Ikpeze et al., 2012; Mutemeri & Chetty, 2011; Souto-Manning & Martell, 2019). Farrell (2021) highlighted how the university has led and constructed partnerships resulting in norms and frameworks that lack collaboration and minimize the role of school stakeholders. Yet, while the university traditionally dominates teacher education, power is also at work within the school context too (Beck, 2016; Martin et al., 2011). For example, hierarchy and power within the school system was exemplified in Beck's (2016) study when university stakeholders struggled to navigate the school district. A hierarchy was in place that kept other potential stakeholders at bay, and it was only through intentional relationships that trust formed and power was challenged. Therefore, when power, lack of relationships, and communication are ignored, the result is persistent cycles of hierarchy rather than mutuality within partnership (Mutemeri & Chetty, 2011; Zeichner, 2010).

Additionally, partnerships are multifaceted and difficult to manage resulting in additional hierarchal borders (Martin et al., 2011). One way this difficulty manifests is when there are differing ideologies or philosophies about collaboration and what it is or how it should look (Ikpeze et al., 2012). Another way this is demonstrated is through the lack of real dialogue between stakeholders (Jonsdottir, 2015). For instance, Mutemeri and Chetty's (2011) participants mentioned the lack of structures, links, and relationships between partnership stakeholders. Consequently, without concerted efforts by stakeholders, differences are challenging to overcome. As a result, hierarchy may seem more "manageable" compared to the alternative. This may be especially difficult within hierarchal societies, such as in Hong Kong, China (Chan, 2019).

However, there is evidence of UTEs within the university pursuing and participating in collaborative hybrid spaces rather than promoting hierarchy within partnerships (Klein et al., 2016; Williams, 2014). For example, Ikpeze and colleagues (2012) wrote, "We jettisoned earlier assumptions in which mentor teachers were seen mostly from a deficit perspective" (p. 285). Steele (2017) also worked against deficit views by using joint supervision between UTEs and MTs that was complementary and non-hierarchal. Additionally, Nickens and colleagues (2018) addressed this through the pursuit of collaborative placements of TCs based on district needs. These studies show the intentional pursuit of questioning power and hierarchy, and a result of such efforts is reconciling tensions and the development of trusting relationships. Consequently, UTEs can encourage confidence amongst stakeholders rather than intimidation by creating an environment of mutual respect where working side-by-side is the norm (Jackson & Burch, 2019; Klein et al., 2013; Taylor et al., 2014). For example, UTEs purposely used their power in hybrid spaces to shift power to other stakeholders (Martin et al., 2011; McCulloch et al., 2020). In McDonough's (2014) study, this looked like a UTE using her hybrid position between the university and school to give voice to other stakeholders. In Souto-Manning and Martell's (2019) study, it looked like a UTE and MT intentionally pursuing a horizontal relationship that shifted the dynamics of power relationally and physically by coteaching a university course.

This working side-by-side is also exemplified in relationships between TCs and other stakeholders. For instance, when positioned as equals in exploratory or inquiry spaces, power was redistributed, and TCs were able to learn with and from students, MTs, and university-based educators (Cahill, 2016; Klein et al., 2016; Klein et al., 2013). This is also fostered with community members when TCs encounter community immersion types of partnerships and clinical practice (Handa & Tippins, 2012; Lee, 2018). The result of such experiences are third spaces that allow for the questioning of hierarchy and a place where collaborative relationships are celebrated and misconceptions are contested (Gannon, 2010; Styslinger et al., 2014). Consequently, there is a reorientation of multiple power differentials within partnerships and clinical practice.

However, to move more toward collaboration, partnerships must continue to shift from cooperation, where schools host TCs and follow university guidelines, to collaboration, where all stakeholders are equal participants (Jackson & Burch, 2016; Martin et al., 2011; Taylor et al., 2014). This means creating opportunities for crossing of boundaries and embracing tensions as stakeholders learn from one another (Hackett et al., 2021; Ramsaroop & Gravett, 2017). Intentionally striving for collaboration is further encouraged through listening, co-constructing new knowledge, making decisions together, finding solutions together, and creating collaborative assessments (Grudnoff et al., 2017; Phompun et al., 2013; Steele, 2017). The result is a third space where there is a culture of development, reflection, and responsiveness for the betterment of all in the partnership (Beck, 2016). Additionally, transformation occurs that shapes the identities of all partners, and the othering of everyday knowledge and students becomes less apparent (Hallman, 2012; Jackson & Burch, 2019; Williams, 2014). Therefore, it is within this hybrid space that constructive collaboration becomes more and more possible for all those involved (Jackson & Burch, 2016).

