Theme: Restructuring Teacher Education

Traditions of Reform in U.S. Teacher Education

Kenneth M. Zeichner
University of Wisconsin-Madison

Daniel P. Liston
Washington University

Four traditions of reform in 20th century teacher education in the United States are described: academic, social efficiency, developmentalist, and social reconstructionist. Each tradition is illustrated with examples from both early to mid-century and contemporary teacher education programs. It is argued that this framework of reform traditions can help clarify some important differences among ideas and practices in teacher education that appear on the surface to be similar.

> A tradition is an argument extended through time in which certain fundamental agreements are defined and redefined in terms of two kinds of conflict: those with critics and enemies external to the tradition who reject all or at least key parts of those fundamental agreements, and those internal, interpretative debates through which the meaning and rationale of the fundamental agreements come to be expressed and by whose progress a tradition is constituted....To appeal to tradition is to insist that we cannot adequately identify either our own commitments or those of others in the argumentative conflicts of the present except by situating them within these histories which made them what they have now become (MacIntyre, 1988, p. 12-13).

One of the most notable characteristics of the current reform movement in U.S. teacher education is its lack of historical consciousness. Very little attention has been given in the literature of this movement to the historical roots of contemporary reform proposals. One is hard pressed to find explicit references in this literature to any of the numerous reform efforts that foundations, governmental agencies, or teacher educators have initiated over the past 50 years. Although several recent analyses of the development of teacher education programs within colleges and universities in the 20th century have illuminated many of the tensions and conflicts impeding the reform of programs (Clifford & Guthrie, 1988; Herbst, 1989; Powell, 1976; Schneider, 1987), attempts to identify lessons that have been learned from specific teacher education reform efforts, and from efforts in other professions, are scarce. Some examples of recent efforts to inform debate through analyses of reform projects of the past include Sykes (1984), Coley and Thorpe (1986), Johnson (1987), Zeichner (1988a) and Herbst (1989).

One consequence of the historical amnesia in the current teacher education reform movement is a lack of clarity about the theoretical and political commitments underlying specific reform proposals. Currently popular terms like "reflective teaching," "action research," "subject matter," "development," and "empowerment" are bandied about with a great deal of confusion about the underlying commitments and assumptions that distinguish one proposal from another. In some cases (e.g., with "reflective teaching"), the use of particular terms has become almost meaningless because of the way in which teacher educators holding diverse perspectives express allegiance to the same slogans.

We contend that efforts to reform teacher education throughout the 20th century have always reflected varying degrees of commitment to several

Kenneth M. Zeichner, Professor, Department of Curriculum & Instruction, University of Wisconsin, 225 N. Mills Street, Madison, WI. Specialization: the study of teacher education, with an emphasis on clinical teacher education.

Daniel P. Liston, Associate Professor, Department of Education, Washington University, Campus Box 1183, St. Louis, MO. Specialization: the study of teacher education with a focus on philosophies of education.

distinct reform traditions. Drawing on Kliebard's (1986) analysis of the various interest groups that have vied for control of the primary and secondary school curriculum in this century and on several recent analyses of alternative conceptual orientations in teacher education (Feiman-Nemser, in press; Joyce, 1975; Kirk, 1986, and Zeichner, 1983), we will discuss four traditions of reform in 20th century U.S. teacher education. These traditions are (a) the academic tradition, (b) the social efficiency tradition, (c) the developmentalist tradition, and (d) the social reconstructionist tradition. (These traditions are elaborated more fully in Liston and Zeichner, in press.) We believe that this framework of reform traditions can help clarify some of the important differences among contemporary reform proposals that appear on the surface to be similar.

Although we do not advocate here any of the reform traditions, we do argue that it is important for teacher educators to understand the conceptions of knowledge, teaching, learning, and social welfare associated with particular reform proposals. The implication is that teacher educators should choose carefully among reform alternatives with a clear sense of their own location in relation to the four traditions.

The Academic Tradition

Prior to the existence of formal programs of teacher education, a classicial liberal arts education was equivalent to being prepared to teach (Borrowman, 1965). As programs for the preparation of elementary and secondary teachers became established in colleges and universities, the point of view persisted that a sound liberal arts education, complemented by an apprenticeship in a school, was the most sensible way to prepare teachers for their work. Throughout this period, the contributions of schools, colleges, and departments of education to an education for teaching (with the exception of student teaching) have been severely criticized for their alleged inferior intellectual quality and for interfering with the liberal education of teachers. This orientation to teacher education emphasizes the teacher's role as a scholar and subject matter specialist and has taken different forms, depending upon the view of the disciplines and subject matter knowledge that has supported specific reform proposals.

One of the earliest critics of professional education courses for prospective teachers was Abraham Flexner, noted for his contributions to the reform of medical education in the U.S. In his seminal work on European and American universities, Flexner (1930) lodged a number of criticisms that advocates of the academic tradition have raised repeatedly. He argued, for example, that mastery of subject matter is the most important goal in the education of teachers. Flexner, like many who have followed him, criticized education courses for their superficiality, education professors and their students for their meager intellectual resources, and education scholarship for its insignificance. Accepting the value of a few legitimate areas of study in education such as educational philosophy and comparative educational studies, Flexner argued that what teachers need to learn, beyond a sound liberal education, could come from an apprenticeship in a school.

> Why should not an educated person, broadly and deeply versed in educational philosophy and experience, help himself from that point on? Why should his attention be diverted during these pregnant years to the trivialities and applications with which common sense can deal adequately when the time comes? (pp. 99-100)

Flexner's bias toward disciplinary knowledge is also revealed in his criticisms of the education literature.

> The topics discussed in the current literature are so unimportant as compared with the subjects discussed by physicists, chemists, or political scientists that it may well seem as though they were designed to frighten off intelligence. (p. 102)

Since Flexner's critique, a number of highly visible and controversial analyses of teacher education (e.g., Bestor, 1953, 1956; Conant, 1963; Koerner, 1963; Lynd, 1953) have repeated these allegations of the inferior intellectual quality of education courses, faculty, and students. At least some of these charges have been and continue to be true in some situations. There is some question, however, as to the extent to which these characterizations of the professional education component of teacher education are representative of education courses generally or exclusively (see Zeichner, 1988a). Recently, several commentators have argued (e.g., Clifford &

Guthrie, 1988; Ginsburg, 1988; Lanier & Little, 1986) that these academically-oriented criticisms may have less to do with the quality of people, courses, and programs in education, than with status differences based on gender and social class between education faculty and students and those in arts and sciences. Although even the harshest of these critics, such as Bestor, have admitted that things are not all well within courses in the arts and sciences, the general assumption has been that courses within the arts and sciences are necessarily liberalizing, whereas education courses are exclusively technical and vocational (Borrowman, 1956).

