DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 295 937 SP 030 348

AUTHOR Liston, Daniel P.; Zeichner, Kenneth M.
TITLE Critical Pedagogy and Teacher Education.
PUB DATE Apr 88
NOTE 44p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 5-9, 1988).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Controversial Issues (Course Content); Critical Thinking; Curriculum Development; *Educational Change; Educational Research; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; *Moral Issues; *Politics of Education; Social Problems; Teacher Education; *Teacher Educators; *Teacher Responsibility

ABSTRACT

The authors offer their view of a normative basis for an approach to teacher education that contributes to the establishment of more critical and emancipatory practices in the public schools of United States. These ideas are then linked to the broader tradition of radicalism in teacher education. A variety of conceptual lenses and instructional strategies utilized by radically oriented teacher educators are discussed together with the possibilities for the realization of a radical agenda for teacher education. It is argued that teacher educators need to become much more politically involved in confronting the external conditions that limit the possibilities for reform in teacher education. (Author)

CRITICAL PEDAGOGY AND TEACHER EDUCATION

Daniel P. Liston

Washington University

Kenneth M. Zeichner

University of Wisconsin-Madison

Presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, April, 1988

ABSTRACT

The authors offer their view of a normative basis for an approach to teacher education that contributes to the establishment of more critical and emancipatory practices in the public schools of the U.S. These ideas are then linked to the broader tradition of radicalism in teacher education. A variety of conceptual lenses and instructional strategies utilized by radically oriented teacher educators are discussed together with the possibilities for the realization of a radical agenda for teacher education. It is argued that teacher educators need to become much more politically involved in confronting the external conditions that limit the possibilities for reform in teacher education.

Teacher education in the United States is a massive enterprise. Teacher preparation programs exist today in approximately 1,400 colleges and universities which together make up about 80% of all tertiary institutions in the country. Students pursuing a teaching certificate represent anywhere from a fifth to a quarter of all college and university students in the U.S. Our public schools absorb about 200,000 new teachers each year. According to some estimates over half of the current teaching force of about two million will need to be replaced within the next decade (Lanier, 1986). These demographics, together with the unquestionably key role of classroom teachers in any educational reform effort, underline the importance of teacher education reform.

This paper addresses the important role for teacher education in efforts to bring about more emancipatory educational practices in our public schools. A more critically oriented approach to teacher education, in conjunction with other educational, political, and economic reforms, could help to create a more democratic and just society. We view teacher education reform as an important part of a more comprehensive reform strategy, one that must also include changes in the preparation and training of school administrators and other support personnel, the quality of working conditions in schools and universities, the occupational structure of teaching, state certification and testing policies, and the unequal economic, political, and social realities that characterize our society as a whole. While all of these reform efforts are necessary, none of them are likely to make a significant and lasting impact if the quality of teacher education is not improved as well.

We begin this paper by presenting our own views of the basis for a critically oriented teacher education program that contributes to the

environment, and then engage in political action, seems misplaced. It seems odd to expect prospective teachers and their future students to come to agreement in areas where teachers (and the entire adult population) reasonably disagree, or to accomplish what teachers either have not tried to change or have been unsuccessful at changing.

Now this is not to say that teachers should shy away from presenting controversial curricular topics or maintaining certain moral norms in the classroom. In fact, we do not see how an elementary education could be educational without discussing controversial issues or how an educational environment could exist without establishing moral norms. A discussion of two distinct moral concerns should illustrate our point. There are good reasons for all of us to be concerned with how conflicts are resolved and with the stewardship of our natural resources. These two domains have implications for both personal interactions and social policy. Within the classroom it is certainly defensible to promote the peaceful resolution of conflicts and the conservation of school resources. These norms can and should guide interactions within the classroom. With regard to social policy it would be highly instructive for students to examine the different ways to resolve national and international conflicts, and the various approaches to conserve natural resources. And, in these particular instances, it would seem reasonable for teachers to assume generally that peaceful resolutions of conflict are preferable to violent ones and that scarce resources ought to be conserved. This all seems quite defensible. But what would be problematic is the expectation that teachers should rally their students to join a particular cause (e.g. the Sandinistas in Nicaragua -- even though we personally support

When arguing that teacher education programs should encourage teachers to act as transformative intellectuals, Giroux and McClaren (1986) state that teachers must

> replace pedagogical practices which emphasize disciplinary control and one-sided character formation with practices that are based on emancipatory authority, ones which enable students to engage in critical analysis and to make choices regarding what interests and knowledge claims are most desirable and morally appropriate for living in a just and democratic state. Equally important is the need for students to engage in civic-minded action in order to remove the social and political constraints that restrict the victims of this society from leading decent and humane lives. (p. 225)

In order to engage in this sort of "civic-minded action" both teacher and student must know and agree on the constraints which restrict people from leading decent lives. While we believe that the forces of class, gender, and racial discrimination restrict many people, this assessment is by no means shared by all members of our society. And although we personally agree with much of the spirit of the radical critique of schooling, we nevertheless recognize that it lacks crucial evidential and ethical substantiation (Liston, in press-a, in press-b). It is difficult enough to envision a collection of adults arriving at agreement on specific "civic-minded" actions, much less adolescents or children. To expect students to arrive at consensus on these matters in a noncoercive

of teachers as transformative intellectuals presents teaching as a thoughtful, skilled, and reflective endeavor. They maintain that teachers teach in institutions where the effects of class, racial, and gender discrimination are quite apparent. They also convey with passion and clarity the cultural task of schooling. Schools are places where social, political, and personal meanings are conveyed and created. Teachers are central actors in this process. On these and many other points we support Giroux and McClaren's analysis. However there is one essential area of difference. In their attempt to "politicize" schooling, we feel they blur an essential distinction between the teacher as educator and the teacher as political activist. We maintain that a critical and emancipatory teacher education program should encourage prospective teachers to consider both roles but, at the same time, it must honor the following distinction: in the classroom the teacher is first and foremost an educator and only tangentially (if at all) a political activist. Teachers, as citizens and workers, can and should engage in political action outside the classroom, especially that action which would create better conditions for schooling. But teachers, as educators, must struggle to help students find their own voice and develop their own identities. Teachers, as educators, should be more concerned with enabling students to acquire and critically examine moral beliefs. This entails a careful and impartial consideration of the plurality of moral issues. Premature and misplaced calls for student participation in political transformation obstruct rather than facilitate students' moral inquiry.

