

Tezgiden, Cakcak, Y. (2016). A Critical Review of Teacher Education Models, *International Journal of Educational Policies*. 10 (2), pp.121- 140.

ISSN: 1307-3842

A Critical Review of Teacher Education Models*

Yasemin Tezgiden Cakcak**

*Middle East Technical University
Turkey*

Abstract

This paper provides a critical review of teacher education models. Different teacher education approaches in the literature – technicist, reflective and critical teacher education - will be described in detail with the teacher roles they foster: teachers as passive technicians, teachers as reflective practitioners and teachers as transformative intellectuals. Following Kumaravadivelu, the author claims that these teacher roles are not mutually exclusive, rather they are complementary, which means for teachers to accomplish their true missions, they should assume the roles of transformative intellectuals, as this role embodies the characteristics of all teacher roles. For doing justice to all elements of teacher knowledge, for making teacher education transformative and intellectually challenging, the author concludes that teacher education programs should embrace a critical approach.

Keywords: *teacher education models, technicism, reflective teaching, critical education, teachers as transformative intellectuals*

* An earlier shorter version of this article was published in *Eleştirel Pedagoji* (January-February 2016, issue 43, pp. 60-68) in Turkish.

** Dr. Yasemin Tezgiden Cakcak, Middle East Technical University, Faculty of Education, Department of Foreign Language Education, Ankara, Turkey.
E-mail: tezgiden@metu.edu.tr

Introduction

The roles teachers play seem to have intrigued human societies since the early civilizations. Probably the most well-known teaching controversy from the early human history is the role Socrates played as a teacher, which resulted in his execution. The basic discussion at the time revolved around the question of whether teachers should serve for the public good or work for the interests of the powerful. The same question is still being debated in the field of teacher education. The issue of roles for which teacher candidates are prepared has not been resolved yet. Today there seems to be a multiplicity of models discussed in the literature under different names. As the point of departure in each teacher education model is different, so are the characteristics of teachers they intend to prepare: technicist teacher education preparing teachers as passive technicians, reflective teacher education programs educating reflective practitioners and critical teacher education programs preparing teachers as transformative intellectuals (Kumaravadivelu, 2003). While mainstream literature names traditional approach to teacher education as the training approach (Richards, 1989) or as the applied science model (Wallace, 1991), critical pedagogy calls it technicist. As for reflective teacher education, there seems to be a general consensus in naming the model. There are nuances in teacher education programs - "liberatory education" (Freire, 1970), "social justice teacher education," (Zeichner, 2011) and "multicultural teacher education" (Sleeter & Grant, 2007) - aiming to educate teachers as transformative intellectuals - but in this paper I will use a more generic term as "critical teacher education" to cover a wider spectrum of teacher education programs. This article will describe characteristics of each teacher education paradigm as well as the teacher roles they foster. While particular teacher education models might aim to prepare teachers with certain characteristics, I do not intend to claim that all teacher candidates will *deterministically* hold the characteristics fostered in their teacher education programs. These characteristics are only meant as general dispositions that might be seen in prospective teachers.

Technicist Teacher Education: Teachers as Passive Technicians

Technicist teacher education programs aim to educate teachers as passive technicians, who transmit knowledge produced by experts neither questioning its underlying purpose, validity or reliability nor assessing the situation of their own school context. The notion of passive technician teachers originates from the writings of American sociologist Donald A. Schön (1987), who criticized traditional teacher education model as "technical rationality." For Hodkinson (2011), "technical rationalism assumes that people can be managed as if they behaved like machines. Education and training are seen as systematic production processes, using the metaphor of the assembly line, with its inputs, processes and outputs" (p. 199). In technical rationality, quality, efficiency and control are key words. To make the education system controllable from top down, the system is divided into manageable fragments with objectives, procedures and tests. Trainees are taught how to perform those small parts. In this system, teachers and trainers

are like "widgets" in the system which ensure the maintenance of the system (Hodkinson, 2011, p. 200). They are considered as technicians to be controlled rather than as competent decision-makers. Halliday (1998) describes technicism in teacher education "as the notion that good teaching is equivalent to efficient performance which achieves ends that are prescribed for teachers" (p. 597), which is in contrast with the reflective practice in which teachers decide the ends and means of their teaching. In the technicist model of teacher education, good teaching is equal to the use of a technique. In this rationality, if learning does not occur in the classroom setting, it is because teachers do not use "the right" method and technique. Because this approach is built on the notion that all learners learn in a similar way regardless of their background knowledge or socio-economic background, they are provided with a standardized curriculum and a prescribed way of teaching. This is, however, regarded as an oversimplification of the complexity of education.

For Schön (1987), this model of professional education assumes that all professional problems could be solved with the application of scientific facts, rules and procedures. This model is based on the premise that the findings of the scientific studies will answer all problems in practice (Wallace, 1991). In this approach to teacher education, practitioners' role is restricted to learning the results of scientific research and putting them into practice. Therefore, trainee teachers' success is measured in the extent to which they have put the professional knowledge base into practice. However, current professional knowledge may not provide an answer to each teaching situation and there might not be a single right answer for each case (Schön, 1987). Assuming the only legitimate knowledge comes from empirical studies, this model of teacher education privileges professional experts (Kumaravadivelu, 2003) leading to a hierarchy of knowledge production and consumption (Schön, 1987). Theory and research are considered the responsibility of university-based scientists and scholars whereas the practitioners are only given the role of passive technicians who learn the content knowledge available in the literature and pass it onto the following generations. It is not common practice for teachers to engage in research themselves unlike those in some other professions, e.g. surgeons in the medical profession who both conduct research and perform operations. In this model, teachers do not have a chance to use their own experience, creativity or critical reflection in practicing their profession even though they are the ones who know the requirements of their everyday classroom context in contrast to scholars who are usually detached from the classroom reality.