Rejecting Binaries, Embracing Democracy

Within the third space of partnerships and clinical practice, new types of knowledge are created and co-constructed as stakeholders reconcile different types of knowledge (Bhabha, 1994; Soja, 1996). This is done in partnerships as stakeholders move toward a new future and kind of knowledge that recognizes and respects the knowledge of each stakeholder while also pursuing knowledge that is both unique and unifying to the part-

nership at large. For example, in the Klein and colleagues' (2016) study, the partnership intentionally supported the current and future construction of knowledge between UTEs, MTs, community members, TCs, and students through inquiry learning experiences and co-creation of the curriculum. Therefore, when stakeholders are pursuing a third space partnership, everyone becomes co-learners to form a "new" type of knowledge related to the partnership as they work together (Grudnoff et al., 2017; Taylor et al., 2014). Additionally, each stakeholder plays an important role as the TCs' identities are shaped and various types of knowledge begin to influence their practice and identity within clinical practice (Chan, 2019; Phompun et al., 2013). This pursuit of creating something new is associated with the principle of rejecting binary ideas and instead co-constructing ideas or concepts together in democratic ways (Bhabha, 1994; Soja, 1996). These democratic ways and spaces also reject othering and give all stakeholders the opportunity to have a voice that contributes to the partnership and clinical practice. However, tensions linger or remain as partnerships work towards this but still lack authentic democratic spaces that promote multiple truths and co-construction of knowledge (Jonsdottir, 2015; Mutemeri & Chetty, 2011).

Tensions related to binary ideas, co-construction of knowledge, and democratic ways of being are not easily reconciled. One way this tension specifically manifests within partnerships and clinical practice is through the theory and practice divide, which refers to how the knowledge of the university's theories and the schools' practices have traditionally been at odds (Farrell, 2021; Zeichner, 2010). It is only through intentionality and the laying aside of deficit views of school stakeholders that progress is made toward reducing the persistent gap between theory and practice in teacher education (Ikpeze et al., 2012; Souto-Manning & Martell, 2019). For instance, in Jackson and Burch's (2016) collaborative partnership framework, the school and university were encouraged to work together to bridge the theory and practice divide. They encouraged "co-emergent possibilities" to resolve binary issues, which involved "principled practice" combined with "practical theorizing" (p. 520). In other words, the partnership pursued a mutual and reciprocal relationship between stakeholders that promoted co-construction of knowledge in which theory and practice were constantly serving one another. In McCulloch and colleagues' (2020) study, this merging of different types of knowledge was done through designing a mathematics task for a classroom. As TCs communicated with teachers within the schools

and the UTE, they were able to recognize, negotiate, and incorporate both types of knowledge into the task. Additionally, there are also instances of UTEs co-creating knowledge with other stakeholders by offering their reality to the discussion instead of claiming it is the only reality (Klein et al., 2013; Taylor et al., 2014). For instance, UTEs within Martin and colleagues' (2011) study recognized that mutuality "requires an embracing of complexity and uncertainty in social contexts, rather than control and power" (p. 308). The result is a transformative setting for teacher education where a narrative representation of all stakeholders is formed. However, those such as Zeichner (2010) have expressed that this cannot occur to the full extent needed until UTEs are properly rewarded for engaging in this kind of transformative teacher education.

In addition to dynamics between the university and schools within partnerships, there are also concerns related to community stakeholders and lack of community knowledge within partnerships and clinical practice (Zeichner, 2010). The voice and knowledge of the community cannot be ignored within partnerships because students bring this knowledge to the classrooms in which clinical practice is occurring (Hallman, 2011; Lee, 2018). Therefore, TCs must be aware of theory, practice, and community knowledge (Hackett et al., 2021). However, community members are frequently seen as outsiders who are not a part of the formation of teachers for their own communities or who are seen as a community to be taken from rather than worked with and alongside (Lee, 2018). This outsider mentality is synonymous with othering. One way this is exemplified in teacher education is when knowledge is being constructed. When local variables do not mediate learning, the dominant narrative becomes privileged (Souto-Manning & Martell, 2019). Likewise, when voices of the community do not mediate partnerships and clinical practice, then the dominant narrative of the university becomes privileged. Lee (2018) expressed that this othering mentality is even stronger in urban areas. Rather than disregarding the community, it is necessary to invite their knowledge into the partnership's dialogue, because it is essential to the formation of future teachers as well as the students they will be teaching.