> interlocutor to see things as you do, if only for the time. A pupil may discover, in the course of discussion, what he [her]himself thinks, what moral views [s]he holds. But he cannot do this without exercising his imagination to see in the material under discussion a moral issue.... The teacher must help him to exercise [her]his imagination; it is indeed his only serious function; and thus he must help him to see the material as morally significant. (p. 170)

We agree with Warnock that the teacher's role is to engage students' moral judgments. But we also want to reinforce the idea that without presenting a plurality of positions, the students' education may be too narrowly circumscribed and not adequately facilitated. The teacher educator must ensure that the full range of views is present. This is not to say that teacher educators must stand up and pretend to be someone they are not, but that their students deserve a fair and honest treatment of any morally relevant topic. A critical education would seem to require this sort of moral deliberation.[2]

Teachers as Political Activists

Recently Henry Giroux and Peter McClaren (1986) proposed a view of teachers as transformative intellectuals. While there is much to commend in their proposal, we feel uneasy with some of the implications of their view. But before we note our concerns, we want to underline the many similarities to our own position. Giroux and McClaren's view

> Part of the point, ... is to teach them [children] to judge fairly on the evidence, and to understand the arguments both for and against [a] proposition. But part of the point is also actually to get them to think about right and wrong, good and evil, to think, that is to say about morals. If this is accepted as part of their education, then they must not be deprived of the spectacle of a teacher who holds, and clearly expresses, moral views. There is nothing but benefit in the contemplation of a [woman or]man of principle. A [woman or]man without moral views is after all a monster and it is hard for pupils, especially if they are quite young, to realize that the neutral teacher is only play-acting. Moreover, if they do realize this, they resent it. Practically speaking, one of the things one learns from teaching children is that play-acting is despicable. The first rule of teaching is sincerity, even if one's sincerity is dotty or eccentric.

She adds that:

> For holding a moral belief is in some respects like having a vision. It is in a sense, an imaginative vision of how things ought to be though they are not. Expressing a moral belief is thus attempting to share a vision or way of looking, and this cannot be done without in some sense attempting to get your

> an "objective" or "impartial" manner. To teach honesty as if it were a kind of safety rule or conventional form of courtesy may effectively accomplish the first aim without in the least furthering the second. It cannot, on the other hand, be denied that a serious attempt to accomplish the second may delay and even impede the achievement of the first. (To encourage a reflective and impartial critique of norms may lead to a rejection of our norms.) We may, as teachers [and as teacher educators], try to further both aims by subjecting the very norms we are concerned with under the first aim to the very sort of reflective scrutiny we encourage under the second. (p. 95)

While we believe that particular practices within our schools are unjust and contribute to a larger system of injustice, we also maintain that a truly critical education must encourage an examination of this belief and other contrasting views. If the teacher education curriculum is to encourage moral reflection, choice between sufficiently varied and articulated positions is essential.

Now this is not to say that committed radical or conservative teacher educators should not present their views to students. Pedagogically it makes good sense for teachers to present their views. We agree with Mary Warnock (1975) when she writes that teachers who do not present and develop their own positions fail to educate their students.

that other reasonable individuals do not share the radical point of view. Other defensible moral positions exist. Rather than viewing schools as harbingers of injustice, many people feel that our public schools adequately, though not perfectly, prepare students for their appropriate futures. Others maintain that our schools fail o transmit the essential cultural knowledge, and still others argue that our schools do not adequately train our industrial and clerical workers. In short, a variety of moral assessments exist. It would seem that, by definition, a reflective and critical approach to the moral education of teachers would recognize this plurality and enable future teachers to identify and choose between sufficiently articulated and reasonably distinct moral positions. If the education of future teachers is going to be truly critical, if it is to encourage an examination and assessment of the assumptions and logic of distinct educational views and the consequences of schooling, then the moral choices confronting prospective teachers ought to be sufficiently clear, distinct, and varied. The goal of a reflective and critically oriented teacher education program is certainly not moral inculcation, but rather a reflective examination of educational goals and alternative courses of action. Unfortunately, this distinction between inculcation and moral education is all too frequently overlooked. Israel Scheffler (1960) highlights this distinction when he states:

> If moral conduct is our goal in moral education, we are, in effect, striving to achieve not alone the acquisition of norms of a given sort in practice, but the reflective support of norms of this sort in

of education as a virtue-laden social practice. Our reflective approach to teacher education is centrally concerned with developing morally and intellectually autonomous prospective teachers, who are compassionate and caring toward others and engaged in developing their identities as teachers. Since much of our discussion has been fairly abstract, we would like to clarify further our conception. We will extend it in three ways. First, we clarify what we mean by moral deliberation and how that meshes with the radical educational tradition. Second, we caution against the portrayal of teachers as political activists within the classroom. And finally, we argue that prospective teachers should begin to examine and alter those features of schooling and teachers' work which obstruct a critical and emancipatory education.

Moral Deliberation, Teacher Education, and the Radical Tradition

Our proposal that future teachers ought to examine the moral implications of pedagogy and the structure of schooling is motivated by a desire to incorporate moral and political principles into educational discourse and to identify connections between life in the classroom and wider social conditions. We believe this sort of examination enables future teachers to raise important social, political, and moral questions. Now many of the authors who have proposed reflective, critical, or emancipatory programs (ourselves included) are motivated by a specific desire to rectify social and educational inequality and injustice. We, along with others in the radical tradition, believe that our schools contribute to an unjust society. We want prospective teachers to consider these radical critiques (Liston & Zeichner, 1987). But we recognize

and moral autonomy, a sense of community, and an ethic of caring are key goals for any education at the elementary or secondary level. When viewed in this manner, education is construed as a social practice, one which depends on the honest, just, and courageous actions of teachers and is focused on developing intellectually and morally autonomous, compassionate, and caring students.

We have found this view of education as a "virtue-laden" social practice to be compatible with--and in fact provide a foundation for--our reflective approach to teacher education. In the past, we have maintained that future teachers ought to be taught and encouraged to critically analyze and reflect on (a) the pedagogical and curricular means used to attain justifiable educational aims, (b) the underlying assumptions and consequences of pedagogical action, and (c) the moral implications of pedagogical actions and the structure of schooling (Liston & Zeichner, 1987; Zeichner & Liston, 1987). For the most part we have focused on the third area, the moral implications of pedagogy and school structure, since we believed this to be not only a neglected area in teacher education, but also a route to a more rigorous examination of schools. We sensed that if prospective teachers began to examine the moral implications of schooling and pedagogy, these experiences would facilitate a more personal examination of schools and also enhance their development as teachers. We felt that this sort of deliberation could not occur unless novice teachers experienced a degree of community, security, and support. That is, in order for novice teachers to examine critically schools and teaching, they need to feel that their instructors and peers are supportive. In short, the goals and values of our reflective approach are congruent with the view

schooling. We begin with Alasdair MacIntyre's (1984) notion of a social practice.