The programmatic implications of the academic tradition have changed somewhat over time depending upon particular views of a good liberal education and of the kinds of subject matter knowledge that teachers need. Following the decline of the humanist position based firmly in a classical liberal arts education (Kliebard, 1986) and periodic attempts to professionalize subject matter offerings by considering pedagogical implications in academic courses (Borrowman, 1956), most manifestations of this position have, until recently, involved proposals for the preparation of teachers based firmly in the traditional academic disciplines as they are taught to all students regardless of their intended vocations. Proponents (e.g., Bestor, 1953) have argued that this approach will draw academically talented students into teaching who would otherwise be repelled by requirements to take many education courses of doubtful intellectual value.

The most significant impact of the academic tradition of reform has been on the preparation of secondary teachers. With a few notable exceptions, such as in California (Hendrick, 1967) and in liberal arts colleges (Travers & Sacks, 1987), elementary education students have typically completed twice as many education courses as prospective secondary teachers and have rarely completed academic majors. One notable example of academically-oriented teacher education reforms was the efforts of the Ford Foundation and its Fund For the Advancement of Education to establish various forms of graduate teacher education as a replacement for traditional undergraduate preparation. In the 1950s and 1960s Ford sponsored several graduate teacher education program models, including an attempt to convert an entire state (Arkansas) to an approach in which all prospective teachers would receive 4 years of liberal arts education as undergraduates and a reduced load of professional education courses at the graduate level. Throughout this period, Ford spent over $70 million on initiatives that included fifth year preparation programs specializing in the preparation of older liberal arts graduates for teaching, M.A.T. programs for secondary teachers that education and arts and sciences faculties developed jointly, and a special set of "Breakthrough" programs (Stone, 1968; Woodring, 1957). These Ford programs became models for many graduate programs, some of which continue to exist today, as well as for aspects of the National Teacher Corps (Corwin, 1973; Saxe, 1965).

Recently several challenges have been raised to this emphasis on a liberal arts education and of subject matter knowledge for teachers. One line of inquiry from a feminist perspective criticizes traditionally defined liberal arts education for perpetuating the Platonic emphasis "on mind not hand, thought not action, production not reproduction, and reason not emotion."

> The project for teacher educators that I am recommending...is neither so simplistic nor so impoverished as one that merely replaces an emphasis on head with one on hand, one on thought with one on action, one on reason with one on feeling and emotion, one on separation of the self with one on connection to others, one on the productive processes of society with one on its reproductive processes. It is a difficult project to carry out because it is possible to join together the two sides of the various Platonic dichotomies only if they are equally valued....Once we understand the historic roots of liberal education, we will begin to see the inappropriateness for prospective teachers today of the educational ideal Plato held up for the guardians of his just state and of the educational program he designed for them in light of it. (Martin, 1987, p. 406)

Contemporary examples of teacher education programs that have been influenced by recent feminist scholarship are the graduate M.A.T. program at Lewis and Clark College (Tetreault, 1987; Tetreault & Braunger, 1989) and the teacher education program at Wheaton College (Maher, in press). In these programs teacher educators have infused issues on

women and gender that challenge Platonic dichotomies throughout the curriculum and have critiqued the pedagogy and social relations in their program through the perspectives of feminist scholarship.

A second challenge to the dominance of conventional notions of the academic reform tradition has emerged from recent work on teachers' subject matter knowledge. Stimulated in part by Shulman's (1986, 1987) criticisms of the lack of attention to teachers' subject matter understandings by both researchers and teacher educators, investigators are exploring how teachers' understandings of subject matter content interact with other kinds of knowledge to influence instruction (e.g., Ball & McDiarmid, in press; Wilson, Shulman, & Richert, 1987). One consequence of these efforts to explicate the dimensions of subject matter knowledge that are appropriate in a teacher's education is the emergence of a new "knowledge base" for teacher education that is much broader than the earlier behavioristic knowledge bases of the 1960s and 1970s (see Reynolds, 1989).

Feiman-Nemser (in press) described how this cognitive psychological perspective has been applied to teacher education in the Academic Learning program at Michigan State University. This program is concerned with preparing elementary and secondary teachers to teach school subjects in ways that promote conceptual understanding (Schram, Wilcox, Lanier, & Lappan, 1988). Another example of this general approach is the work on "cognitively guided instruction" that has been introduced into teacher education programs at the University of Wisconsin-Madison (Fennema, Carpenter, & Peterson, in press). In courses incorporating a "CGI" orientation, prospective teachers are given opportunities to understand how children think about mathematics and then to base their instruction on children's cognitions and knowledge. The goal for the "CGI" program is to prepare teachers who can foster children's active mental involvement in worthwhile mathematical tasks.

A third challenge to historically dominant notions of academically oriented reform in teacher education has focused on the western, white, middle class biases in the liberal arts curriculum. There has also been criticism of the failure of many academically oriented teacher education reforms (e.g., M.A.T. programs) to respond to needs for preparing teachers to work in economically depressed and culturally diverse inner cities (Coley & Thorpe, 1986; Keppel, 1986; Zeichner, 1988b).

One response to these elitist tendencies in U.S. teacher education has been attempts to incorporate multicultural perspectives into the curricula of teacher education programs (Gay, 1986). This movement received a great deal of federal support in the 1960s and 1970s through Teacher Corps and Trainers of Teacher Trainers (TTT) programs (Drummond & Andrews, 1980). A great deal of effort has been devoted over the years to analyzing the extent to which multicultural perspectives have been incorporated into the curricula of U.S. teacher education programs (e.g., Gollnick, 1978), assessing the impact of multicultural learning opportunities that have been incorporated into programs (e.g., Grant & Koskella, 1986) and providing guidelines for action and program exemplars to the teacher education community (e.g., Baptiste, Baptiste, & Gollnick, 1980). Cabello and Dash (1988) and Grant and Secada (in press) discussed recent efforts to develop teacher education programs with a focus on pupil diversity.

Despite challenges to historically dominant notions of good liberal education for teachers, calls for a return to traditional forms of liberal arts education for teachers continue today (e.g., Damerell, 1985). Recent state policies, such as the ones placing limits on the number of education courses allowed in a teacher education program (Imig, 1986) and the establishment of alternate routes allowing people to enter teaching with little or no professional education coursework (Uhler, 1987), reinforce the belief noted by Borrowman (1956) that a course is necessarily liberalizing if offered by academic faculty and is necessarily technical if offered in a school of education. Current efforts to arbitrarily limit the number of education courses in a teacher preparation program fail to address the issue of academic quality by ignoring the substance of what is offered within particular courses (Zeichner, 1988a).