Embracing community knowledge also supports developing positive relationships between teachers and students as they explore together and misconceptions are challenged and critiqued (Cahill et al., 2016; Gannon, 2010). For example, in Hallman's (2012) study, TCs' deficit views of homeless teens were deconstructed as they worked with teens in a clinical practice that was specifically community-based. In addition, by participating in a clinical practice immersed within the community, students in Handa and Tippin's (2012) study were able to learn from, make sense of, and participate in constructing knowledge alongside the community. Therefore, clinical practice that specifically incorporates the community and its knowledge is one way in which community involvement and knowledge is pursued within partnerships. It provides a place where everyday knowledge from communities and academic knowledge from school experiences are both intentionally considered (Gannon, 2010; Hallman, 2012). The result is an alternative space where everyday knowledge is no longer looked at as an "other" but rather an equal participant that is essential to the formation of knowledge for all stakeholders (Handa & Tippin, 2012).

Every stakeholder brings a specific type of knowledge to the table. Traditionally, UTEs bring the theory, and MTs bring the practice. In addition to these types of knowledge, the community and its expertise should also be considered (Handa & Tippin, 2012). Community knowledge represents not only the community but also our students, making it of utmost importance. A purpose of third space is to provide a transformative environment where these various types of knowledge are bridged (Bhabha, 1994). For this to happen, each type of knowledge must be recognized and respected, and there must be a willingness to collaborate, remove binaries, and cross boundaries to come to these new types of knowledge (Grudnoff et al., 2017; Taylor et al., 2014). Intentionality is needed, and opportunities to work together and strategic meetings of the minds must occur for co-construction to further transpire.

Overcoming Borders, Spanning Boundaries

Throughout the literature, each stakeholder within a partnership offers a unique perspective, plays a necessary role, and faces challenges specific to their role. In addition, each stakeholder in a third space partnership must pursue some form of boundary spanning. Boundary spanning requires stakeholders to be engaged in different contexts, and it results in a hybrid space, or a bridge of sorts, between differing contexts, knowledges, and identities. Examples within partnerships and clinical practice could be P-12 teachers teaching university courses, UTEs and students being in schools for classes and clinical practice, or UTEs working concurrently in schools and the university (Souto-Manning & Martell, 2019; Zeichner, 2010). This type of boundary spanning is essential to democracy within a third space

because it promotes the reconciliation of polarized ideas and the creation of collaborative meaning and identity between stakeholders (Jackson & Burch, 2016). However, it does not lack tension (Hackett et al., 2021). For example, differences are not always easily reconciled, and negotiations, whether amongst individuals or within oneself, take intentional reflection and the embracing of a learning posture. Therefore, due to the importance of boundary spanning within third space partnerships, I will now consider the tensions of borders and spanning boundaries related to various stakeholders.

Traditionally, UTEs teach methods courses and are responsible for supervising TCs (Zeichner, 2010). The result is the separation of UTEs from the everyday practices that occur within schools. However, within a third space, UTEs can be bridges between the practical and theoretical, the university and the classroom (Martin et al., 2011; McDonough, 2014; Zeichner, 2010). For example, they foster relationships between multiple stakeholders by spending time at schools and becoming a part of the school community and culture (Martin et al., 2011; Taylor et al., 2014). While there, they also mediate the third space as they gather and give information that links various collaborators as new knowledge is formed and co-constructed (Klein et al., 2013; Williams, 2014). They also become liaisons who foster relationships between the university and MTs, TCs, administrators, and others that are complex and constantly shifting in nature. This looks like forming lines of communication that are new or need repaired within partnerships (Martin et al., 2011). In Jackson and Burch's (2019) study, they were found to be necessary for facilitating the connection of theory and practice for MTs. As these types of relationships are nurtured, trust is formed, but UTEs must also learn to navigate power dynamics and change roles when needed. For example, they must resign deficit ideas about other stakeholders (Ikpeze et al., 2012). Instead, it should look like UTEs providing confidence to MTs as MTs are trained to become school-based teacher educators (Jackson & Burch, 2019). Additionally, it should look like advocating for TCs or mediating between various stakeholders (McDonough, 2014).