Education as a Value-Laden Social Practice

In MacIntyre's view, a social practice (e.g. sustaining family life, farming, politics in the Aristotelian sense, and--we would add--education) is a complex, socially established, and cooperative human activity. It is the type of activity in which the goods internal to it can only be realized through attempts to achieve standards of excellence which "are appropriate to and partially definitive of, that form of activity" (p. 187). A major purpose for engaging in one of these social practices is that "the human powers to achieve excellence, and human conceptions of the ends and goods involved, are systematically extended" (p. 187). MacIntyre goes on to explain that these practices require a "certain kind of relationship between those who participate" in them (p. 187). He maintains that these goods can only be achieved "by subordinating ourselves within the practice in our relationship to other practitioners" (p. 187). By subordination, it is evident that MacIntyre does not mean to imply an oppressive relationship. Instead, he claims that practitioners must honor the virtues of justice, honesty, and courage in their relationships with others. In order to engage in social practice, the participants need to treat each other fairly and honestly and act out of conviction. These virtues are necessary conditions for the continuation of any practice. MacIntyre does not talk directly about education and so we have specified goods internal to the practice of education. We maintain that the development of students' personal identity, their intellectual

act in morally virtuous ways (to be moral, caring, considerate teachers). This process of developing a conception of "reflective teaching" goes on as we continue to critique our visions of what our work* is about. We've argued before that "reflection" has become a slogan that has lacked sufficient conceptual elaboration and programmatic strength (Liston & Zeichner, 1987). This paper is part of our continuing effort to clarify and elaborate our own conception of "reflection" and "reflective teacher education."

In the past we have argued that teacher educators should encourage reflective analysis of, and moral deliberation over, the dilemmas of teaching and schooling. In this paper we focus on issues of moral deliberation. Within this focus we maintain that teacher educators must educate, not inculcate. In order to support this view we first outline a view of education as a virtue-laden social practice and as an exercise in reflective inquiry. We then move on to consider how our view of reflective inquiry supports a critical approach to moral deliberation, how our conception cautions against viewing teachers as political activists within the classroom, and how it simultaneously encourages the political activity of teachers outside the classroom. In this manner, we hope to clarify and defend a particular view of teacher education, one which is not only critical, but also promises to help emancipate future teachers and their students. In the second major section of this paper (Concepts and Strategies for the Development of Critical Pedagogy in Teacher Education) we outline pedagogical approaches which encourage an examination of the moral implications of pedagogy and the structure of

where inquiry about teaching is viewed as a legitimate part of the work of teaching.

During the process of reconceptualizing our program, the term "reflective teaching" became a construct that organized our thinking about our work. "Reflective teaching" began as a slogan that represented more of a reaction against what we didn't like about our program than as a clearly articulated and elaborated vision of what we wanted to create. Over the years we have gradually developed both our notions of what reflective teaching means in our program and a set of pedagogical strategies and curricular plans to bring it about.

We began with the Deweyian distinction between reflective action (the active, persistent and careful consideration of any belief in light of the grounds that support it and the consequences to which it leads) and routine action (that which is guided primarily by tradition, external authority and circumstance). We also began to differentiate between different forms of reflection - technical, practical, and critical (see Zeichner & Liston, 1987) and to stress the importance of problematicizing the context in deliberations about teaching. We also began to stress the fact that reflection was not merely an intellectual activity, but was one moment in a larger process of strategic action. Also, in some of our work we began to identify substantive areas as foci for reflection (e.g. multicultural education) that we felt need particular attention in our program (Gillette, 1988). Most recently we've begun to elaborate a conception of a process of moral deliberation about teaching that incorporates both an "ethic of duty" (where students confront a plurality of moral positions) and an "ethic of virtue" (where students strive to

a teacher educator, as a member of a school, community and occupation, and as a member of a society where the gaps between the "haves" and the "have nots" grows increasingly wider over time and where the quality of education one receives depends to a degree on the color of one's skin and on the economic standing of one's parents. For many of our students, teaching became separated from its moral and ethical roots. Issues of justice and equity were not at the forefront of students' minds as they sought to master the technical dimensions of teaching.

In many ways our program resembled a typical apprenticeship model of field experience where it is implicitly assumed that good teaching is "caught" and not taught - where if good things happened, they happened more by good fortune than by deliberate design. For many students, student teaching was viewed as a time merely to apply things previously learned and not as an occasion for continued learning about teaching. Traditional notions of theory as existing within the universities and practice within the schools prevailed. The practice of the university and the theories embedded in school practices had not been attended to in any great degree.

Over the last decade many of the faculty, graduate students, and classroom teachers who work in this program have sought to come together to develop strategies that would foster more systematic and deliberate attention to teacher learning during the student teaching experience. We've sought, in part, to redefine the common sense meaning of student teaching and of the ways in which student teachers learn from firsthand experience in schools - from an exercise in apprenticeship to an experience

realization of more emancipatory educational practices in schools. We then link these ideas to a broader perspective of radicalism in teacher education and review a variety of conceptual lenses and instructional strategies that have been employed by practicing teacher educators to organize thinking and practice within this tradition. Finally we address the possibilities for achieving this radical agenda for teacher education and identify three levels of reform that need to be pursued simultaneously by would-be reformers of teacher education.

A CRITICAL APPROACH TO TEACHER EDUCATION

It is clear to us that teacher educators can begin to provide programs that are critical and, in the best sense, emancipatory. Teachers educated within these programs might then be prepared to engage their own students in a meaningful and productive education. However, since our view of a critical and emancipatory education differs from other conceptions, we think it best to clarify our own position.[1]

As a result of studies conducted by faculty and graduate students at the University of Wisconsin-Madison in the mid-1970's, we became concerned about the ways in which our student teaching program was failing to foster habits and capabilities that would lead to continued learning about teaching and becoming better at teaching over time. We were concerned about the overly technical and narrow emphasis that many of our students assumed during their participation in the teacher education program. Narrow, in that students were mainly concerned with the mastery of teaching skills within classrooms and not with the broader dimensions of the teacher's role, as a curriculum developer, as

the Sandinista cause), to march against alleged industrial polluters (even though we, as concerned citizens, would march), or to present only one side of a controversial issue. In the elementary classroom in particular, calls for political action or one-sided presentations are much too risky. The potential for harm seems all too likely.