The technicist notion of teacher education assumes that student teachers come to teacher education programs with some deficiencies in content knowledge. Their existing notions as to what makes effective teaching are not taken into consideration in the teacher education program (Lortie, 1975). This model of teacher education is based on the idea that there are some effective methods, which would work in every context. Teachers are thus expected to match their teaching styles to the most effective method prescribed by the experts in the field. In this approach, content knowledge is separated into discrete skills and techniques to be mastered (Freeman, 1989) and it is believed that if trainee teachers learn those skills, they will be effective teachers. As Richards (1989, p. 3) put it, "Training is intended to expand the teacher's repertoire of tasks and to improve the effectiveness with which tasks are used." Moreover, it is considered

that learning to teach can happen by separating theory from practice in which student teachers learn *about* teaching in one context, observe and practice teaching in another context and improve their teaching in a third context when they start active teaching (Johnson, 2009). In this view, student teachers are assumed to learn everything about teaching in their teacher education programs at the start of their careers.

When it comes to the role of the teacher educators in this technicist approach, “the teacher educator is seen as an expert, as a catalyst for change, as a model teacher, and as the source of new ideas and information. His or her primary functions are to provide ideas and suggestions, to solve problems, and to intervene and point out better ways of doing things” (Richards, 1989; p. 3). Although the teacher educator’s role as a model to the student teachers may prove effective in teaching certain skills and techniques which do not require much reflection (Richards, 1989), it does not acknowledge the experience, creativity and wisdom of the student teachers by reducing them to passive recipients. Moreover, this approach is criticized as presenting a limited understanding of what teaching is about without realizing the complexity of classroom life. Important components of teaching such as teacher beliefs, values and decision- making skills are totally ignored. What is more, the responsibility of student teachers’ professional development is given to the teacher educator rather than on the trainees themselves (Richards, 1989).

As the above discussion demonstrates, this transmission approach disempowers teachers by reducing them to the role of passive practitioners who never use critical judgment. Suppressed by the system of teacher education, these student teachers find it difficult to find their own voices or styles in teaching and to develop their own philosophies of teaching based on their own experience and context. As Kincheloe (2008) suggests, technicist approach to teacher education renders teaching into a "lifeless" practice by killing the curiosity and creativity of teachers.

Because this approach is built on the notion that all learners learn in a similar way regardless of their background knowledge or socio-economic background, they are provided with a standardized curriculum and a prescribed way of teaching. This is, however, regarded as an oversimplification of the complexity of education. Güven (2008) maintains that this model of teacher education does not help teachers solve problems stemming from the learning difficulties of students or their diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds. Having been educated to perceive problems at schools as classroom-based originating from either students' lack of motivation or teachers' inability, student teachers or practicing teachers are not able to link their practical problems to the wider sociopolitical context (Güven, 2008).

Reflective Teacher Education: Teachers as Reflective Practitioners

As a reaction to the disempowering nature of the technicist view of teacher education, reflective teaching movement has appeared. According to reflective teaching, teachers are not passive consumers or transmitters of knowledge, but producers of knowledge offering solutions to the problems in their own setting (Zeichner & Liston, 1996). The roots of this movement can be found in the works of educational philosopher John Dewey, who makes a distinction between routine

and reflective action (Dewey, 1933/1997). For Dewey, those teachers involved in routine action obey tradition and authority without challenging them. They lose their autonomy and decision-making skills trapped in mechanical, habitual actions, which lead to burnout. However, those engaged in reflective action evaluate every idea by critical reasoning and look for different solutions in line with the demands of the situation. Reflective teachers take responsibility for their actions and consider alternatives rather than acting without thinking. Dewey (1933/1997) thinks teaching is not a routine sequence of pre-determined acts, but a context-sensitive creative intellectual activity in which teachers actively seek solutions to their everyday problems.

For Dewey (1933/1997), reflective teachers have three distinguishing characteristics: open-mindedness, responsibility and whole-heartedness. Open-mindedness means being tolerant towards different ideas and not seeing them as threats. Open-minded people evaluate their existing beliefs when they encounter new data and they are open to accepting the possibility of making mistakes. They are aware of the fact that they may not be right and they are not in a race to win a debate (Larrivee, 2008). They can criticize themselves. Open-minded reflective teachers are ready to hear different views from their students and peers and they are capable of adjusting their beliefs and teaching styles according to the different conditions. Responsibility means "taking ownership for the consequences of one's actions" (Larrivee, 2008; p. 91). Responsible teachers are aware of the fact that even their good intentions may have unintended consequences for others and they act accordingly. Wholeheartedness is devoting oneself to improve a situation. Wholehearted reflective teachers look for different alternatives to help their students. They do not give up until they find a solution (Larrivee, 2008). Even when there is a lot of uncertainty, confusion and frustration, wholehearted teachers do not stop looking for answers.

Another important figure in reflective practice is Donald Schön, who built on the work of Dewey. Following Dewey, Schön (1987) believes that teachers are autonomous decision makers who learn to teach by practicing teaching and reflecting on their practice. For Schön (1987), classroom reality is full of unexpected problems and dilemmas. To solve problematic situations teachers might encounter every day, they need to engage in reflective action evaluating the context and coming to conclusions. When they come up with a solution, they need to test it and to reflect on the findings. For Schön (1987), reflection is a never-ending process consisting of acting, observing, reflecting, inventing, and testing. Therefore, it is a process of continuous growth.