Within the school, MTs typically are responsible for guiding TCs through their clinical practice and gradually allowing TCs to take over the classrooms for a designated period. This method provides an opportunity for TCs to apply what they learned in their university courses (Klein et al., 2013). However, this technique also promotes polarity and power amongst stakeholders

as knowledge related to theory and practice feels disconnected rather than integrated. In contrast, within third space partnerships, MTs are expected to have responsibilities related to the school-university partnership and the mentoring of TCs, which results in their own boundary-spanning role. This means MTs work with UTEs and TCs, and they are involved in co-constructing curriculum, co-teaching, co-planning, and supervising (Grudnoff et al., 2017; Steele, 2017). This is of utmost importance considering that mentors are essential to "facilitating or hindering the transfer of knowledge across institutional domains" (Chan, 2019, p. 6). Therefore, they are pivotal to dismantling borders for TCs by allowing them the space to merge theory and practice. However, there is concern that MTs do not have the tools they need to be boundary spanners because they are unaware or unable to integrate theory and need to be mentored or trained (Mutemeri & Chetty, 2011; Zeichner, 2010). A recurring theme regarding MTs is the need for trusting, mutual, and dialogical relationships between them and UTEs; being properly informed and mentored are also of importance (Ikpeze et al., 2012; Mutemeri & Chetty, 2011; Williams, 2014). When the university does not properly communicate and prepare mentors for clinical practice through open dialogue, a third space is not truly in existence since they are not a part of the conversation. Research showed that this gap could be narrowed through more strategic building of relationships and having meetings or professional development opportunities (Beck, 2016; Klein et al., 2013; Martin et al., 2011). Farrell (2021) also noted that partnerships that promote democratic ways of being have mutual understandings of roles, responsibilities, and the language being used within the partnerships and clinical practice. At times, this may mean intentionally transforming roles and relationships to remove boundaries and better align with a third space model (Grudnoff et al., 2017).

Community members also have boundary-spanning abilities, because they have invaluable experience and knowledge from within the community context. Therefore, incorporating community knowledge in partnerships and community-based clinical practice is of the utmost importance. These types of interactions allow TCs to learn from community members and become culturally competent (Handa & Tippin, 2012; Lee, 2018; Zeichner, 2010). TCs also learn how to contextualize and better understand the lives and experiences of students, which aids in student learning (Gannon, 2010; Hallman, 2012). For example, by participating in a community-based field experience, TCs were able to better understand their students' out-of-school

knowledge and create sounder connections related to their in-school knowledge (Hallman, 2012). To support further involvement of community members in school-university partnerships, Lee (2018) suggested reciprocal relationships between the community and other stakeholders that contain a collaborative research agenda, an asset-based mindset, and a non-hierarchal space for dialogue that dismantles privilege. To promote this community involvement within third space partnerships, Beck (2018) recommended a community liaison. This would be a boundary spanner who aids in understanding the community needs and assists in asset-based community research within schools.

Finally, I will give voice to the lack of boundary spanning for and with TCs, because TCs should be actively participating in the shaping of their teacher identity through overcoming borders and spanning boundaries. For instance, in Phompun and colleagues (2013), it was clear that TCs were spanning the various contexts of theory and practice as they shaped their own teaching styles. However, at times, TCs are not recognized or regarded as stakeholders within partnerships. For example, TCs have expressed their concern about lack of preparation and inclusivity in conversations within clinical practice (Mutemeri & Chetty, 2011; Steele, 2017). As a result, TCs are merely on the receiving end of information rather than a part of the creation of knowledge with other stakeholders. This is reminiscent of Freire's (1970) banking system in which "knowledge is a gift bestowed by those who consider themselves knowledgeable upon those whom they consider to know nothing" (p. 72). Additionally, Martin and colleagues (2011) recommended that TCs be participants on the periphery. This intentionally removes TCs from the conversation rather than inviting them into a third space where borders are removed, boundaries are spanned, and meaning is created between all stakeholders. However, others have recognized this shortcoming and have considered how to make TCs' prior knowledge, experiences, and contexts an intentional part of co-constructing knowledge and the teacher education curriculum rather than being mere receivers of knowledge (Klein et al., 2013). For instance, McDonough (2014) mentioned that she found herself intentionally drawing on her power as a UTE to give TCs more voice within partnerships. Efforts such as these should be more purposefully pursued with the intention of providing opportunities for TCs to further span boundaries within clinical practice. This will also aid in their own pedagogy as they pursue spanning boundaries for their own future students (Handa & Tippin, 2012; Klein et al., 2016; Styslinger et al., 2014).

Within a third space partnership, tension is always lurking. Therefore, the embracing of complexities is essential, and the instilling and practicing of collaborative habits is imperative. These necessary habits are enacted through stakeholders and their boundary-spanning capabilities. This includes overcoming borders and spanning boundaries between different types of people, ideas, and knowledge. It also includes investing in mutually collaborative relationships where power is considered and redistributed. As each voice is given the opportunity to contribute to the partnership, transformation and the co-construction of knowledge occurs. When this is done well, the co-construction of knowledge, transformation of stakeholders, democratic environments, and more mutual collaborations are apparent (Grudnoff et al., 2017; Hallman, 2012; Jackson & Burch, 2019). However, creating a third space in partnerships and clinical practice is a process, and the skills necessary to overcome tensions may be absent or need to be refined. I turn to this next.