The problem with this sort of approach lies in part, we think, with the foggy conception of emancipation and freedom. All too often the concept of emancipation (and freedom) is used as a slogan. The affiliative functions of the concept are much stronger than its conceptual foundation. When this situation occurs, much confusion is bound to exist. Freedom is an essential concept for radical (and nonradical) educators, and in this case requires further elaboration. In particular, the connection between students' freedom and their developing identities has not been explored adequately. Frithjof Bergmann (1977) argues, and we agree, that the concept of freedom is conceptually dependent on the concept of identity. He states that:

> An act is free if the agent identifies with the elements from which it flows; it is coerced if the agent disassociates [her- or]himself from the element which generates or prompts the action. This means that identification is logically prior to freedom, and that freedom is not a primary but a derivative notion. Freedom is a function of identity and stands in a relationship of dependency to that with which a man [or woman] identifies. If an identification is present, the corresponding freedom appears. The

> primary condition of freedom is the possession of an identity, or of a self-freedom is the acting out of that identity. (p. 37)

If freedom is the acting out of an identity and education is centrally concerned with the development of a student's identity, then care and caution must attend this process. We fear that an educational agenda that calls for action, especially civic-minded action in areas as fuzzy and diffuse as those which restrict people from leading decent and humane lives, is likely to be premature at best and indoctrinatory at worst. In order for a classroom of students to agree to action which flows from their identity, teachers must respect the variety of potential student identifications. In order for an education to be emancipatory it must first and foremost be concerned with the development of students' identities. Only when students identify with the elements from which the action flows, can their education be referred to as emancipatory.

Teacher Education and the Conditions of Schooling

Now although we are highly cautious about such "civic-minded action" within the classroom, we encourage it outside the classroom. It is essential for prospective teachers to consider how teachers' work and the conditions of schooling obstruct teaching and learning and to consider ways to alter those conditions which are viewed as obstacles. Much of the current reflectively oriented literature on teachers and teaching neglects this crucial aspect. Donald Schon (1987) has elaborated a reflective approach to the artistry of teaching. Freema Elbaz (1983) has supported a view of teachers' practical knowledge. And Alan Tom

(1984) has offered a view of teaching as a moral craft. All three of these authors neglect the larger social context of teaching, either focusing primarily on isolated teaching acts or assuming an insular institutional context. As a result the student of education is left with detailed and indeed interesting accounts of educational practice, but with relatively little knowledge about the social and political context of this practice. Teacher education programs should begin to examine how the conditions of schooling and teacher's work inhibit prospective teachers' chosen goals. As a novice teacher develops beliefs about such issues as ability grouping, cooperative social relations in the classroom, discipline and classroom control, or approaches to reading instruction, then it is the role of the teacher educator to help the prospective teacher examine the ways in which the conditions of schooling and teachers' work obstruct or facilitate their goals.

For example, if a prospective teacher felt that ability grouping was a major impediment to quality and fair instruction she or he should know that many teachers believe ability grouping to be an efficient means of distributing educational resources, even though they may feel somewhat uncomfortable with the practice. Institutionally, ability grouping allows students to be tracked through a school-wide or district-wide reading program. Bureaucratically, this is said to be an advantage. And historically, ability grouping has lent credence to the notion that schools operate meritocratically. Ability grouping has helped to legitimate schools as intellectual and social sorters. If a young teacher wanted to alter the practice of ability grouping in his or her classroom, an understanding of these forces would certainly be pertinent.

In this section we have argued for an emancipatory and critical view of teacher education, one which encourages moral deliberation while recognizing the plurality of moral stances. Such a view acknowledges the distinction between the teacher as an educator and teacher as a political activist. and encourages an examination of the conditions of schooling. In the next section we will examine a variety of strategies that have been employed by teacher educators committed to these and similar goals.

CONCEPTS AND STRATEGIES FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF CRITICAL PEDAGOGY THROUGH TEACHER EDUCATION

The Radical Tradition in Teacher Education

While radical teacher educators disagree over specific aspects of an emancipatory approach to teacher education, they also share a set of commitments and common purposes which challenge dominant ideologies and practices in teacher education. In fact, an increasingly visible minority of teacher educators in the U.S. and abroad have attempted to develop teacher education programs which are both critical and emancipatory. These teacher educators have employed a variety of conceptual lenses and pedagogical strategies to facilitate their educational commitments. Having already developed further our own view of a critical and emancipatory education, we wish now to (a) describe the dominant ideological perspectives within teacher education, (b) discuss the strategies developed and used thus far by radical teacher educators to facilitate an emancipatory approach, and (c) briefly consider the necessary conditions for change to occur in teacher education. So as to place the critical orientation within a larger context, we begin with a characterization of the dominant perspectives within teacher education.

David Kirk (1986) has identified three dominant ideological perspectives in the theoretical discourse of teacher education that have been in conflict with each other throughout most of the history of formalized teacher education programs. The first perspective, traditionalism, is based on a view of teaching as a craft and of teachers as craftspersons.[3] According to this view, knowledge about teaching is accumulated largely by trial and error and is to be found in the wisdom of experienced and

successful practitioners. The central problem of teacher education from this point of view is how to bring to focal awareness the tacit knowledge that constitutes good practice. A master - apprentice relationship is seen as the proper vehicle for transmitting the "cultural knowledge" posessed by good teachers to the novice. Prospective teachers are viewed largely as passive recipients of this knowledge and play little part in determining the substance and direction of their preparation for teaching. The political thrust of this approach is essentially conservative. Preparing prospective teachers to fit smoothly into existing teaching roles encourages the continued acceptance of the educational, political, and social contexts in which teaching now occurs. Despite the reluctance of college and university teacher educators to openly affiliate themselves with this ideological perspective, it represents the dominant reality in U.S. teacher education programs today.[4]

The second ideological position identified by Kirk, rationalism, came to the fore partly as a response to what were perceived to be the limitations of a traditionalist ideology.[5] A view of teaching as an "applied science" (Tom, 1984) and of the teacher as a technician (i.e. an executor of the principles and practices of effective teaching derived from systematic research on teaching) undergirds this perspective. The purpose of teacher education is defined very narrowly as providing prospective teachers with that which will give them technical mastery of the teaching - learning environment. Preparing teachers to develop curriculum and to participate as full partners in curriculum debates and in the creation of school policies is not part of the rationalist agenda. Prospective teachers are viewed primarily as passive recipients

of teaching knowledge and skills, and play little part in determining the substance and direction of their preparation for teaching and pedagogical practices. Within the rationalist perspective the institutional and societal context of teaching and learning is not seriously examined. These contexts are accepted, for the most part, as given.