As reflective teaching became widely popular, confusion has emerged as to what it really means, and it has started to be criticized as becoming a slogan word losing its essence (Burton, 2009). In a similar vein, Adler (1990) surveyed some varying definitions of reflective teaching in the literature. Cruikshank (1987, as cited in Adler, 1990) defined reflective teaching as a teacher's self-evaluation of her own teaching. In this model, student teachers teach a lesson to their peers and then they evaluate their own performance, students' reactions and learning, etc. together with their peers. Schön (1987) defined a reflective practitioner as someone who is able to think while teaching and can respond to the ambiguity in the immediate classroom setting. The thinking process of a teacher while teaching and her creative problem-solving cannot be formulated as rules and procedures to

be followed by other teachers. Therefore, reflective teaching is learnt by doing and coaching (Adler, 1990). Schön suggested a reflective practicum in which students and coaches reflect on practice in dialogue. Zeichner and Liston's (1987, as cited by Adler, 1990) model, however, suggested three levels of reflection: technical reflection, situational and institutional reflection and critical reflection with respect to moral and ethical issues. Zeichner and Liston (1996) think it is not enough only to think about the effectiveness of one's teaching strategies. Teachers should also reflect on the situational, institutional factors on certain choices made. They should also critically analyze the moral and ethical consequences of their actions. Zeichner and Liston (1996) warned that not every thinking about teaching can be considered as reflective "if a teacher never questions the goals and values that guide his or her work, the context in which he or she teaches, or never examines his or her assumptions" (p. 1). Therefore, they clarified what they meant by a reflective practitioner. For them a reflective teacher:

- examines, frames, and attempts to solve the dilemmas of classroom practice;
- is aware of and questions the assumptions and values he or she brings to teaching;
- is attentive to the institutional and cultural contexts in which he or she teaches;
- takes part in curriculum development and is involved in school change efforts;
- takes responsibility for his or her own professional development. (Zeichner & Liston, 1996; p. 6).

Larrivee (2008) also conceptualized reflection as a continuum consisting of three stages of reflection: surface reflection, pedagogical reflection and critical reflection. In surface reflection, teachers are concerned with the methods and techniques they used to arrive at predetermined goals, but they do not question those goals. At the level of pedagogical reflection, teachers reflect on the goals and the underlying theoretical reasons behind those goals. At the level of critical reflection, they consider the moral and ethical implications of their acts, similar to what Zeichner and Liston (1996) advocated. They reflect both inwardly on their actions and outwardly on the social conditions. Though all models of reflective teaching view teaching as a complex activity which cannot be easily predicted, Larrivee (2008) asserts, it is crucial for teachers to reach higher levels of reflection asking questions as to their own practice.

Schön (1987) believed that professional education should give priority to practice rather than delaying it until students are given enough content knowledge, as he thinks student teachers should learn to teach by doing. As opposed to the normative curriculum in which practicum comes after theory to give student teachers the opportunity to practice the techniques prescribed by the professional experts, in a reflective curriculum, practice is at the center of the program in which learners learn to teach by being actively involved in reflection *in* and *on* action. In such a practicum, Schön (1987) asserted, student teachers should be given some tasks to explore their own learning by questioning their own assumptions and

comparing theory with their experience. In this process, teacher educators should work as coaches and help student teachers deal with situations for which there are no suggested solutions. Students should thus be encouraged to experiment with difficult situations in practice so that they develop a broader perspective to teaching (Schön, 1987). In this perspective, student teachers' prior experience as students, their beliefs, values and assumptions play a crucial role in addition to received knowledge (Johnson, 2009; Wallace, 1991). Their background knowledge is considered significant and they are provided with the tools to analyze their own beliefs (Richards, 1989). Content knowledge is not limited to skills/techniques; it also includes concepts, attitudes and emotions. In addition, it provides room for the negotiation of content according to the needs or dilemmas of student teachers (Richards, 1989). In such a curriculum, student teachers are continually involved in activities to reflect on their own teaching and their roles as teachers. Even the development of technical skills is addressed in a broader reflective framework in which student teachers' awareness is increased and they are encouraged to consider the effects of their actions (Richards, 1989).

Reflective teacher education approach does not consider classical techniques of teaching skills like modeling, imitating, practice as adequate; thus, students are asked to write reflective pieces on their values and beliefs (Richards, 1989). They are encouraged to observe and reflect on their own teaching video-recording themselves. They are motivated to write reflective journals to monitor their own learning. Problem-solving tasks and group projects are used for student teachers to offer solutions to puzzles of teaching. Action research is a key element in this model which forces student teachers to determine a problem area in their own classroom (Richards, 1989). They try to solve dilemmas by collecting data, designing an intervention and evaluation. In this model, student teachers assume responsibility to organize and monitor their own learning while teacher educators work as coaches or facilitators who raise the consciousness of the student teachers. What is more, in this perspective, learning to teach is seen as a life-long process (Johnson, 2009). According to this view, teacher education programs only provide the foundations. Their ultimate goal is to help student teachers to become flexible professionals who are confident and competent enough to address the needs of their learners in differing situations (Johnson, 2009). Therefore, teacher educators try to make student teachers internalize the skill to examine their own teaching in pre-service teacher education. So a seminar allowing students to discuss their experiences and insights from their teaching practice as a whole group is considered key in reflective teaching. The atmosphere of dialogue in the seminar invites student teachers to question their assumptions, and enables them to relate theory to practice (Adler, 1990; Goodman, 1984). Journal writing, narratives, autobiographies, support groups and peer coaching are other mediums which stimulate reflection (Larrivee, 2008).

Even though reflective teaching movement has been very influential in the role and image of a teacher, it has also drawn some criticisms (Kumaravadivelu, 2003). As the main figure behind reflective teaching, Schön has been criticized for treating the teacher's learning process as an individual one in which the teacher is considered alone in evaluating his/her practice without paying attention to the interaction of that teacher with the social context or the people around him/her. Despite discussing the interaction between the student teacher and teacher educator, he doesn't focus on the teachers' collaboration in reflecting together or

the dialogic conversations they have (Zeichner & Liston, 1996). For social-constructivist perspective of teacher education, however, teachers cannot reach the level of reflection they reach in a dialogic mediation when they are alone (Johnson, 2009; Vygotsky, 1986).