The Social Efficiency Tradition

A second major reform tradition in 20th century U.S. teacher education, the social efficiency tradi-

tion, has involved faith in the power of the scientific study of teaching to provide the basis for building a teacher education curriculum. This tradition emerged largely within schools, departments, and colleges of education and has been seen by many as part of a strategy to strengthen educationists' claim to legitimacy within the university (Sykes, 1984). Cremin (1953), in reflecting upon the development of teacher education in the early part of this century, observed:

> Growing out of this faith [in science] came innumerable attempts during the 1920s to break down and analyze the teaching task into its component parts and to build a teacher education program around such technical analysis. (p. 246)

One of the earliest and most prominent efforts at scientific curriculum making in U.S. teacher education was the Commonwealth Teacher Training Study (Charters & Waples, 1929). Criticizing teacher education programs for lacking a clear definition of objectives and logical plans of procedure, Charters and Waples sought to demonstrate that a comprehensive description of the duties and traits of teachers would provide the basis for systematically determining what teachers should be taught. Kliebard (1975) summarized the way in which the study was conducted:

> As a first step Charters and Waples ascertained the traits that characterize excellent teachers. Adapting the consensus approach, the investigators used two methods: analyzing the professional literature and interviewing expert judges. Working from a list of 83 traits, ranging alphabetically from Accuracy through Foresight and Magnetism all the way to Wittiness, "translators" were given the task of interpreting statements made in writing or in interviews. Reliability among translators was determined by applying the Spearman prophecy formula. Finally, after some of the original traits were telescoped, scientifically determined lists were prepared indicating that senior high school teachers should be characterized by twenty-six traits including Good Taste and Propriety; junior high school teachers by Conventionality (morality) and Openmindedness.... Next in an adaptation of the job analysis technique, the investigators collected a master list of 1,001 teacher activities. (p. 35)

The teacher activities were based on the results of mailing surveys to experienced teachers in 42 states. The final list of 1,001 teaching activities was subdivided into 7 major divisions (e.g., classroom instruction, school and classroom management). These teaching activities and the master list of 83 teacher traits broken down into those appropriate for various levels of schooling were to assist teacher educators in designing teacher preparation programs that were based firmly in the realities of schooling rather than in tradition or individual judgment. Although this study had little direct impact on teacher education programs, the idea of systematically building a curriculum of teacher education on the basis of a careful analysis of the work performed by teachers persisted.

One of the subsequent manifestations of this perspective in U.S. teacher education was the emergence of Competency/Performance Based Teacher Education (C/PBTE) in the 1960s and 1970s. Stimulated in part by applications of behavioristic psychology to the training of personnel in industry and the military during and after World War II (McDonald, 1973) and by the U.S. Department of Education's support for the development of plans for nine model competency-based teacher education programs that applied procedures of systems and job analysis to the design of a teacher education curriculum (Clarke, 1969), the idea of C/PBTE received so much attention in the literature that it has been described both within the U.S. and abroad (Atkin & Raths, 1974; Turney, 1977) as the single most influential and controversial trend in U.S. teacher education in this century.

Despite the attention that C/PBTE received in the literature and popular press, the movement affected actual practice in teacher education programs only minimally. Sandefur and Nicklas (1981) concluded that full-scale implementation of C/PBTE programs occurred in only about 13% of the 618 responding institutions associated with the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. Joyce, Yarger, and Howey (1977) and the National Center for Education Statistics (1977) reached similar conclusions in two national surveys of practices in preservice teacher education programs. Two of the most prominent examples of institutions where C/PBTE gained a foothold were the University of Houston (Ginsburg, 1988) and the University of Toledo

(Howey & Zimpher, 1989).

This general approach to teacher education emphasizes the acquisition of specific and observable teaching skills that are assumed to be related to pupil learning. By the 1960s educational research had progressed far beyond the relatively crude survey and analysis techniques used in the Commonwealth Study. This more recent version of the social efficiency orientation sought to establish the intellectual legitimacy of teacher education through a grounding in classroom research that linked observable teacher behaviors with pupil outcomes. Despite the increased sophistication in research methods, one of the major criticisms of the approach has been a questioning of the empirical validity of the teaching competencies (e.g., Heath & Nielson, 1974; Tom, 1984). Even advocates of the approach were careful to admit that they had not yet attained their goal of empirically validated teaching competencies. They hoped, however, that increased commitment to the approach from the profession and from those who would support the necessary research would eventually yield such knowledge (Sykes, 1984).

One key characteristic of the C/PBTE approach is that the knowledge and skills to be mastered by prospective teachers are specified in advance, usually in behavioral terms. Furthermore, the criteria for measuring mastery are made explicit. Performance, rather than the completion of specified coursework, is assumed to be the most valid measure of teaching competence (Gage & Winne, 1975). Another important element in this approach is the development of instructional, management, and evaluation systems to monitor students' mastery of competencies. A number of significant developments occurred in this area. First, microteaching was developed at Stanford University as a method for systematically teaching specific teaching skills to students (Allen & Ryan, 1969). Microteaching was later incorporated into more comprehensive teacher training packages called "minicourses" by staff at the Far West Educational Laboratory (Borg, 1970). Closely related to these developments was the development of protocol and simulation materials (Cruickshank, 1985), systematic classroom observation systems (Simon & Boyer, 1967), and models of skill training (Joyce, Weil, & Wald, 1974).

These developments caused a great deal of controversy in the teacher education community. A vast literature quickly emerged that raised several criticisms of the general orientation. One challenge, as mentioned above, came from those who questioned the empirical validity of the "knowledge base" upon which these programs rested. Some criticized the methods that had been used in conducting the studies through which competencies were identified but retained faith that improved research would overcome existing validity problems (Gage, 1970). Others questioned whether the complex and uncertain nature of teaching would ever enable these problems to be overcome through research (Tom, 1980) or argued that to attempt to do so would limit our conception of teaching to "telling" (Broudy, 1973).

A second line of protest against the C/PBTE movement came from "humanistic" educators such as Art Combs and his colleagues at the University of Florida. This critique focused on the assumptions of the behavioristic psychology underlying most examples of the approach. Combs (1972) went so far as to argue that "requiring a teacher education program to define precisely the behaviors it hopes to produce may be the surest way to destroy the effectiveness of its products" (p. 288).

A third critique of the C/PBTE movement came from those, such as Apple (1972) and Nash and Agne (1971), who criticized the conservative political tendencies that were thought to be associated with the approach. By basing the specification of competencies on current conceptions of the teacher's role in a system that was thought to be in need of fundamental reform, it was argued that C/PBTE undermined the reconstructionist ideals of many teacher educators and legitimated the status quo in school and society.

Despite the low rate of implementation of C/PBTE in teacher education programs across the U.S., the social efficiency tradition has emerged once again in the current debates on teacher education reform, this time under the label of "research-based teacher education." Many current proposals for the reform of teacher education (e.g., The Holmes Group, 1986) have argued that the past decade of research on teaching has produced a "knowledge base" that can form the foundation for a

teacher education curriculum. For example, Berliner (1984) concluded: "We have only recently developed a solid body of knowledge and a fresh set of conceptions about teaching on which to base teacher education. For the first time, teacher education has a scientific foundation" (p. 94).