The third ideological perspective identified by Kirk (1986) is radicalism.[6] Here the concern is with enabling prospective teachers to reflect critically upon both the craft of teaching and the contexts (educational, social, economic, political and cultural) in which teaching exists and to act on the basis of these reflections to bring about the realization of an emancipatory educational process through schooling. Marie Brennan (1987) and E. Wayne Ross and Lynne Haney (1986) have commented on the problem of the widespread proceduralization or technicization of "reflection" in the discourse of teacher education. They distinguish approaches where reflection is viewed as an end in itself from those in which reflection is viewed as a means toward the development of ethical judgments, strategic actions, and the realization of ethically important ends. They also distinguish approaches in which reflection occurs without a critique of educational and social contexts from those in which reflection entails the critique of both the craft of teaching and social contexts. The radical tradition in teacher education encompasses only those approaches that seek to develop both reflective thought and reconstructive action (i.e. critical pedagogy) which, by definition, entails a problematization of both the craft of teaching and the contexts in which it is embedded.

Within this radical view of teacher education, a variety of conceptual lenses and theoretical principles have been offered as frames for organizing thinking and practice. In addition to our earlier expressed views of an emancipatory approach to teacher education, built on the notion of education as a reflective and value-laden social practice, Ira Shor (1986) has set out an agenda for what he calls "egalitarian teacher education." He proposes a number of themes that he feels need to permeate teacher education if it is to contribute to emancipatory schooling (e.g. dialogic teaching, cross cultural communication, critical literacy). And, as we noted earlier, Giroux and McClaren (1987) have proposed a conceptual apparatus for thinking about teacher education as a democratizing or counter hegemonic force and teachers as "transformative intellectuals." According to Giroux and McClaren, if teacher education is to contribute to the development of a system of schooling that works in the interests of "democratic and just communities" then a program of studies for prospective teachers needs to be viewed as a form of cultural politics that includes the study of such themes as language, history, culture, and power. They feel that emancipatory teacher education programs need to be able to help prospective teachers extend beyond the limited emancipatory goal of making the everyday problematic, to the more important goal of developing alternative pedagogical practices that will contribute to the transformation of schools into more democratic and equitable places of learning and self-empowerment.

Kirk (1986) has also offered a set of guidelines to help orient the development of critical pedagogy in teacher education. Kirk argues that teacher education programs need to take as their starting point th act

of teaching itself and focus on two forms of knowledge: (a) knowledge that feeds directly into the teaching act and aims at the development of competency and a capacity for reflective self development and (b) knowledge that contextualizes experience of the teaching act and helps prospective teachers broaden their conceptions of the teacher's role and helps them examine a number of political, social, and ethical issues that bear on curriculum and instruction in schools.

Although there is not and probably should never be a uniform radical view, further discussion and debate over the conceptual foundations of a radical approach to teacher education are clearly needed. To date, there has been little debate and discussion within the tradition. Most critical comments of radically oriented teacher educators have been directed at advocates of other traditions.

Strategies for the Realization of Critical Teacher Education

Beyond the articulation of these themes and guidelines for radical approaches to teacher education, a number of practicing teacher educators have described a variety of instructional strategies and curricular plans that have been employed to create teacher education programs with an empancipatory intent. Here we have descriptions of how methods and curriculum courses (Adler & Goodman, 1986; Di Chiro, Robottom, & Tinning, 1987; Goodman, 1986b; Gore and Bartlett, 1987) and clinical experiences (Beyer, 1984; Goodman, 1986a; Zeichner & Liston, 1987) have been reconstituted to develop the capacity and dispositions for the practice of critical pedagogy.

A number of specific instructional strategies can be identified that have been utilized by teacher educators operating within a radical tradition. It is important to note that the use of these strategies by themselves does not constitute an emancipatory approach to teacher educatio Many of the terms (e.g. "reflective teaching") and practices (e.g. "action research") have also been used by teacher educators who are not seeking to develop critical pedagogy.[7] In order for these pedagogical strategies to facilitate a critical approach within teacher education, they need to be oriented toward (a) an examination of the moral and political implications of the structure of schools and of the pedagogy used in them, (b) a consideration of the variety of teacher roles and identities and (c) an identification of those conditions of schooling which obstruct the moral education of elementary and secondary students. There are at least five specific strategies that have appeared in the literature in relation to the goal of developing critical pedagogy through teacher education: (1) action research, (2) ethnographic studies, (3) journal writing, (4) curriculum analysis and development, and (5) supervisory approaches with an emancipatory intent.

First, action research is a form of self-reflective inquiry undertaken by participants in a social setting in order to improve their own practices, their understandings of these practices, and the situations in which the practices are carried out (Kemmis, 1985). Action research has a long history in education and has been employed periodically over the last 40 years or so as a form of staff development for practicing teachers. It has also been employed less frequently within preservice teacher education programs as a vehicle for the development of critical

pedagogy. Most of the recent radically oriented work that has utilized action research with preservice teachers has drawn heavily on materials developed at Deakin University in Australia. For example, Kemmis and McTaggart's (1982) Action Research Planner has been commonly used in both Australian and U.S. programs. Although there are many different interpretations available of the cyclical action research process, Kemmis and McTaggart's description of the strategies of reconnaissance, planning, acting, observing, and reflecting has been the interpretation most commonly employed in teacher education programs.

Beyond this stage, the action research work that has been initiated with preservice teachers has been quite varied. Sometimes prospective teachers move through the action research process individually and at other times groups of student teachers work collaboratively on common problems. Sometimes pupils have been actively involved in student teachers' action research projects and sometimes they have not. Sometimes student teachers are placed in classrooms with cooperating teachers who are themselves practitioners of action research, but most often they are not. There has also been variation in the degree to which teacher educators structure and guide the action research projects of student teachers. Two examples of the use of action research with an emancipatory intent in preservice teacher education programs can be found in the description of the work currently in progress at the University of Wisconsin-Madison (offke & Zeichner, 1987; Brennan & Noffke, 1988) and at Deakin University (Di Chiro, Robottom, & Tinning, 1987).