Reflective teaching also drew some criticisms because it does not go beyond an individualized focus on teachers and their personal reflections (Yogev & Michaeli, 2011). It focuses on the classroom setting alone without considering the broader sociopolitical factors that influence teachers and the institutional context they work in (Kumaravadivelu, 2003). In other words, while reflective teacher education might be a good way of ensuring personal professional development, it lacks a moral, emancipatory dimension for the improvement of society (Akbari, 2007). Schön is criticized for directing the attention on teachers' inward inspection and losing touch with the sociocultural reality. According to the critics, by focusing on their own role in the classroom alone, teachers are directed to play a submissive role in an education system which tries to suppress teachers to become technicians (Zeichner & Liston, 1996). Eryaman (2007) believed this might be because the original form of reflective teaching in close contact with the political, social, moral and aesthetical dimensions of teaching is misinterpreted in practice. As opposed to Eryaman (2007), Zeichner (1990) thinks the popularity of an individualized reflective teaching might be due to its easy adaptation to every kind of teacher education approach. In reaction to the concept of reflective teaching losing its substance, Zeichner (1990) does not believe that just because teachers reflect, they will teach better. For Zeichner (1990), what teachers reflect on is crucial: they should "focus inwardly at their own practice (and the collective practices of a group of colleagues) and outwardly at the social conditions in which these practices are situated" (p. 59). Critics assert if teachers are not to become servants to those in power, they should empower themselves by questioning the purposes and consequences of the education system.

Apart from its disregard for critical issues, there are other concerns as to the notion of reflective teaching, though. First, reflection is criticized as it has turned into another technique for improving teaching losing its essence (Halliday, 1998). Despite the wide popularity of reflective teaching, Akbari (2007) asserts, there is no evidence that it helps student or teacher performance. In the same line, Canning (2011) argues that there is no need to prioritize reflective teaching in initial teacher education when there are equally effective collective practices like observing and dialoguing with peers and mentor teachers. On the other hand, notwithstanding its claims of empowering teachers, reflective teaching imposes teachers a certain way of reflective practice (Liston, Whitcomb & Borko, 2009) assuming teachers would not reflect on their own practice without the guidance of academic scholars (Akbari, 2007; Eryaman, 2007), which implies a belittling view of teachers and teaching. Besides, reflective practice is usually limited to teachers' earlier experience not allowing them to exercise reflection in preparing creative lessons for the upcoming lessons. What is more, asking pre-service teachers to engage in reflective practice might be asking too much considering their very limited teaching experience (Akbari, 2007). One last issue of concern over reflective teaching is its overemphasis on teachers' depending on their own resources like their memories and experience. As Akbari (2007) argues, there is no guarantee that deeper thinking on one's own experience through journaling will give them a better view of the reality; it might only help teachers admit their

frustrations or concerns before a larger audience, which in turn would discourage teachers from finding alternative ways to improve their practice. A heavy concentration on reflective teaching also entails a risk of focusing too much on practice neglecting theory, which will bear a loss of contact with one's colleagues on a common conceptual framework (Akbari, 2007).

Critical Teacher Education: Teachers as Transformative Intellectuals

The notion of teachers as transformative intellectuals was suggested by Henry Giroux (1988), as a reaction to the attempts to devalue and deskill teacher work. For him, in the current political and ideological climate, teachers are reduced to the status of technicians responsible merely for the implementation of curricular programs rather than developing those programs in line with the needs of their students or contexts (Giroux, 1988). He argues that this instrumental technocratic approach is also evident in the teacher preparation programs which focus on preconceived subject matter and methodology without letting student teachers discover teaching on their own. For Giroux (1988), by emphasizing “how to teach” a certain skill effectively, these programs do not direct students to see the underlying principles behind various theories, methods or techniques. This rationality, Giroux (1988) asserts, is also at work at the school setting, as teacher autonomy is limited with standardized “teacher-proof” curriculum packages, which makes it easier for the central management to control and direct teacher behavior. In this rationality, there is the illusion that all students will learn with the same materials and methodology regardless of their different backgrounds, experiences or talents (Giroux, 1988).

To reconceptualize teacher work, Giroux (1988) argues teachers should be seen as transformative intellectuals. By focusing on the notion of teacher as an *intellectual*, he underlines the fact that teachers are reflective practitioners who should take active part in curriculum development efforts. Even though his notion of a teacher as an intellectual corresponds with the definition of a reflective practitioner, Giroux thinks this is not the only role teachers should play. For Giroux (1988), teachers should also be *transformative* and challenge the social and political movements that “ignore the intelligence, judgment and experience that teachers possess” and that prevent teachers from preparing “active and critical citizens” (p. 121). The mission of teachers as transformative intellectuals is to “combine scholarly reflection and practice in the service of educating students to be thoughtful, active citizens” (Giroux, 1988; p. 122) for the well-being of democracy. In fact, Giroux and McLaren (1986) gave a detailed explanation of the term transformative intellectual in their article a long time ago:

By the term "transformative intellectual," we refer to one who exercises forms of intellectual and pedagogical practice which attempt to insert teaching and learning directly into the political sphere by arguing that schooling represents both a struggle for meaning and a struggle over power relations. We are also referring to one whose intellectual practices are necessarily grounded in forms of moral and ethical discourse exhibiting a preferential concern for the suffering and struggles of the disadvantaged and oppressed. Here we extend the traditional

definition of the intellectual as someone who is able to analyze various interests and contradictions within society to someone capable of articulating emancipatory possibilities and working towards their realization. Teachers who assume the role of transformative intellectuals treat students as critical agents, question how knowledge is produced and distributed, utilize dialogue, and make knowledge meaningful, critical, and ultimately emancipatory (p. 215).