Moving Forward

To continue moving toward a more genuine third space that embraces postcolonial ways of thinking, there must be intentionality and humility amongst stakeholders as Bhabha's (1994) hybridity is pursued. This hybrid space lacks polarization and othering, and it is a democratic space where power is negotiated, altered, and shared equitably. This space may also look different and require different variations of implementation depending on context. Therefore, borders should be recognized, processes must be embraced, and strategies must be put in place to aid in forwarding movement, spanning boundaries, and creating transformed identities. It is with this in mind that I make suggestions for third space partnerships that address the themes that surfaced in the review above. These suggestions are meant to provide implications and future steps related to moving further away from hierarchy, binaries, and borders and closer to pursuing more collaborative, democratic, and boundary-spanning interactions within partnerships, which ultimately supports postcolonial ways of being via third space.

The first way this can be pursued is through additional opportunities for intentional collaboration and relationship building amongst those in third space partnerships. The coming together of various stakeholders is of the utmost importance. To prevent issues of power and address the cultural hegemony that postcolonial thought brings to light, meeting etiquette may be bene-

ficial. By putting guidelines in place, a supportive, reciprocal environment where all stakeholder voices are heard is more achievable. Just as Robert's Rules of Order is used in various organizations to conduct meetings, there could be protocols associated with the major tenets of third space to guide partnership meetings. Additionally, it is important that stakeholders have more opportunities to work alongside one another as they did in Klein and colleagues' (2013) and Jackson and Burch's (2019) studies, because this supports the mutual transformation of third space. This could include sitting down together regularly and planning, teaching in classrooms, creating assessments, or even eating meals together. Kansas State University's PDS partnership pursued this by having a summer institute where stakeholders sat with one another as they addressed issues related to teacher education (Heller et al., 2007).

Additionally, third space partnerships could be expanded by more intentionally including TCs and members of the community within the partnership. However, the historical, regional, and sociopolitical context must always be attended to in these partnerships. For example, Hackett and colleagues' (2021) study of a partnerships in Atlanta, Georgia, focused on a collaborative of stakeholders within a teacher residency. However, these stakeholders were only representative of the university, school district, and individual schools. While these individuals were essential members, it would further partnerships to include community members and TCs within the collaborative. Specifically, it would add supplementary cultural and historical contexts to the partnership that would in turn promote additional transformation of the partnership. Hackett and colleagues (2021) wrote,

> Contexts are often neglected in clinical teacher practice, but context and culturally relevant pedagogy must, in actuality, be understood and explicitly centered if teacher educators can ever cross traditional boundaries to develop new identities and design experiences outside of clinical practice for transformation and social justice. (p. 35)

I would expand this thought to include all stakeholders in addition to teacher educators. Take for instance the southern capital of Virginia, which is Richmond. Richmond was the capital of the Confederacy during the Civil War. As a result, in addition to including additional stakeholders there is a necessity for a partnership to understand the numerous cultural and historical repercussions of this both in the past and currently. This would require honest and open dialogue. While differences and tensions may initially surface, dialogue would also provide a third space for new and contextual learning, resolutions, and transformations, which would take into consideration the implications and outcomes of the Confederacy on the city of Richmond, as well as its universities, schools, communities, and the various individuals that make up each of the entities.

I would also recommend that partnership stakeholders intentionally pursue reciprocal professional development to aid in fostering collaboration and relationships (NAPDS, 2008). Reciprocal professional development is for all stakeholders within the partnership regardless of their position, which speaks to creating a more democratic third space. This type of professional development is specific to the needs of the partnership, which furthers the transformation of a collaborative and innovative space specific to the contextual progress of the partnership's identity. I would suggest that this begin with partnership stakeholders reimagining knowledge more collaboratively as the professional development space is pursued. Like the reciprocal approach in Lee's (2018) study of a community-based partnership, this would require not entering a space with a preconceived agenda or idea. Instead, professional development agendas would be created together. There would also be a recognition of the positionality and assets specific to each stakeholder. For example, those from the university should acknowledge their historical context in relation to the knowledge of the school and community, and instead approach professional development in a way that is beneficial to all partners and acknowledges the alternative knowledges that are essential to teacher education.