Feiman-Nemser (in press) described two ways in which contemporary teacher education reformers have interpreted the social efficiency perspective. First, she described a technological version in which the intent is to teach prospective teachers the skills that research has shown to be associated with desirable pupil outcomes. This narrow interpretation is basically a re-emergence of a behavioristic version of C/PBTE. Feiman-Nemser cited the work of Joyce and Showers (1984) with the development of procedures for skill training as an example of this trend.

A second contemporary trend in the application of research on teaching to the design of teacher education curricula described by Feiman-Nemser (in press) is teachers' use of the findings of research as "principles of procedure" within a broader process of decision making and problem solving. Advocates of this deliberative orientation to the use of research on teaching to improve teacher education argue that teaching demands an approach to teacher preparation that reflects the complex and uncertain nature of the work. The crucial task from this point of view is to foster teachers' capabilities to exercise judgment about the use of teaching skills.

> Because they view good teaching as good deliberation, their concern is not that teachers follow a set of rules, which could never account for all circumstances anyway, but rather that teachers view teaching as a process of constantly making choices about the means and ends-choices that can be informed by process product research, descriptive research, experience, intuition, and one's own values. (Zumwalt, 1982, p. 226)

Feiman-Nemser (in press) cited the Teacher as Decision Maker teacher education program at Michigan State University as an example of this cognitively-oriented approach to the application of research findings to teacher education. Another contemporary example of this approach described by Feiman-Nemser (in press) is the PROTEACH program at the University of Florida (Ross & Kyle, 1987). Unlike the earlier behavioristically based C/PBTE movement that drew exclusively on correlational or experimental process-product studies of teaching, current versions of the social efficiency paradigm have also drawn upon recent descriptive studies of classrooms, research on teacher thinking (e.g., Clark, 1988), or, as in Hunter's (Gentile, 1988) tremendously popular work, upon cause and effect relationships between teaching and learning that have allegedly been established in research on human learning and behavior.

Although many of the devices for systematically training prospective teachers in the use of specific teaching skills like microteaching have disappeared from the literature, newer versions more compatible with the broader cognitive orientation of the approach have emerged to take their place, such as Cruickshank's (1987) "Reflective Teaching" program and skill training through microcomputer simulations (Strang, Badt, & Kauffman, 1987). Despite the variations among social efficiency approaches throughout the century, the common thread that ties them together is their reliance on the scientific study of teaching as the major source for determining the teacher education curriculum.

The Developmentalist Tradition

The third major tradition of reform, the developmentalist tradition, has its roots in the child study movement that G. Stanley Hall and others initiated near the turn of the century. According to Kliebard (1986), the most distinguishing characteristic of this tradition is the assumption that the natural development of the learner provides the basis for determining what should be taught both to pupils in the public schools and to their teachers. This natural order of child development was to be determined by research involving the careful observation and description of children's behavior at various stages of development. Lucy Sprague Mitchell (1931), founder of Bank Street College of Education, argued that the most pressing need was "a scientific study of children's behavior as conditioned by the stage of their development and planning of a school environment upon the basis of such a study of growth" (p. 254).

In the early part of the century this tradition was most visible in the efforts of the "Bohemian progressives" to prepare teachers to teach in the new child-

oriented progressive schools that were springing up all over the country. Perrone (1989) referred to this work when he wrote about the progressive tradition in U.S. teacher education. Advocates of what was often referred to as the "new" or "modern" education were often critical of the failure of teacher education institutions to supply them with creative and imaginative teachers who had a clear understanding of the developmentalist philosophy and children's patterns of growth and development. As Pollitzer (1931) argued in "Growing Teachers for Our Schools," "only teachers imbued with a thorough understanding of that philosophy and a deep feeling for it can interpret its ideals in practice" (p. 247).

One critical element in these early developmentalist ideas about teacher education was that teachers for progressive schools must be educated in the same kind of supportive and stimulating environment that they were expected to provide for children. Advocates of "student-centered" teacher education institutions were often critical of the methods used in most teacher education institutions because they believed these methods led to mechanical and passionless teaching.

> Still we go on preparing these young teachers of tomorrow by fifteenth century methods to achieve twentieth century aims. We continue to treat these youthful human souls as if they were machines; we polish the cogs with academic brickdust and the kelp of pedagogic taboos; we set them into working order, and in good, oiled, and empty futility we attempt to start these immortal locomotives....We cultivate these young teachers' abilities but we give them no fire....Their chief lack when we send them out to a completely irrational world for which we have prepared them in a wholly rational fashion is a flaming purpose. (Stroh, 1931, p. 260)

According to Perrone (1989), three central metaphors were associated with early manifestations of the progressive/developmentalist tradition in teacher education: (a) the teacher as naturalist, (b) the teacher as artist, and (c) the teacher as researcher. The teacher as naturalist dimension of the movement stressed the importance of skill in the observation and study of children's behavior in natural settings and in building a curriculum and classroom environment consistent with patterns of child development and children's interests. Educating prospective teachers to conduct observations and plan activities for children on the basis of their observations was a key feature in developmentalist proposals for teacher education reform.

The teacher-as-artist metaphor had two dimensions. On the one hand, the artist teacher, who has a deep understanding of the psychology of child development, is able to excite children about learning by providing them with carefully guided activities in a stimulating environment. To do this, the teacher needs to be a wide awake and fully functioning person in touch with his or her own learning. A common developmentalist proposal was to provide prospective teachers with a variety of experiences in dance, creative dramatics, writing, painting, and storytelling to enable them to exemplify for their students an inquiring, creative, and open-minded attitude. The comments of the director of one progressive school about the qualities needed for successful teaching illustrate the stress often placed on the personal and artistic development of the teacher as well as the influence of Freudianism on child-centered pedagogy in the 1920s.