To transform their students into critical agents of change, teachers as transformative intellectuals raise their consciousness about the political nature of schooling not to mention the social, economic and political inequalities it reinforces that exist in the society. (Giroux, 1988). For their students to work for emancipation, transformative teachers prepare both themselves and their students to struggle against oppression exploring the ways to deal with the risks. They motivate their students to develop a critical lens and to fight against the injustice and exploitation at schools and in the larger world (Kumaravadivelu, 2003). On the other hand, teachers as transformative intellectuals make the subject matter more relevant to students' own experiences so that they are able to see the political and moral implications of their experience and to question their own assumptions (Giroux, 1988). Teachers as transformative intellectuals also give students voice in expressing their ideas and concerns so that they develop "a civic courage" to transform themselves, others and the society at large (Giroux, 1988; p. xvii). To put it in Giroux's words (1988, p. xxxiii), teachers as transformative intellectuals should "not only empower students by giving them the knowledge and skills they will need to be able to function in the larger society as critical agents, but also educate them for transformative action."

Critical teacher education diverges from mainstream teacher education in its care for the sociopolitical and educational problems of the society. For critical teacher education, "the fundamental concerns of democracy and critical citizenship should be central to any discussion of the purpose of teacher education" (Giroux & McLaren, 1986, p. 222). However, faculties of education hardly encourage teacher candidates to develop a notion of education in relation to social critique and social change because they see their mission as offering technical expertise (Giroux & McLaren, 1986). From a critical perspective, mainstream teacher education is another mechanism of ideological state apparatus working to transmit capitalist values among teacher candidates fostering them to care for money and personal career prospects (Abednia, 2012; Darder, Baltodano, & Torres, 2008; Yogeve & Michaeli, 2011). In traditional teacher education, teachers are not usually recognized as decision makers or educational leaders. Seldom are they exposed to intellectually challenging materials under a heavy focus on how to teach (Kincheloe, 2004). They are usually exposed to a single mainstream teacher education paradigm which offers a narrow perspective onto teaching (Liston et al., 2009). They are directed to concentrate on the procedure of teaching more than the content. They are expected to work as facilitators, but there is little concern over the subject matter to be facilitated (Giroux & McLaren, 1986). Thoroughly alienated by the mismatch between the prescription of how to teach in university classrooms and the classroom realities they face, teacher

candidates or practicing teachers are overwhelmed (Kincheloe, 2004). Bombarded with the technical and mechanistic procedures of teaching, they are far from gaining the skills of analyzing educational purposes, the implications of education for diverse groups of students, the impact of political economy on schooling or their own roles as agents of transformation (Kincheloe, 2004). They are socialized to think that teaching is an individual, cognitive process which could be practiced by implementing what the established methods and scientific research indicate without considering the racial, social, cultural, economic or ethnic background of students (Eryaman, 2007). Yogev and Michaeli (2011) summarize the problem of teacher education programs as follows:

Contemporary teacher training demarcates itself within the boundaries of inculcating disciplinary knowledge, developing didactic skills, and nurturing self-awareness. Graduates of traditional teacher training ... perceive themselves mainly as knowledge brokers and do not think about or question the basic concepts of the system in which they work, the curriculum they teach, or the teaching methods they apply (p. 315).

In addition to the above mentioned technicism in teacher education, Liston et al. (2009) write about the dominant progressive teacher education paradigm which gives limited space to a variety of educational philosophies other than constructivism. Teacher candidates are "schooled" to a narrow understanding of education (Liston et al., 2009). For Liston et al. (2009), there are a number of reasons for this limited approach to teacher education. One reason is the limiting view of education put forward in national standards and the testing system. Another reason is the disregard for the social foundations of education. Even scholars do not give enough attention to philosophical and historical understanding of education for Liston et al. (2009). Okçabol (2012) makes a similar statement about the teacher education programs in Turkey in the quote below:

The existing system [in Turkey] is unable to make significant changes in teacher candidates. Candidates come to schools of education and leave four to five years later without experiencing any major changes in their worldview, scientific thought, understanding of the importance of their profession and the essence of education, and democratic attitudes. They do not gain the theoretical and philosophical background necessary to be considered as good teachers and educators. They graduate without acquiring the spirit of teaching, without questioning the attitudes and habits that they took on from their earlier education, and without understanding why they are becoming teachers. If they gain anything in the schools of education, it is only some teaching skills and knowledge about their subject matter (p. 228)

The main function of critical teacher education, however, is to reveal the dominant ideologies affecting the lives of teacher educators, teacher candidates and their students (Cochran-Smith, 2006), because students studying at teacher education programs usually have "unexamined assumptions, knowledge and beliefs about students, teaching and the role of schools in society" (Carrington & Selva, 2010, p. 46). In contrast to traditional teacher education programs which reinforce these assumptions, critical teacher education allows students to examine their own beliefs about class, ethnicity and gender roles, and reconstruct the role of schooling through theoretical content and discussions. They should be able to understand that these systems of education are human constructions and could be changed (Kincheloe, 2004). They should be able to see the microcosm of their classroom from a macro perspective (Pennycook, 1994). Kincheloe (2004, p. 24) describes what kind of teacher education is targeted in critical teacher education in the following paragraph:

I want universities to produce rigorously educated teachers with an awareness of the complexities of educational practice and an understanding of and commitment to a socially just, democratic notion of schooling. Only with a solid foundation in various mainstream and alternative canons of knowledge can teachers begin to make wise judgments and informed choices about curriculum development and classroom practice. In this context they can craft a teacher persona that enables them to diagnose individual and collective needs of their students and connect them to their pedagogical strategies and goals. It is naive and dangerous to think that teachers can become the rigorous professionals envisioned here without a conceptual understanding of contemporary and past societies and the sociocultural, political, and economic forces that have shaped them.