In addition, the idea of fostering a new identity within partnerships is essential because third space requires an embracing of a new identity that goes beyond the seemingly autonomous ones currently held. Therefore, there it is a coming together that disregards the colonial "us" and "them" and embraces a new "us" instead. This new identity aids in removing any instances of what postcolonialism labels as othering. However, to truly become something or someone new there also must be a willingness to embrace the tensions, reflect, and grow, as I mentioned previously when considering the cultural and historical contexts of all stakeholders within a context such as Richmond (Alsup, 2006). Therefore, I recommend there be intentional, regular reflection amongst those in the partnership. This would require exploring data, considering where the partnership is, and where the partnership wants to go. However, it would also require those individuals within the partnership to reflect individually on their roles and progress toward promoting a third space. For instance,

those in the Richmond context may need to ask themselves questions such as, Do I have misconceptions about other stakeholders or stakeholder groups rooted in the cultural and historical past of my city? How can I overcome these borders? How can I help others overcome borders? These questions and answers will differ based on the individual, group, and context, but reflecting on such questions is essential to both individual and partnership identity growth when pursuing a third space.

Along with meeting etiquette, working alongside one another, and embracing new identities, there should also be more intentionality when possible to select stakeholders. While each role within a third space partnership is pertinent, there is a particular need for stakeholders with boundary spanning characteristics, because boundary spanning is essential to third space and Bhabha's (1994) postcolonial idea of hybridity. Therefore, to move forward, third space partnerships need clear criteria for each stakeholder. This need not only be a definition, but rather characteristics needed for being a boundary spanner. Context will need to be considered here too, because having stakeholders who understand or are willing to understand the spaces in which they find themselves is important to a third space. For example, if a boundary spanner was needed in Atlanta, it would be essential to pursue someone with a solid grasp on the cultural and historical past of the city and its residents. Additionally, these boundary spanners should be present within each entity of the partnership: university, school, and community.

This importance and need for boundary spanners in the creation of a third space points to the necessity of further research in this specific area. It is essential to consider who would be the best boundary spanner, but more importantly, it is essential to consider how one is a boundary spanner. Questions for further research may include: What characteristics are most essential in a boundary spanner? What boundary spanners are needed in different contexts? How can one become a boundary spanner? In addition, the time, effort, and monetary compensation for this type of position must be considered (Zeichner, 2010). Finally, the research in this review was overwhelmingly qualitative in nature. For example, it included case studies, program descriptions, and self-studies. Future research needs to expand to include participatory qualitative research (Beck, 2018). For example, action research has the potential to disrupt power dynamics as the goal is to create change together, which further supports the postcolonial idea of hybridity within the research of third space, partnerships, and clinical practice. As stakeholders create research questions specific to their context, collect data, and make action steps for change, transformation amongst stakeholders would be further promoted. In addition, third space is a theory that must be applied over time. The process, as well as the progress, is essential to creating third space. Therefore, longitudinal studies are recommended for future research in this area.

In conclusion, further application and implementation of third space within clinical practice and partnerships will continue to challenge and push teacher education to more postcolonial ways of being to better prepare teachers for all contexts. For instance, including community knowledge within third space partnerships aids in preparing culturally relevant teachers who challenge misconceptions and focus on the assets of their specific community and students (Cahill et al., 2016; Lee, 2018). In addition, purposefully weaving theory and practice together through partnerships, clinical practice, and its various relationships creates equipped teachers who are aware of best practices rooted in research and are also able to implement them within the practice of a contextually specific classroom (Klein et al., 2016; Souto-Manning & Martell, 2019). Therefore, intentional reflection and pursuit of purposeful steps forward are essential for third space partnerships, and it is within this intentionality that the promise of this work is seen as small steps lead to larger changes over time.

References

Alsup, J. (2006). *Teacher identity discourses: Negotiating personal and professional spaces*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

American Association of College for Teacher Education (2018). *A pivot toward clinical practice, its lexicon, and the renewal of educator preparation*. Author. https://aacte.org/

Beck, J. (2018). Investigating the third space: A new agenda for teacher education research. *Journal of Teacher Education, 71*(4), 379-391. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0022487118787497

Beck, J. (2016). The complexities of a third-space partnership in an urban teacher residency. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 43*(1), 51-70. https://www.jstor.org/stable/teaceducquar.43.1.51

Bhabha, H. (1994). *The location of culture*. Routledge.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *3*(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Cahill, H., Coffey, J., & Mclean Davies, L. (2016). Learning with and from: Positioning school students as advisors in pre-service teacher education. *Teacher Development, 20*(3), 295-312. https://doi.org/10.1080/13664530.2016.1155478