A second strategy that has been employed within the radical tradition of teacher education is the conducting of ethnographic studies by prospective

teachers. Peter Woods (1985) has advocated the use of ethnography in preservice teacher education programs as a vehicle for helping prospective teachers examine school realities that lie beneath surface appearances. Several teacher educators have employed ethnographic work in radically oriented teacher education programs, within campus-based courses (Beyer, 1984; Gitlin & Teitelbaum, 1983) and in clinical experiences (Zeichner & Liston, 1987; Zeichner & Teitelbaum, 1982). In both cases prospective teachers spend some time in schools studying various aspects of classrooms, curriculum, pedagogy, schools, and communities with guidance provided by teacher educators. With the use of ethnography, the school, which has most often been utilized as a model for practice, becomes a social laboratory for study, critique, and, potentially, reform. Through the use of ethnographic methods, teacher educators have hoped to take common-sense perceptions and assumptions about schooling and make them problematic, and to help prospective teachers see and invent alternatives to undesirable practices. Most teacher educators who have described the use of ethnographic methods in teacher education programs have sought to help students explore the ideological elements of curriculum, pedagogy, and assessment and the interrelationships between these socially constructed practices within the school and the social, economic, and political contexts in which they are embedded.

A third strategy that has been employed within the radical tradition of teacher education has been the use of journal writing. Although journals have been widely used in teacher education programs for many years, only recently have materials appeared that offer guidance to teacher educators and teachers on how to use journals to foster personal and professional

development (e.g. Holly, 1984). It is even more recently that articles have appeared on the use of journals to facilitate the development of critical pedagogy in teacher education programs (Gore & Bartlett, 1987; Zeichner & Liston, 1987). In addition to the use of journals, other more structured forms of written expression such as portfolios (Walker, 1985) and the autobiographical method of currere (Grumet, 1978) offer much potential for use in radically oriented teacher education programs.

Another approach to the development of critical pedagogy through teacher education has been the focus by some teacher educators on preparing teachers for active involvement in curriculum deliberations and development. This more active role for teachers in curriculum matters is seen as an alternative to the currently dominant view of teachers as implementors of predesigned curriculum programs (Apple, 1983). Susan Adler and Jesse Goodman (1986), Jesse Goodman (1986b), and Landon Beyer (1984) describe attempts to restructure methods courses and field experiences with the intent of empowering prospective teachers as decision makers with regard to curriculum issues. In each of these cases students are taught a specific approach to curriculum design which entails consideration of technical, educational, and moral issues at each stage of the process and which requires students to produce original curriculum materials and plans. Students are then required to teach and evaluate a curriculum unit or project as part of a practicum experience. Zeichner and Liston (1987) and Ben Peretz (1984) on the other hand, describe ways in which prospective teachers are or can become involved in the analysis of school curricula and the curriculum development process used in schools. Here the focus is on increasing students' sensitivities to the values

and assumptions embedded in particular curriculum materials and programs (e.g., assumptions about the roles of teacher and learner) and to the reasons for and consequences of using various methods of curriculum development.

A final approach to the development of critical pedagogy through teacher education has involved changes in the methods of field supervision used in teacher education programs. As teacher educators have begun to restructure field-based experiences to enhance the degree to which they are utilized as occasions for teacher learning (Zeichner, 1986a), new and more egalitarian supervisory methods have been developed and employed that place more emphasis on developing the reflective capabilities of prospective teachers than traditional methods. Examples of these supervisory approaches include "partnership supervision" (Ruddick & Sigsworth, 1985), "horizontal supervision" (Gitlin, Ogowa, & Rose, 1984), and some critically oriented versions of clinical supervision (Zeichner & Liston, 1987). Work is also currently in progress at the University of Queensland in Australia (Gore & Bartlett, 1987) and at the University of Wisconsin-Madison (Miller, in progress) that is exploring the potential of forms of peer teaching and peer supervision for developing critical pedagogy.

All five strategies can be used by teacher educators to examine the moral norms of classrooms and the conditions of schooling, and to facilitate moral deliberation among prospective teachers. For example, action research is a useful way to encourage prospective teachers to examine their own practices and the settings in which those practices occur. Through the framework and processes of ongoing action research,

teacher educators can facilitate the exploration of questions concerning the moral norms of the classroom, the moral implications of particular forms of instruction, and the conditions of teachers' work. Questions raised during these sorts of investigations can then be pursued further over time. Journal writing offers another route, a means to express very personal reactions to the classroom and to reflect on those reactions. Frequently, journals provide an excellent way for teacher educators to connect those very personal reactions with aspects of teachers' professional lives and the conditions of schooling. And finally, experiences concerned with curriculum deliberation and development offer a route to examine the moral norms embedded in the curriculum-in-use and a way to create alternative curriculum designs and content. The creation of curriculum units in teacher education courses frequently provides students with their first guided experience in curriculum conception, development, and execution. Teacher educators can utilize these three strategies (along with ethnographic work and alternative supervisory approaches) to encourage an examination of the moral implications and the conditions of schooling.

Achieving the Radical Agenda for Teacher Education

The efforts of teacher educators described above to develop critical pedagogy through teacher education have had mixed success. Although some teacher educators have documented how they have had some success with a few individual students (Gore & Bartlett, 1987; Hursh, 1987; Zeichner, Tabachnick, & Densmore, 1987), it is not always clear whether the "successes" can be attributed to participation in the teacher

education programs or to other factors (see Zeichner, in press). There are also examples in the literature of cases where the emancipatory goals of teacher education have clearly been undermined by the hidden curriculum of programs (e.g. Crow, 1987). Finally, there is also much that we just do not know about the impact of radically oriented teacher education programs because of the difficulties involved in studying program impact (see Zeichner, in press).

Generally, efforts to develop critical pedagogy through teacher education have involved alterations of specific courses or program components within overall program and institutional contexts that remain unchanged. Benham (1979) has argued that an emphasis on "reflection" needs to be incorporated into every aspect of a teacher education program from beginning to end. The general literature on reflection and education has continually emphasized the importance of organizational contexts that encourage reflective activity (Schon, 1987). Given the current condition of teacher education in the U.S. and many other countries--low status and prestige, fragmented and uncoordinated curricula, and limited investment of financial and human resources in their maintenance and improvement--we are somewhat pessimistic that fundamental and meaningful change can be brought about within current institutional and political environments. Recent policies of state educational agencies in the U.S. (Popkewitz, 1987) and by governmental bodies in the U.K. (Barton, Pollard, & Whitty, 1987) to "rationalize" and control the preservice teacher education curriculum from without, pose an especially troubling obstacle to the aspirations of radically oriented teacher educators.[8]

Radically oriented teacher educators need to be active at several levels simultaneously to achieve their goals. First, it is necessary that would-be radical reformers directly involve themselves in the practice of teacher education and in the struggles to restructure it. Radically oriented teacher educators should not make the mistake, as has sometimes been the case, to seek the reform of teacher education while remaining personally detached from the consequences of their reform proposals. We feel that it is pragmatically unfeasible and ethically indefensible to attempt to reform teacher education unless one has, or can develop, some direct involvement in the process.