As seen in the above quote, this model of teacher education "emphasizes the preparation of teachers who are critical of the current inequities in public schooling and the social, economic, and political structures of the society and will work in and outside their classrooms for greater educational, economic and social justice" (Zeichner & Flessner, 2009, p. 24). For Welsh (1985, as cited in Giroux & McLaren, 1986, p. 226), teachers as transformative intellectuals should work "as bearers of dangerous memory." In other words, intellectual teachers should make those rarely told stories of oppression public and problematize the histories of women, ethnically diverse groups of people or working-class people. They should not just raise consciousness about these issues, however. They should also be calling people to struggle.

Teacher educators who work for social justice aim at culturally responsive teaching. This culturally responsive way of teaching does not only include appreciating diversity, but it also entails issues of oppression and injustice related to ethnicity, social class, gender and other markers of difference with a view to

working as an activist to overcome all sorts of injustices. Thus, it is important for these programs to provide the necessary content knowledge together with the skills to transform that knowledge into practice. In the program, students learn to examine their own values and beliefs about others in addition to racism and privilege by reading, writing and discussing autobiographies, films, case studies and doing action research (Zeichner & Flessner, 2009). They also analyze the political and economic factors that influence the schooling practices from administrative decisions to materials. They attempt to discover the hidden messages these practices provide. However, since learning to teach in a culturally responsive way requires a great deal of personal transformation, student teachers are reported to resist (Zeichner & Flessner, 2009). Thus, it is necessary to set an example to these student teachers for the caring relationships they are asked to form with their students, which means that teacher educators need to internalize culturally responsive ways of teaching. They should also build a community composed of student teachers, expert mentor teachers and teacher educators in which all participants are considered equally valuable sources of information (Zeichner & Flessner, 2009).

Critical teacher education uses dialogue and co-construction rather than direct-instruction in teaching critical content. For critical education, it is not possible to "empower" or "enlighten" anybody without their deliberate effort to do so. In the words of Clarke (2003, as cited in Morgan, 2009, pp. 90-91):

"Empower" and "liberate" are not transitive verbs. Grammatically, of course, this is not true; both verbs require objects and therefore are transitive ... Pragmatically, however, the matter is not so straightforward. Empowerment and liberation are not serums that can be administered to other. They are not states of grace that we confer on our students. We do not empower others by declaring them to be liberated, nor can we harass them into being empowered... In other words, liberation education is not a direct-instruction phenomenon. The best we can do is work to create the conditions under which students will begin to take the initiative.

The above quote reminds one of Freire's (1970) warnings that no one can liberate anyone. For Freire, educators should not fall into the trap of using oppressors' methods in liberatory pedagogy.

One important distinguishing characteristic of critical teacher education approach is the central position it assigns to field experiences student teachers acquire in schools and communities (Zeichner & Flessner, 2009). As opposed to the traditional teacher education approaches which provide distanced methods instruction, this teacher education perspective provides a vast situated instruction working closely with the mentor teachers in teaching students and student teachers. The schools and the mentor teachers student teachers work with are chosen carefully. Both the student teachers and the mentor-teachers are supported during the experience (Zeichner & Flessner, 2009). What is more, student teachers are also asked to develop projects with the school community both to

contribute to the change efforts and to experience the life of students outside school in their own communities. In this way, skills of student teachers to take civic responsibility and to engage in social action are developed. They also have a broader perspective into the values and beliefs of the school community, since social justice teacher education gives equal importance to the development of attitudes, beliefs and dispositions as the development of knowledge and skills (Zeichner, 2009).

Another important characteristic of this teacher education model is the participation of the K-12 teachers to the decision-making processes in teacher education programs “as full and equal partners in program planning and renewal” (Zeichner & Flessner, 2009, p. 41). The existence of a hierarchical relationship with those people outside the university is not consistent with the aims of this teacher education for creating a more just and equal society (Zeichner & Flessner, 2009). This collaboration with the school teachers is seen as a remedy to solve the traditional and ineffective teacher preparation programs which are detached from the complexities of the classroom environment. If the instruction is situated with the help of observation, videotapes, teacher diaries, etc., it will turn out to be a more effective way of preparing student teachers for the realities of classroom work. In those programs, school teachers also work with teacher educators on campus and they provide instruction (Zeichner & Flessner, 2009).

As can be seen from the above discussion, critical teacher education does not address only technical issues in preservice teacher education. For this teacher education approach, moral issues are as indispensable as the technical ones in preservice teachers’ preparation. Inspired by New College’s teacher education program, Giroux and McLaren (1986) advocate that a teacher education program should include critical conceptual understanding, educational theory, and teaching practice. Zeichner (2009) argues that both technical and ethical issues of teaching should be taken into consideration so that student teachers become aware of the consequences of their actions.

As for the charges against critical teacher education as being too political, indoctrinating and ideological, Cochran-Smith (2006) argues that it is not possible to have a neutral or value-free teacher education:

All of teacher education is political - including decisions about the content and focus of the curriculum, the pedagogy developed, the assessment strategies employed, the arrangements regarding program structures and all fieldwork experiences, and the ways candidates are selected and recruited. All of these things involve choices about what is included and what is left out, whose viewpoints and interests are served and whose may not be, which aspects of teaching and schooling are made problematic and which are taken-for-granted, and what assumptions are made - whether spoken or unspoken - about the purposes of teaching and schooling in a democratic society (Cochran-Smith, 2006, p. 200)

For Cochran-Smith (2006), such accusations against critical teacher education being "ideological" is an attempt to move politics out of teacher education and reduce it to only subject matter knowledge and teaching skills. As an answer to the claims that critical teacher education does only focus on multicultural education making students feel good about themselves and ignoring academic knowledge and skills, Cochran-Smith (2006) asserts that this is far from reality, because critical teacher education aims to provide deep learning opportunities for all learners. The content is not, however, limited to facts, but includes understanding oneself and the world in which one lives.