> I do not see how anyone can teach in a progressive school who is not a real person and who has not lived some sort of interesting, full life, or who is not living such a life. If one has amounted to something and is living life to the full, I have found little difficulty in giving the techniques necessary to make an excellent teacher, provided it is in the person. Such a one, who has an interest in life and is well balanced and emotionally free, has usually, by the very fact of his interest acquired the necessary sort of information and continues to keep it up. I should think that the courses for teachers would include dancing and physical education to relieve physical inhibitions; plenty of social contacts with life and persons of the opposite sex to relieve emotional inhibitions; a great deal of dramatic work and expression to free the teacher from self consciousness; and the discovery of some vital interest in the teacher's life and a pursuit of that interest as far as possible during the years at normal school....Some of my best teachers have never been trained at all but have lived in a world of reality. (Bonser, 1929, p. 116)

The third guiding metaphor in the developmentalist tradition in teacher education was the teacher

as researcher. Here the focus was on fostering the teacher's experimental attitude toward practice. Child study was to become the basis for teachers' inquiries, and teacher educators were to provide instruction to prospective teachers about how to initiate and sustain ongoing inquiries in one's own classroom about the learning of specific children. Mitchell's (1931) summary of the aims of the Cooperative School for Student Teachers (a joint venture between the Bureau of Educational Experiments and eight progressive schools) illustrates the importance placed upon the development of an experimental attitude toward practice and its relationship to the artistic and naturalistic themes:

> Our aim is to turn out teachers whose attitude toward their work and toward life is scientific. To us, this means an attitude of eager, alert observation; a constant questioning of old procedure in light of new observations; a use of the world, as well as of books, as source material; an experimental open-mindedness, an effort to keep as reliable records as the situation permits, in order to base the future upon accurate knowledge of what has been done. Our aim is to equally turn out students whose attitude toward their work and toward life is that of the artist. To us this means an attitude of relish, of emotional drive, a genuine participation in some creative phase of work, and a sense that joy and beauty are legitimate possessions of all human beings, young and old. If we can produce teachers with an experimental, critical, and ardent approach to their work, we are ready to leave the future of education to them. (p. 251)

Other than the Cooperative School for Student Teachers and subsequent work at Bank Street College and a few other institutions such as Milwaukee State Teachers College (Ayer, 1931), one does not find the overall transformation of mainstream teacher education that the child-centered progressives hoped for. Apprenticeship has been and continues to be a major way in which the developmentalist philosophy is awakened in prospective teachers (Beatty, 1933).

During the late 1960s and early 1970s when child-centered pedagogy and "open education" once again received widespread attention in the U.S., a number of experimental teacher education programs were initiated that resembled those of the earlier child-centered progressives. Crook (1974) analyzed four of the programs that sought to translate the assumptions of the "open education" movement into a teacher education curriculum: the Center for Teaching and Learning at the University of North Dakota, the American Primary Experimental Program at the University of Vermont, the Educational Program for Informal Classrooms at Ohio State, and the Integrated Day Program at the University of Massaschusetts. Crook (1974) identified a number of developmentalist themes that they all shared:

> a commitment to involvement in one's own learning, an active approach to learning in terms of direct experience with materials, an encouragement of children's communication and prospective teachers' communication with children using skills of observing, reading, speaking, and writing; early field experiences, offerings in the expressive arts as well as in academic areas, and an understanding of children's development which reflects the writings of Jean Piaget. (p. 1)

About this same time, several other versions of the developmentalist tradition emerged in the literature. For example, Art Combs and his colleagues at the University of Florida received a lot of attention for their "humanistic" teacher education program (Combs, Blume, Newman, & Wass, 1974). Their notion of "self as an instrument" (that a good teacher is fundamentally striving for self-fulfillment) resembles the earlier emphasis by Lucy Sprague Mitchell and her contemporaries on the teacher as artist. Another prominent developmentally-oriented program of this period was the "Personalized Teacher Education Program" at the University of Texas, which was grounded in Fuller's (1972, 1974) studies of teachers' concerns. The goal of this program was for the curriculum to address students' concerns as they experienced them. The assumption was that if the program was conducted in accordance with the developmental needs of students, the students would progress through various "stages of concerns" toward maturity as a teacher.

One of the most prominent contemporary examples of a developmentalist approach to teacher education is the "Developmental Teacher Education Program" at the University of California-Berkeley. This 2-year graduate program culminating in a master's degree was initiated by a small group of faculty

who were dissatisfied with the limited emphasis given to knowledge of human development in teacher education programs (Amarel, 1988, Feiman-Nemser, in press). This program is a clear example of the developmentalist emphasis on teacher as naturalist. It is guided by the view that understanding of developmental principles is the best preparation for teaching. Students are exposed in their courses to theories of cognitive, social, moral, and language development and then focus in various practicums on the application of developmental principles to the teaching of mathematics, science, and literacy. In recent years the program has shifted from an application of content-free developmental principles to a concern with the development of domain-specific knowledge within each of the basic school subjects (Ammon & Black, 1988).

The Social Reconstructionist Tradition

The fourth and final tradition in U.S. teacher education, the social reconstructionist tradition, defines both schooling and teacher education as crucial elements in a movement toward a more just society. According to Kliebard (1986), this tradition "derived its central thrust from the undercurrent of discontent about American economic and social system...and saw curriculum as the vehicle by which social injustice would be redressed and the evils of capitalism corrected" (p. 183). This "undercurrent" existed in the 1920s and before and emerged in the 1930s.

A critical mass of radical progressives was located at Teachers College, Columbia in the 1930s. Following Counts's (1932) forceful articulation of the reconstructionist position in *Dare the School Build a New Social Order,* challenging teachers to reach for political power and lead the nation to socialism, this reform perspective continued to be expressed and debated in the John Dewey Society and in the pages of *The Social Frontier* from 1934 to 1939 and its successor *The Frontiers of Democracy* from 1939 to 1943 (Bowers, 1969). This tradition, which was strengthened by the economic depression and by widespread social unrest, stressed the role of the school allied with other progressive forces, in planning for an intelligent reconstruction of U.S. society where there would be a more just and equitable distribution of the nation's wealth and the "common good" would take precedence over individual gain. Although collective ownership of the means of production was not essential to all social reconstructionists, most felt that the private economy must be regulated to help ensure full employment, economic opportunity, and adequate incomes for a fair standard of living (Stanley, 1985). Given the vast number of changes wrought by science and technology, these "frontier educators" argued that it was the task of

> education to prepare individuals to take part intelligently in the management of conditions under which they will live, to bring them to an understanding of the forces which are moving, and to equip them with the intellectual and practical tools by which they can themselves enter into the direction of these forces. (Kilpatrick, 1933, p. 71)

One of the major issues of debate among social reconstructionists was the degree to which teachers and teacher educators should consciously indoctrinate their students with socialist and collectivist values or rely on the methods of experimentalism and reflective inquiry to lead to social improvements. Counts (1932) was representative of those who argued for deliberate indoctrination of socialist values and ideas. In *Dare the School Build A New Social Order* he argued that given the inevitable partisanship of all educational activity and the dominance of capitalistic and individualistic values in all aspects of society, it is necessary for the teacher consciously to foster ideas and values supportive of the new social order. Holmes (1932) of Harvard and Bode (1935) of Ohio State were among those who rejected the notion that the school should be used to promote a previously determined social program. They placed their emphasis on cultivating students' ability to think critically about the social order.

Because the "frontier educators" were asking the teaching profession to assume a leadership role in the reconstruction of the American society, teacher education was viewed as playing a key role in the process.