Within teacher education, radically oriented teacher educators must serve as living examples of the very kind of critically oriented pedagogical practices that they seek to have their students adopt. This means that teacher educators need to reflect critically and act strategically upon the nature of their own pedagogical practices and the institutional contexts in which they work. One consequence of this position is that teacher educators will have to become much more involved than is now the case in the political arenas of teacher education, higher education, and state government to work for the kinds of environments that will support the development and continuing implementation of teacher education strategies like the ones that have been discussed in this paper. It is not sufficient for teacher educators to continue to focus attention on the development of the internal features of programs while neglecting other external forces that contribute greatly to the quality of programs. Although further conceptual and curricular work remains an important element of the radical agenda for teacher education, this work must be complemented

by a much more aggressive political stance by teacher educators in relation to the organizations and agencies that allocate resources and rewards affecting teacher education programs. Given the dominance of a "technical rationality" in the current teacher education reform movement (Cornbleth, 1986) and the continued implementation of policies designed to "rationalize" programs (Zeichner, 1987), it is especially important for teacher educators to begin to confront the external factors that set severe limits on the possibilities for reform within programs. These institutional realities of teacher education could, if not fundamentally altered, lead to the assimilation of radically oriented approaches into current patterns of belief and practice.

A second consequence of the crucial role of modeling in teacher education is that the social relations and pedagogical practices within programs need to reflect the emancipatory practices that teacher educators seek to establish in the public schools. Our earlier stated conception of a radically oriented approach to teacher education based on a view of education as a value-laden social practice, as well as similar statements by Shor (1987), Giroux and McClaren (1987) and Kirk (1986), are attempts to address this issue head-on.

At a second level of intervention, teacher educators need to be supportive of efforts to reform many other aspects of the educational arena outside teacher education such as the occupational structure of teaching, working conditions and role definitions within schools, the character and quality of continuing professional development opportunities for teachers and other school personnel, and the overregulation of teacher education institutions and schools by state educational agencies.

For example, teacher educators should support current efforts to democratize schools in a way that would give teachers and parents greater control over the school curriculum and school management.

Finally at a third level, teacher educators need to be involved in the broader political struggles to alter the unequal economic and social relations that dominate our society and the world at large. Unless we begin, for example, to address such issues as economic policies that continue to divert precious resources to the military and the arms race at the expense of human needs and the race-, class-, and gender-based discrimination so prevelant in our society, we will not get very far in efforts to reform either teacher education or schooling.

We have asserted throughout this analysis that teacher education reform is, by itself, insufficient for overcoming the many ideological and material constraints that have continued to undermine the hopes of many in our society for access to fulfilling and rewarding lives. We have also asserted, however, that teacher education reform is a key arena where progressive forces must assert themselves in this era of "conservative restoration" if the potential for the reform of schooling and society is to be realized.

Notes

* This "program" has now extended to other locations as people who have worked in Madison go off and work in other teacher education programs across the U.S.

1. One of the distinguishing features of the radical approach to education and schooling is its explicit normative and political stance. Paulo Freire (1974) argues that education should free both the oppressed and the oppressor classes and be grounded in the values of faith, love and courage. Other radical theorists argue that public schools ought to be more equal, free and just places to learn (Apple, 1979; Bowles & Gintis, 1976; and Willis, 1980). While we believe there is much to commend in the radical stance, there are also problems. Elsewhere Liston has argued that the explanatory and ethical foundations of radical theories are not secure, maintaining that they require further evidential substantiation and ethical justification (Liston, forthcoming a). Rather than reiterate those arguments here, we would like to construct the outline of an alternative formulation, one which provides a relatively secure normative foundation for a critical and emancipatory education. What follows is such an attempt.

2. See Hogan's (1983) discussion of the central role of prejudice in teacher education for an elaboration of this issue.

3. This perspective is analagous to the "traditional-craft" paradigm of teacher education discussed by Zeichner (1983). We have decided, for the purposes of this paper, to use Kirk's (1986) formulation of alternative teacher education traditions because it precisely identifies the radical perspective on teacher education that we want to discuss here. "Inquiry-oriented" teacher education is not as useful as a category in the present paper because of the many instances in existence where "inquiry-oriented" teacher education refers to a purely technical form of reflection about teaching.

4. See Stones and Morris (1972), Zeichner (1986a) and Beyer & Zeichner (1987) for discussions of the continued dominance of a traditionalist ideology in teacher education practice, despite attempts to rationalize teacher education programs and for discussions of the problematic aspects of a traditionalist approach.

5. This perspective is very similar to the "behavioristic" paradigm discussed by Zeichner (1983).

6. This perspective is similar to some segments of what Zeichner (1983) has labeled the "inquiry-oriented" paradigm of teacher education.

7. For example, see Noffke and Zeichner (1987) for a discussion of the dominance of technical rationality in the use of action research in the U.S.

8. See Kirk (1986), Zeichner (1986b) and Zeichner & Liston (1987) for discussion of the institutional structures and constraints that serve as obstacles to the achievement of the radical agenda for teacher education.

References

Adler, S. and Goodman, J. (1986). Critical theory as a foundation for methods courses. Journal of Teacher Education 37, 2-8.

Apple, M. (1983). Curricular form and the logic of technical control: The building of the possessive individual. In M. Apple & L. Weis (Eds.) Ideology and practice in education (pp. 143-166). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Apple, M. (1979). Ideology and curriculum. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Barton, L.; Pollard, A. and Whitty, G. (1987). Accreditation as centralization and control. Paper presented at a conference of the Six Country Study of Teacher Education at Wingspread. Racine, Wisconsin.

Benham, B.J. (1979). The effect of reflective writing on identity maintenance in student teachers. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Ben-Peretz, M. (1984). Curriculum theory and practice in teacher education. In L. Katz & J. Raths (Eds.) Advances in teacher education (volume 1). Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex.

Bergmann, F. (1977). On being free. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.

Beyer, L. (1984). Field experience, ideology and the development of critical reflectivity. Journal of Teacher Education 35(3), 36-41.

Beyer, L., & Zeichner, K. (1987). Teacher education in cultural context: Beyond reproduction. In T. Popkewitz (Ed.) Critical studies in teacher education: Its folklore, theory and practice (pp. 298-334). London: Falmer Press.

Bowles, S., & Gintis, H. (1976). Schooling in capitalist America. New York: Basic Books.

Brennan, M. (1987). Contextual and theoretical problems in reflective teaching. Unpublished manuscript, University of Wisconsin-Madison, School of Education.

Brennan, M. & Noffke, S. (1988). Action research and reflective student teaching. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators, San Diego.