Conclusion

Teacher models and teacher roles outlined above are not absolute opposites, Kumaravadivelu (2003) noted, they have some features in common. In fact, teachers as reflective practitioners encompass some of the features of teachers as passive technicians while teachers as transformative intellectuals include characteristics of the former two. To better illustrate the relationship between these teacher education models and teacher roles, I use the metaphor of matryoshka dolls, which are comprised of a set of wooden carved baby dolls of differing sizes placed one inside another. Just like the biggest matryoshka doll having smaller figures in it, the role of teacher as a transformative intellectual reveals a smaller figure inside, teacher as a reflective practitioner, which in turn consists of another figure, teacher as a passive technician. That means these roles are not mutually exclusive, rather they are complementary, which means for teachers to accomplish their true missions, they should have the characteristics of all these roles, which could be accomplished only via a more comprehensive critical teacher education approach.

There is no doubt that teacher candidates should have a mastery of the existing teaching methodologies and they should make self-evaluations (Adler, 1990). They should learn the collective memory of the field not to reinvent the wheel and to be able to move beyond the existing pedagogical content knowledge. As Zeichner (2009) argued, critical education does not intend to devalue technical knowledge, reflective abilities or reflective teaching. These are all necessary for educating teachers. From a critical perspective, however, these are not sufficient. The knowledge base of teacher education should not be limited to general pedagogical knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge or the subject matter knowledge (Zeichner, 2014). For critical pedagogues, all types of teacher knowledge as categorized by Shulman (1987) should be included in teacher education. To remind the reader of Shulman's (1987, p. 8) categorization, it included the following:

- 1) content knowledge,
- 2) general pedagogical knowledge,
- 3) curriculum knowledge,
- 4) pedagogical content knowledge,
- 5) knowledge of learners and their characteristics,
- 6) knowledge of educational contexts,
- 7) knowledge of educational ends, purposes and values and their philosophical and historical grounds.

Shulman (1987) came up with this categorization after years of observing novice and expert teachers and analyzing what knowledge teachers gained (or failed to gain). Despite providing a comprehensive description of teacher knowledge base, he warned that this categorization was not "fixed or final" (p. 12). Since Shulman's categorization, new models of teacher knowledge base have been offered (Turner-Bisset, 1999; Verloop, Van Driel & Meijer, 2001). Still, Shulman's is recognized as the main source of reference.

If parallelism is to be made between Kumaravadivelu's (2003) teacher roles and Shulman's (1987) categorization of teacher knowledge base, one might argue that a technicist view of teacher education focuses on items 1, 2 and 4 in the above list (i.e., content knowledge, general pedagogical knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge). Reflective teacher education, however, integrates these fundamental bases of teacher education with curriculum knowledge, knowledge of learners and their characteristics and knowledge of educational contexts (i.e., all of the above except for item 7). Critical teacher education, in turn, encapsulates all elements in Shulman's list with a specific focus on educational ends, purposes and values to educate teachers as transformative intellectuals. In this respect, it could be natural for teachers as transformative intellectuals to emerge as the broadest category of teacher roles in Kumaravadivelu's (2003) categorization.

Despite the all-encompassing nature of the notion of *teachers as transformative intellectuals*, one might argue that it is not possible to address all the items in Shulman's (1987) list in a pre-service teacher education program given the limited time and resources. One might even find it as luxurious or utopian to educate teachers as transformative intellectuals taking into consideration the big gaps in learners' content knowledge or pedagogical content knowledge. Though such an argument might have a point, a counter-argument would claim that a four-year university level pre-service teacher education would not be complete without doing justice to all elements of teacher knowledge. While a short-term teacher-training course could prioritize some areas of teacher knowledge, a four-year university education cannot be reduced to a selection of elements from among the teacher knowledge base. Such a selection would "trivialize" teaching "ignoring its complexity" in Shulman's (1987, p. 6) words. On the other hand, as Kincheloe (2004) put it, it would be "naive and dangerous to think that teachers can become the rigorous professionals ... without a conceptual understanding of contemporary and past societies and the socio-cultural, political and economic forces that have shaped them" (p. 50). From a critical perspective, only through such an understanding can teachers develop new ways of teaching and advancing knowledge both for themselves and for their community (Kincheloe, 2004).

Besides, a university education based on a limited body of teacher knowledge could be considered as a violation of students' rights of getting a high-quality education. As Liston et al. (2009) put it:

Candidates should not be trained or molded to get a particular educational path - at least not without their informed and educational consent. Today, however, many (certainly not all)

university-based teacher candidates are being inculcated to see teaching and schooling within a dominant, progressive paradigm ... Candidates are prepared for a professional role that frequently does not match the realities of public schooling. Future teachers' education should include .. an examination of their own personal and professional values as well as the larger educational and cultural values. The education we offer our candidates should engage them in the best that the liberal arts tradition has to offer: reflective self-discernment as well as critical cultural understanding. Without this sort of educational engagement ... we are failing the profession, the larger public, as well as our schools' students (p. 107).

As the above quote reveals, for the well-being of the profession of teaching and for teacher candidates to get an understanding for the reasons behind the problems they face at schools, teacher education needs to have a broader scope. Otherwise, teachers would fall into the trap of diagnosing the problem as their faulty methodology and look for new techniques rather than trying to broaden their limited understanding of the complexity of teaching (Halliday, 1998). For teachers to construct education as a political, social and cultural action and for them to educate critical free-thinking citizens, there is an urgent need for teacher education programs to adopt critical teacher education model and educate teachers as transformative intellectuals, who would engage in reflection and action to build a more humane life for themselves, for their students and for the whole society.