> The duty of the teachers colleges is thus clear. They must furnish over a period of years a staff of workers for the public schools who thoroughly understand the social, economic, and political problems with which this country is faced, who are zealous in the

improvement of present conditions, and who are capable of educating citizens disposed to study social problems earnestly, think critically about them, and act in accord with their noblest impulses. (Brown, 1938, pp. 328)

If teachers were to fulfill their role in social reconstruction, however, teacher education would have to be reconstructed. In *The Educational Frontier*, Kilpatrick (1933) and his colleagues, including John Dewey, criticized traditional forms of teacher education for their emphasis on techniques divorced from consideration of broader purposes and called for a new emphasis on helping prospective teachers develop an adequate social and educational philosophy and "a zeal for the betterment of our common civilization" (Kilpatrick, 1933, p. 270). This development of a thoughtful orientation among prospective teachers about education and society was thought to be critical to the ability of teachers to lead the intelligent redirection of the social order.

Unlike many contemporary reconstructionist plans for teacher education that focus exclusively on what needs to be done to develop social consciousness and reform capabilities among prospective teachers, these earlier "frontier educators" also recognized the dominant tendency toward conformity among the "teachers of teachers" and focused some of their efforts on awakening social consciousness among teacher educators:

> In the education of teachers probably no one factor is more important than the social attitude of the faculty of the professional institution. In general social outlook and attitude...the staff of our ordinary normal school or teachers' college is only too often severely lacking. A more adequate social outlook is an absolute necessity if prospective teachers are to catch the social vision. The socially unenlightened teaching too often found in the ordinary college or normal school can hardly have any other result than turning out teachers ignorant of our social situation and with no intelligent concern about it. We must then, as fast and as far as is humanly possible, bring it about that all members of the professional staff hold an intelligent and positive social outlook....Each staff member should be encouraged to know first hand how the less favored among us live and feel. First-hand contacts carry greater potency. We can easily disregard the needs of those we do not know. In every possible way we must work for the more intelligently social outlook within the staff of our teacher preparing institutions. Without this we can hardly hope for socially prepared teachers. (Kilpatrick, 1933, p. 266)

Two prominent early examples of efforts to apply the proposals of these radical progressives to teacher education were New College, an experimental and demonstration teacher education program at Teachers College, Columbia from 1932-1939 and the emergence of an integrated social foundations component in teacher education programs. New College was designed to serve two major purposes: (a) to prepare "first-rate" elementary and secondary teachers and (b) to serve as a teacher education laboratory for those graduate students who would staff the teachers colleges of the nation (also see Feiman-Nemser, in press).

The New College experiment represented a conscious effort to apply to teacher education the idea that teachers could be prepared to be leaders of societal reconstruction. The college's first announcement quoted from Counts's (1932) manifesto and reminded prospective teachers that "it is the peculiar privilege of the teacher to play a large part in the development of the social order of the next generation" (Cremin, Shannon, & Townsend, 1954, p. 222). Important elements of the New College experience were its integrating seminars, problems-based curriculum, and firsthand experiences with various aspects of community life. The New College faculty held that "a major task of professional preparation is the enlargement of the student's range of interest and the deepening of his insight into basic problems of human living so that he may see his specific job in terms of larger social needs" (New College, 1936, p. 30).

The New College curriculum provided students with opportunities for contact with life that would contribute to the development of a social outlook. All students were expected to develop skills of community planning, living, and leadership by spending at least a summer living and working on a student-operated farm in western North Carolina. They were also required to work in industry for at least a summer and to participate in field trips that involved them with cultural and commercial opportunities in New York City.

Consistent with this emphasis on the value of direct experience in a teacher's education, the faculty attempted to foster political activity among the students. For example, in 1937, the director announced the establishment of two scholarships that would be given to the two students who "go the furthest beyond academic neutrality in active participation in life outside the walls of the university" (Cremin et al., 1954, p. 226). Many of the assemblies of students and faculty over the years became forums for the debate of political issues. Limbert (1934), in describing important happenings at the college during one 4-month period, reported a variety of activities that were consistent with the emphasis on developing students' abilities to take an intelligent stand on important economic and political issues. According to Limbert (1934), the faculty was determined that no one be allowed to graduate from the program who was politically illiterate or indifferent.

A second example of early attempts to apply the social reconstructionist agenda to teacher education was the development, also at Teachers College, Columbia, of the social foundations of education as a component of a teacher education program. According to Cohen (1976), Rugg and Kilpatrick spearheaded in 1934-35 "the most famous and influential innovation in American teacher education in the 20th century," the initiation of the 2-semester course Education 200F, Social Foundations of Education (p. 31). According to Rugg (1952), the foundations of education, with its focus on the fundamental problems of the school, the society, and the culture, would aid in the development of a social and educational philosophy by prospective teachers that would enable them to assume a leadership role in the making of educational policy. According to the faculty who created the program, this coordination of focus among previously isolated disciplines represented a significant shift from a mechanistic and atomistic outlook on life to an organic one (Borrowman, 1956). This effort to develop an integrated social foundations approach was complemented by attempts to reconstruct the general education of teachers in a manner that broke down conventional subject matter boundaries, such as the efforts of Frank Baker at Milwaukee State Teachers College (Rugg, 1952).

Although Education 200F was never popular among many Teachers College faculty who maintained a commitment to discipline-based education, the idea of social foundations courses spread to teacher education institutions throughout the U.S. During the 1940s and 1950s, the leadership of the foundations movement in teacher education shifted to the University of Illinois where William Stanley, Kenneth Benne, B. Othaniel Smith, and Archibald Anderson formed the core of the social foundations group (Cohen, 1976). The newly developed social foundations components of teacher education programs and the "educationists" who taught them became the main targets for reformers in the academic tradition, like Bestor (1956) and Koerner (1963), who charged that the interdisciplinary focus of the foundations approach destroyed the integrity of the disciplines.

Another aspect of the social reconstructionist tradition has been the commitment evident in several federally funded teacher education programs, such as the National Teacher Corps and TTT, to alter social inequities by focusing on the improvement of educational conditions for children of the poor. It was hoped that the cycle of educational failure, poverty, and despair for many rural and urban children could be broken through programs that prepared teachers and teacher educators to work in poverty schools. Among the contemporary examples of the social reconstructionist tradition in teacher education is Landon Beyer's work at Knox and Cornell colleges on "teacher education as praxis." Beyer (1988) has described his efforts to implement a "foundationally oriented" approach to teacher education as guided by the principles of democracy, equality, and autonomy and committed to the development of practical wisdom. One key to his efforts is students' examination of a variety of issues from multiple and interdisciplinary perspectives. Another key is the uniting of reflective inquiry and practical action by giving students opportunities to enact and then examine their ideas. Beyer's (1988) commitment to the preparation of teachers who will be inclined toward and capable of contributing to the reconstruction of schools and society is clear:

> Teacher education must be committed to the development of critically oriented, compassionate, and

impassioned, reflective and socially engaged practitioners who can aid in the process of educational improvement and social change. (p. 185)