Cornbleth, C. (1986). Ritual and rationality in teacher education reform. Educational Researcher, 15, 5-14.

Crow, N. (1987). Hidden curriculum in a teacher education program.

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, DC.

Di Chiro, G., Robottom, I., & Tinning, R. (198? Participatory inquiry in teacher education. Paper presented at the seventeenth annual conference of the South Pacific Associ tion of Teacher Educators, B.llarat, V'ctoria.

Elbaz, F. (1983). Teacher thinking: A study of practical knowledge. London: Croom Helm.

Freire, P. (1974). Pedagogy of the oppressed. New York: Seabury Press.

Gillette, M. (1988). Reflective teaching and education that is multicultural. Presented at the annual meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators, San Diego.

Giroux, H., & McClaren, P. (1987). Teacher education as a counter-public sphere: Notes towards a redefinition. In T. Popkewitz (Ed.) Critical studies in teacher education: Its folklore, theory and practi ., 266-297. London: Falmer Press.

Giroux, H., ' McClaren, P. (1986). Teacher education and the politics of engagement: The case for democratic schooling. Harvard Educational Review, 56(3), 213-233.

Gitlin, A., & Teitelbaum, K. (1983). Linking theory and practice: The use of ethnographic methodology by prospective teachers. Journal of Education for Teaching, 9(3), 225-234.

Gitlin, A., Ogawa, R., & Rose, E. (1984). Supervision, reflection and understanding: The case for horizontal evaluation. Journal of Teacher Education, 35(3), 46-52.

Goodman, J. (1986a). Making early field experiences meaningful: A critical approach. Journal of Education for Teaching, 12(2), 109-125.

Goodman, J. (1986b). Teaching preservice teachers a critical approach to curriculum design. Curriculum Inquiry, 16(2), 181-201.

Gore, J. and Bartlett (1987). Pathways and barriers to reflective teaching in an initial teacher education program. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Australian Curriculum Studies Association. Sydney, N.S.W.

Grumet, M. (1978). Supervision and situation: A methodology of self report for teacher education. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Toronto.

Hogan, P. (1983). The central place of prejudice in the supervision of student teachers. Journal of Education for Teaching, 9(1), 30-45.

Holly, M. L. (1984). Keeping a personal-professional journal. Geelong, Australia: Deakin University Press.

Hursh, D. (1987). Becoming reflective teachers: Preservice teachers understandings of school and society. Paper presented at the annual meeting of tha Midwest Educational Research Association, Chicago.

Kemmis, S. (1985). Action research. In T. Husen & T.N. Postlathwaite (Eds.), International encyclopedia of education. Oxford: Pergamon.

Kemmis, S., & McTaggart, R. (1982). The action research planner. Geelong, Australia: Deakin University Press.

Kirk, D. (1986). Beyond the limits of theoretical discourse in teacher education: Towards a critical pedagogy. Teaching and Teacher Education, 2(2), 155-167.

Lanier, J. (1986). Research on teacher education. In M. Wittrock (Ed.) Third handbook of research on teaching. New York: Rand McNally.

Liston, D. (in press-a). Capitalist schools? Explanation and ethics in radical studies of schooling. New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Liston, D. (in press-b). Faith and evidence: Examining Marxist explanations of schools. American Journal of Education.

Liston, D., & Zeichner, K. (1987). Reflective teacher education and moral deliberation. Journal of Teacher Education.

MacIntyre, A. (1984). After virtue. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.

Miller, M. (in progress). Peer supervision in a prestudent teaching practicum in early childhood education. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Noffke, S., & Zeichner, K. (1987). Action research and teacher thinking. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, D.C.

Popkewitz, T. (1987). Teaching and teacher education reforms: Reconstituting a bureaucratic apparatus and forming a political discourse. Paper presented at a conference of the Six Country Study of Teacher Education at Wingspread, Racine, Wisconsin.

Ross, E. W., & Hannay, L. (1986). Towards a critical theory of reflective inquiry. Journal of Teacher Education, 37, 9-15.

Rossi, P. (1984). The Foundation of the Philosophical Concept of Autonomy by Kant and its Historical Consequences. In D. Mieth and J. Pohier (eds.), op cit.

Ruddick, J., & Sigsworth, A. (1985). Partnership supervision. In D. Hopkins & K. Reed (Eds.) Rethinking teacher education (pp. 153-172). London: Croom Helm.

Scheffler, I. (1960). The language of education. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

Schon, D. (1987). Educating the reflective practitioner. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Shor, I. (1986). Equality is excellence: Transforming teacher education and the learning process. Harvard Educational Review, 56(4), 406-426.

Stones, Edgar, & Morris, Sidney (1972). Teaching practice: Problems and perspectives. London: Methuen.

Tom, A. (1984). Teaching as a moral craft. New York: Longman.

Walker, D. (1985). Writing and reflection. In D. Boud, R. Keogh, & D. Walker (Eds.) Reflection: Turning learning into experience. London: Kogan Page.

Warnock, M. (1975). The neutral teacher. In S. C. Brown (Ed.), Philosophers discuss education (pp. 159-171). Totowa, NJ: Rowman and Littlefield.

Willis, P. (1977). Learning to Labour: How working class kids get working class jobs. Westmead, England: Gower Publishing Co.

Woods, P. (1985). Sociology, ethnography and teacher practice. Teaching and Teacher Education, 1(2), 51-62.

Zeichner, K. (in press). Preparing reflective teachers: An overview of instructional strategies that have been employed in preservice teacher education programs. International Journal of Research in Education.

Zeichner, K. (1987). Alternative strategies for improving the quality of teaching through the reform of teacher education programs. Paper presented at the Second World Basque Congress in Education, Bilbao, Spain.

Zeichner, K. (1986a). The practicum as an occasion for learning to teach. South Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 14(2), 11-27.

Zeichner, K. (1986b). Social and ethical dimensions of reform in teacher education. In M. Hoffman & S. Edwards (Eds.), Clinical teacher education, pp. 87-108. New York: Random House.

Zeichner, K. (1983). Alternative paradigms of teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education 34(3), 3-9.

Zeichner, K., & Liston, D. (1987). Teaching student teachers to reflect. Harvard Educational Review, 57(1), 23-48.

Zeichner, K. and Teitelbaum, K. (1982). Personalized and inquiry-oriented teach. education. Journal of Education for Teaching 8, 95-117.

Zeichner, K., Tabachnick, B., & Densmore, K. (1987). Individual, institutional and cultural influences on the development of teachers' craft knowledge. In J. Calderhead (Ed.). Exploring teachers-thinking, pp. 21-59. London: Cassell.