References

- Abednia, A. (2012). Teachers' professional identity: Contributions of a critical EFL teacher education course in Iran. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 28, 706-717.
- Adler, S. A. (1990). The reflective practitioner and the curriculum of teacher education. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators (Las Vegas, NV, February 5-8, 1990).
- Akbari, R. (2007). Reflections on reflection: A critical appraisal of reflective practices in L2 teacher education. *System*, 35, 192-207.
- Burton, J. (2009). Reflective practice. In A. Burns & J. C. Richards (Eds.) *The Cambridge guide to second language teacher education* (pp. 298-308). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Canning, R. (2011). Reflecting on the reflective practitioner: Vocational initial teacher education in Scotland. *Journal of Vocational Education & Training*, 63(4), 609-617.
- Carrington, S. & Selva, G. (2010). Critical social theory and transformative learning: Evidence in pre-service teachers' service-learning reflection logs. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 29(1), 45-57.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (2006). Teacher education and the need for public intellectuals. *The New Educator*, 2, 181-206.
- Darder, A., Baltodano, M. P. & Torres, R. D. (2008). *The critical pedagogy reader* (2nd edition). New York: Routledge.
- Dewey, J. (1997). *How we think*. Chicago: Henry Regnery. (Original work published 1933)
- Eryaman, M. Y. (2007). From reflective practice to practical wisdom: Towards a post-foundational teacher education. *International Journal of Progressive Education*, 3(1). n1.
- Freeman, D. (1989). Teacher training, development, and decision making. A model of teaching and related strategies for language teacher education. *TESOL Quarterly*, 23(1), 27-45.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed 30th anniversary edition*. New York: Continuum.
- Giroux, H. (1988). *Teachers as intellectuals. Toward a critical pedagogy of learning*. Granby, Mass.: Bergin & Garvey.
- Giroux, H. & McLaren, P. (1986). Teacher education and the politics of engagement: The case for democratic schooling. *Harvard Educational Review*, 56(3), 213-238.
- Goodman, J. (1984). Reflection and teacher education: A case study and theoretical analysis. *Interchange*, 15(3), 9-26.

- Güven, I. (2008). Teacher education reform and international globalization hegemony: Issues and challenges in Turkish teacher education. *International Journal of Social, Management, Economics and Business Engineering*, 2(4), 16-25.
- Halliday, J. (1998). Technicism, reflective practice and authenticity in teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 14(6), 597-605.
- Hodkinson, P. (2011). Technicism, teachers and teaching quality in vocational education and training. *Journal of Vocational Education & Training*, 50(2), 193-208.
- Johnson, K. E. (2009). *Second language teacher education a sociocultural perspective*. New York: Routledge.
- Kincheloe, J. K. (2004). The knowledges of teacher education: Developing a critical complex epistemology. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, Kış 2004, 49-66.
- Kincheloe, J. K. (2008). *Critical pedagogy* (2nd ed.). New York: Peter Lang Publishing.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (2003). *Beyond methods macrostrategies for language teaching*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Larrivee, B. (2008). Meeting the challenge of preparing reflective practitioners. *The New Educator*, 4(2), 87-106.
- Liston, D., Whitcomb, J. & Borko, H. (2009). The end of education in teacher education thoughts on reclaiming the role of social foundations in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 60(2), 107-111.
- Lortie, D. C. (1975). *School teacher: A sociological inquiry*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Morgan, B. (2009). Fostering transformative practitioners for critical EAP: Possibilities and challenges. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 8, 86-99.
- Okçabol, I. R. (2012). The system of teacher training during AKP Rule. In K. Inal & G. Akkaymak (Eds.) *Neoliberal transformation of education in Turkey* (pp. 219-231). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Pennycook, A. (1994). *The cultural politics of English as an international language*. New York: Longman.
- Richards, J. (1989). Beyond training: approaches to teacher education in language teaching. Plenary speaker, Macquarie University, Sydney, June 15, 1989.
- Schön, D. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner*. Oxford: Jossey-Bass Inc. Publishers.
- Shulman, L. S. (1987). Knowledge and teaching. Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review*, 57(1), 1-21.

- Sleeter, C. E. & Grant, C. A. (2007). *Making Choices for Multicultural Education Five Approaches to Race, Class and Gender 5th edition*. Danvers, MA: Wiley.
- Turner-Bisset, R. (1999). The knowledge bases of the expert teacher. *British Educational Research Journal*, 25(1), 39-55.
- Verloop, N., Van Driel, J. & Meijer, P. (2001). Teacher knowledge and the knowledge base of teaching. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 35, 441-461.
- Vygotsky, L. (1986). *Thought and language*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Wallace, M. J. (1991). *Training foreign language learners a reflective approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Yogev, E. & Michaeli, N. (2011). Teachers as society-involved "Organic Intellectuals": Training teachers in a political context. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 62(3), 312-324.
- Zeichner, K. M. (1990). Educational and social commitments in reflective teacher education programs. Proceedings of the National Forum of the Association of Independent Liberal Arts Colleges for Teacher Education, pp. 55-63.
- Zeichner, K. M. (2009). *Teacher education and the struggle for social justice*. New York: Routledge.
- Zeichner, K. (2011). Teacher education for social justice. In M. R. Hawkins (Ed.) *Social justice language teacher education* (pp. 7-22). New York: Multilingual Matters
- Zeichner, K. M. & Liston, D. P. (1996). *Reflective teaching: An introduction*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Zeichner, K. M. & Flessner, R. (2009). Educating teachers for social justice. K. Zeichner (Ed.) *Teacher education and the struggle for social justice* (s. 24-43). New York: Routledge.

International Journal of Educational Policies

ISSN: 1307-3842

<http://ijep.icpres.org>

<http://ojs.ijep.info>

©IJEP