Other contemporary proponents of a social reconstructionist view of teacher education include Ira Shor, Henry Giroux, and Peter McLaren. Shor (1986), for example, set out an agenda for what he called "egalitarian" teacher education. He proposed a number of themes that should permeate teacher education programs if teacher education is to contribute to social change (e.g., dialogic teaching, cross-cultural communication, and cultural literacy). Giroux and McLaren (1986), in contrast, 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 McLaren, if teacher education is to contribute toward a more just, humane, and equitable social order, then it needs to be viewed as a form of cultural politics based on the study of such themes as language, history, culture, and politics:

> The project of doing a teacher education program based on cultural politics consists of linking critical social theory to a set of stipulated practices through which student teachers are able to dismantle and critically examine preferred educational and cultural traditions, many of which have fallen prey to instrumental rationality that either limits or ignores democratic ideals and principles. One of our main concerns focuses on developing a language of critique and demystification that is capable of analyzing the latent interests and ideologies that work to socialize students in a manner compatible with the dominant culture. We are equally concerned, however, with creating alternative teaching practices capable of empowering students both inside and outside schools. (p. 229)

Other contemporary reconstructionist teacher education efforts in the U.S. include the work of Adler and Goodman (1986), who have used social studies methods courses to help prospective teachers develop curriculum analysis and development capabilities that will contribute to more democratic school contexts, the "emancipatory" supervision methods developed by Gitlin and Smyth (1989), our own work in developing an inquiry-oriented student teaching program (Zeichner & Liston, 1987), several feminist-inspired proposals for teacher education programs that seek the correction of gender inequities in schools and society (e.g., Maher & Rathbone, 1986), and proposals like those of Ginsburg (1988) that call for more political activity by teacher educators (see Liston & Zeichner, in press). Beyond the desire to instill in teachers critical perspectives on the relationships between schooling and societal inequities and a moral commitment to correcting those inequities through their daily classroom and school activities, there is a great deal of variation among these contemporary proposals of social reconstructionist-oriented teacher educators. At various times the focus has been on the content of programs, the skills of critical analysis and curriculum development, the nature of pedagogical relationships between teachers and their pupils and between teacher educators and their students, or on the connections between teacher education and other political projects that seek to address the many instances of suffering and injustice in our society.

One of the notable characteristics of contemporary social reconstructionism in teacher education is its marginal status among teacher education programs in the U.S. This marginal status is indicated in part by the lack of examples of teacher education programs in which conceptual proposals are in the process of development. In several of the most prominent of these proposals (Ginsburg, 1988; Giroux & McLaren, 1986, and Shor, 1986) for example, there is not a single reference to existing programmatic examples of the authors' proposals. The marginal status of the reconstructionist tradition in U.S. teacher education has been the case throughout most of the 20th century. According to Kliebard (1986), the social reconstructionist ideas of Counts and his contemporaries aroused the animosity of those on both the political left and right and had very little influence on school practices. Cremin (1988) concurred with this view and characterized the social reconstructionist commentary as largely an academic discussion that has had very little influence outside its own inner circle. The marginal status of social reconstructionist reform proposals is one of the most critical issues that needs to be addressed by those within this tradition.

Conclusion

In our view contemporary proposals for the reform of U.S. teacher education reflect particular patterns of resonance with these four reform traditions. Most existing teacher education programs as well represent some mixture of the four traditions. We believe that this framework can help teacher educators gain a deeper understanding of the fundamental differences in assumptions and goals underlying reforms and programs that appear similar on the surface. The debate in teacher education needs to take place at a very specific level where the different commitments and traditions associated with particular proposals are exposed for analysis and critique. Although space does not permit an illustration here of the heuristic value of the traditions framework, we do provide elsewhere an analysis of the slogan of "reflective teaching" in relation to the reform traditions (Zeichner & Liston, in press).

By attempting to clarify the priorities of particular reform proposals, we do not wish to further the ideological insularity that plagues our field. This insularity continues to be one of the most serious impediments to the improvement of teacher education in the U.S. The common pattern continues to be for subcommunities of teacher educators to operate with relative independence of one another. There is little cross-fertilization of ideas across traditions of practice. Members of the various subcommunities typically read, discuss, debate, and cite only work within a particular tradition and dismiss or ignore everything else. In offering the reform traditions framework as one possibility for thinking about ideas and practices in teacher education, we hope to encourage conversation across as well as within particular traditions. This is not to say that we should aim for some sort of eclectic combination of ideas that seeks to accommodate everyone and offend no one. Ideological evenhandedness does justice to no tradition and leads to further confusion. We should all have morally justifiable passions and priorities for which we are willing to work.[1] In doing so however, we should not be so closed-minded as to lose sight of the limitations of our own particular perspective, whatever it may be.

Note

[1]Although we are concerned about the problem of ideological insularity, we are not neutral with re gard to the four traditions. In Liston and Zeichne (in press) we present proposals for making socia reconstructionist perspectives more central in th education of teachers in the United States.

References

Adler, S., & Goodman, J. (1986). Critical theory as a foundation for methods courses. *Journal o Teacher Education, 37*(4), 2-8.

Allen, D., & Ryan, K. (1969). *Microteaching*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Amarel, M. (1988). Developmental teacher education. In National Center for Research on Teache Education (Ed.), *Dialogues in teacher education* (Issue paper 88-4). East Lansing, MI: Author.

Ammon, P., & Black, A. (1988). A response to M. Amarel. In National Center for Research on Teacher Education (Ed.), *Dialogues in teacher education* (Issue paper 88-4). East Lansing, MI: Author.

Apple, M. (1972). Behaviorism and conservatism: The educational views in four of the "systems" models of teacher education. In B. Joyce & M. Weil (Eds.), *Perspectives for reform in teacher education* (pp. 237-262). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Atkin, J. M., & Raths, J. D. (1974). *Changing patterns of teacher education in the U.S.* Urbana, IL: University of Illinois School of Education.

Ayer, A. (1931). Freedom for the student teacher. *Progressive Education, 8*(3), 256-260.

Ball, D., & McDiarmid, G. W. (in press). The subject matter preparation of teachers. In W. R. Houston (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education*. New York: Macmillan.

Baptiste, H. P., Baptiste, M., & Gollnick, D. (1980). *Multicultural teacher education: Preparing educators to provide educational equity.* (Vol. 1) Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Beatty, W. (1933). Training the teacher for the new school. *Progressive Education, 10*(5), 248-253.

Berliner, D. (1984). The half-full glass: A review of research on teaching. In P. Hosford (Ed.), *Using what we know about teaching* (pp. 51-77). Alexandria, VA: Association of Supervision and Curriculum Department.

Bestor, A. (1953). *Educational wastelands.* Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Bestor, A. (1956). *The restoration of learning.* New York: Alfred Knopf.