Chan, C. (2019). Crossing institutional borders: Exploring pre-service teacher education partnerships through the lens of border theory. *Teaching & Teacher Education, 86*, 1-10. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2019.102893

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (2013). *CAEP 2013 standards for the accreditation of educator preparation.* http://caepnet.org/~/media/Files/caep/standards/caep-standards-one-pager-0219.pdf?la=en

Darling-Hammond, L. (2010). Teacher education and the American future. *Journal of Teacher Education, 61*(1-2), 35-47. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0022487109348024

Farrell, R. (2021). The school-university nexus and degrees of partnership in initial teacher education. *Irish Educational Studies*, 1-18. https://doi.org/10.1080/03323315.2021.1899031

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed.* The Continuum International Publishing group Inc.

Gandhi, L. (2019). *Postcolonial theory: A critical introduction* (2nd Ed.). Columbia University Press.

Gannon, S. (2010). Service learning as a third space in pre-service teacher education. *Issues in Education Research, 20*(1), 21-28. http://www.iier.org.au/iier20/gannon.pdf

Goodlad, J. I. (1990). *Teachers for our nation's schools.* Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers.

Grudnoff, L., Haigh, M, & Mackisack, V. (2017). Re-envisaging and reinvigorating school-university practicum partnerships. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 45*(2), 180-193. https://doi.org/10.1080/1359866X.2016.1201043

Gutiérrez, K. D. (2008). Developing a sociocritical literacy in third space. *Reading Research Quarterly, 43*(2), 148-164. https://doi.org/10.1598/RRQ.43.2.3

Hackett, J., Williams, R., Davis, C., Behm Cross, S., Behizadeh, N., & Hearn, E. (2021). Tensions in designing a third space in a justice-oriented teacher residency: Toward an authentic collaborative for clinical practice. *Peabody Journal of Education, 96*(1), 32-43. https://doi.org/10.1080/0161956X.2020.1864244

Hallman, H. (2012). Community-based clinical practice in teacher education: Possibilities for a pedagogical third space. *Teaching Education, 23*(3), 241-263. https://doi.org/10.1080/10476210.2011.641528

Handa, V. C, & Tippins, D. J. (2012). Tensions in third space: Locating relevancy in preservice science teacher preparation. *International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education*, 11(1), 237-265. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10763-012-9364-x

Heller, M. F., Wood, N. J., & Shawgo, M. (2007). Teaching and learning language arts: From campus to classroom and back again. *Journal of Educational Research*, 100(4), 226–234. https://doi.org/10.3200/JOER.100.4.226-234

Ikpeze, C., Broikou, K., Hildenbrand, S., & Gladstone-Brown, W. (2012). PDS collaboration as third space: An analysis of the quality of learning experiences in a PDS partnership. *Studying Teacher Education: Journal of Self-Study of Teacher Education Practices*, 8(3), 275–288. https://doi.org/10.1080/17425964.2012.719125

Jackson, A., & Burch, J. (2019). New directions for teacher education: Investigating school/university partnership in an increasingly school-based context. *Professional Development in Education, 45*(1), 138-150. https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2018.1449002

Jackson, A. & Burch, J. (2016). School Direct, a policy for initial teacher training in England: Plotting a principled pedagogical path through a changing landscape. *Professional Development in Education, 42*(4), 511-526. https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2015.1052090

Jonsdottir, A. (2015). University-preschool partnership and workplace-based learning: A collaborative 'third space' or no space

at all? *Early Years, 35*(2), 184-196. https://doi.org/10.1080/09575146.2015.1026248

Klein, E. J., Taylor, M., Onore, C., Strom, K., & Abrams, L. (2016). Exploring inquiry in the third space: Case studies of a year in an urban teacher-residency program. *The New Educator, 12*(3), 243-268. https://doi.org/10.1080/1547688X.2016.1187980

Klein, E. J., Taylor, M., Onore, C., Strom, K., & Abrams, L. (2013). Finding third space in teacher education: Creating an urban teacher residency. *Teaching Education, 24*(1), 27-57. https://doi.org/10.1080/10476210.2012.711305

Lee, R. E. (2018). Breaking down barriers and building bridges: Transformative practices in community- and school-based urban teacher preparation. *Journal of Teacher Education, 69*(2), 118-126. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0022487117751127

Martin, S. D., Snow, J. L., & Franklin Torrez, C. A. (2011). Navigating the terrain of third space: Tensions with/in relationships in school-university partnerships. *Journal of Teacher Education, 62*(3), 299-311. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0022487110396096

McCulloch, A., Bailey, N., & Fye, K. (2020). Creating a third space for learning to design technology-based mathematics tasks. *Mathematics Teacher Educator, 9*(1), 7-22. https://doi.org/10.5951/MTE.2020.0011

McDonough, S. (2014). Rewriting the script of mentoring pre-service teachers in third space: Exploring tensions of loyalty, obligation and advocacy. *Studying Teacher Education: Journal of Self-Study of Teacher Education Practices*, 10(3), 210–221. https://doi.org/10.1080/17425964.2014.949658

Moje, E., Ciechanowski, K., Kramer, K., Ellis, L., Carrillo, R., & Collazo, T. (2004). Working toward third space in content area literacy: An examination of everyday funds of knowledge and discourse. *Reading Research Quarterly, 29*(1), 36-70. https://doi-org.proxy.lib.odu.edu/10.1598/RRQ.39.1.4

Moran, C. M. (2018). Learners without borders: Connected learning in a digital third space. *Contemporary Issues in Technology & Teacher Education*, 18(2), 233-254. https://www.learntechlib.org/primary/p/180742/

Mutemeri, J. & Chetty, R. (2011). An examination of university-school partnerships in South Africa. *South African Journal of Education, 31*(4), 505-517. https://doi.org/10.15700/saje.v31n4a325

National Association for Professional Development Schools (2008). *What it means to be a professional development school.* Author.https://3atjfr1bmy981egf6x3utg20-wpengine.netdna-ssl.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/What-it-Means-to-Be-A-Professional-Dev-School.pdf

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) Blue Ribbon Panel (2010). *Transforming teacher education through clinical practice; A national strategy to prepare effective teachers.* Author. http://www.high-ered.nysed.gov/pdf/NCATECR.pdf

Nickens, N., Loman, K, McCoy, A, Tye, N., Danley, A, & DeVilbiss, M. (2018). Matched for success: Strategic student teaching placements. *School-University Partnerships, 11*(4), 5-15. https://3atjfr1bmy981egf6x3utg20-wpengine.netdna-ssl.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/1-Final_Nickens-6_18.pdf

Passy, R., Georgeson, J., & Gompertz, B. (2018). Building learning partnerships between schools and universities: An example from south-west England, *Journal of Education for Teaching, 44*(5), 539-555, https://doi.org/10.1080/02607476.2018.1516346

Phompun, C., Thongthew, S., & Zeichner, K. (2013). Pre-service teacher education in Thailand in the Third space. *International Forum of Teaching and Studies, 9*(1), 11-20.

Ramsaroop, S., & Gravett, S. (2017). The potential of teaching schools in enabling student teacher learning for the teaching profession. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 49*(6), 848-865. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220272.2017.1325516

Routledge, P. (1996). The third space as critical engagement. *Antipode, 28*(4), 399-419. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8330.1996.tb00533.x

Said, E. W. (1978). *Orientalism*. Vintage Books.

Soja, E. (1996). *Thirdspace: Journeys to Los Angeles and other real-and-imagined places*. Blackwell Publishers.

Souto-Manning, M., & Martell, J. (2019). Toward critically transformative possibilities: Considering tensions and undoing inequities in the spatialization of teacher education. *Teachers College Record, 121*(6), 1-42.

Steele, A. R. (2017). An alternative collaborative supervision practice between university-based teachers and school-based teachers. *Issues in Education Research, 27*(3), 582-599.

Styslinger, M., Walker, N., & Eberlin, E. (2014). Teaching in "third space": Understanding pre-service teachers' reading with incarcerated teens. *Journal of Reading Education, 39*(2), 23-29.

Sykes, G., Bird, T., & Kennedy, M. (2010). Teacher education: Its problems and some prospects. *Journal of Teacher Education, 61*(5), 464-476. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0022487110375804

Taylor, M., Klein, E. J., & Abrams, L. (2014). Tensions of reimagining our roles as teacher educators in a third space: Revisiting a co/autoethnography through a faculty lens. *Studying Teacher Education, 10*(1), 3-19. https://doi.org/10.1080/17425964.2013.866549

The Holmes Group (1986). *A report of The Holmes Group: Tomorrow's teachers*. The Holmes Group.

Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.

Williams, J. (2014). Teacher educator professional learning in the Third space: Implications for identity and practice. *Journal of Teacher Education, 65*(4), 315-326. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487114533128

Zeichner, K. (2010). Rethinking the connections between campus courses and clinical practice in college- and university-based teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 61*(1-2), 89-99. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0022487109347671