Beyer, L. (1988). *Knowing and acting: Inquiry, ideology, and educational studies.* London: Falmer.

Bode, B. (1935). Dr. Bode replies. *The Social Frontier, 2*(2), 42.

Bonser, G. (1929). The training of teachers for the new education. *Progressive Education, 6,* 111-121.

Borg, W. (1970). *The minicourse.* Beverly Hills, CA: Macmillan Educational Services.

Borrowman, M. (1956). *The liberal and technical in teacher education.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Bowers, C. A. (1969). *The progressive educator and the depression: The radical years.* New York: Random House.

Broudy, H. (1973). *A critique of PBTE.* Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Brown, H. (1938). A challenge to teachers colleges. *Social Frontier, 4*(37), 327-329.

Cabello, B., & Cash R. (1988). *Programs for the recruitment, preparation and retention of teachers to work with diverse student populations.* San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research & Development.

Charters, W. W., & Waples, D. (1929). *Commonwealth teacher training study.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Clark, C. (1988). Asking the right questions about teacher preparation: Contributions of research on teacher thinking. *Educational Researcher, 17*(2), 5-12.

Clarke, S. (1969). The story of elementary teacher education models. *Journal of Teacher Education, 20*(3), 283-293.

Clifford, G. J., & Guthrie, J. W. (1988). *Ed school.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Cohen, S. (1976). The history of American education 1900-1976: The uses of the past. *Harvard Educational Review, 46*(3), 298-330.

Coley, R., & Thorpe, M. (1986). *A look at the M.A.T. model of teacher education and its graduates: Lessons for today.* Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Combs, A. (1972). Some basic concepts for teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 22,* 286-290.

Combs, A., Blume, R., Newman, A., & Wass, H. (1974). *The professional education of teachers: A humanistic approach to teacher preparation.* Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Conant, J. (1963). *The education of American teachers.* New York: McGraw Hill.

Corwin, R. (1973). *Reform and organizational survival: The Teacher Corps as an instrument of educational change.* New York: Wiley-Interscience.

Counts, G. (1932). *Dare the schools build a new social order?* New York: John Day.

Cremin, L. (1953). The heritage of American teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 4,* 163-170, 246-250.

Cremin, L. (1961). *The transformation of the school: Progressivism in American education, 1876-1957.* New York: Vintage Books.

Cremin, L. (1988). *American education: The metropolitan experience 1876-1980.* New York: Vintage.

Cremin, L., Shannon, D., & Townsend, M. E. (1954). *A history of Teachers College, Columbia University.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Crook, P. (1974). *A study of selected teacher training programs in the U.S. committed to a philosophy of "open education."* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Syracuse University.

Cruickshank, D. (1985). *Models for the preparation of America's teachers.* Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.

Cruickshank, D. (1987). *Reflective teaching: The preparation of students of teaching.* Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators.

Damerell, R. (1985). *Education's smoking gun: How teachers colleges have destroyed education in America.* New York: Freudlich Books.

Drummond, W., & Andrews, T. (1980). The influence of federal and state governments on teacher education. *Phi Delta Kappan, 62*(2), 97-99.

Feiman-Nemser, S. (in press). Teacher preparation: Structural and conceptual alternatives. In W. R. Houston (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education.* New York: Macmillan.

Fennema, E., Carpenter, T., & Peterson, P. (in press). Teacher's decision making and cognitively

guided instruction—A new paradigm for curriculum development. In K. Clements & N. F. Ellerton (Eds.), *Facilitating change in mathematics education*. Geelong, Australia: Deakin University Press.

Flexner, A. (1930). *Universities: American, English, German*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Fuller, F. (1972). *Personalizing teacher education*. Austin, TX: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Fuller, F. (1974). A conceptual framework for a personalized teacher education program. *Theory into Practice, 13*(2), 112-122.

Gage, N. (1970). *Teacher effectiveness and teacher education*. Palo Alto, CA: Pacific Books.

Gage, N., & Winne, P. (1975). Performance-based teacher education. In K. Ryan (Ed.), *Teacher education* (pp. 146-172). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Gay, G. (1986). Multicultural teacher education. In J. Banks & J. Lynch (Eds.), *Multicultural education in western societies* (pp. 154-177). New York: Praeger.

Gentile, J. R. (1988). *Instructional improvement: Summary and analysis of Madeline Hunter's essential elements of instruction and supervision*. Oxford, OH: National Staff Development Council.

Ginsburg, M. (1988). *Contradictions in teacher education and society: A critical analysis*. New York: Falmer Press.

Giroux, H., & McLaren, P. (1986). Teacher education and the politics of engagement: The case for democratic schooling. *Harvard Educational Review, 56*(3), 213-238.

Gitlin, A., & Smyth, J. (1989). A dialogical approach to understanding: Horizontal evaluation. In A. Gitlin & J. Smyth (Eds.), *Teacher evaluation: Educative alternatives* (pp. 61-76). New York: Falmer Press.

Gollnick, D. (1978). *Multicultural education in teacher education: The state of the scene*. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Grant, C., & Koskella, R. (1986). Education that is multicultural and the relationship between preservice campus learning and field experiences. *Journal of Educational Research, 79*, 197-203.

Grant, C., & Secada, W. (in press). Preparing teachers for diversity. In. W. R. Houston (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education*. New York: Macmillan.

Heath, R. W., & Nielson, M. (1974). The research basis for performance-based teacher education. *Review of Educational Research, 44*, 463-484.

Hendrick, I. (1967). Academic revolution in California. *Southern California Quarterly, 49*(2,3,4) 127-166, 253-295, 359-406.

Herbst, J. (1989). *And sadly teach: Teacher education and professionalization in American culture*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.

Holmes, H. (1932). The teacher in politics. *Progressive Education, 4*, 414-418.

Holmes Group. (1986). *Tomorrow's teachers*. East Lansing, MI: Author.

Howey, K., & Zimpher, N. (1989). *Profiles of preservice teacher education*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Imig, D. (1986). Outrage in Texas. *AACTE Briefs*, 9, 1, 2, 12.

Johnson, W. (1987). Empowering practitioners: Holmes, Carnegie, and the lessons of history. *History of Education Quarterly, 27*(2), 221-240.

Joyce, B. (1975). Conceptions of man and their implications for teacher education. In K. Ryan (Ed.), *Teacher education* (pp. 111-145). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Joyce, B., Weil, M., & Wald, R. (1974). Models of teaching in teacher education. An evaluation of instructional systems. *Interchange, 4*, 47-73.

Joyce, B., & Showers, B. (1984). *Power for staff development through research on training*. Washington, DC: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Joyce, B., Yarger, S., & Howey, K. (1977). *Preservice teacher education*. Palo Alto: Booksend Laboratory.

Keppel, F. (1986). A field guide to the land of teachers. *Phi Delta Kappan, 67*, 18-23.

Kilpatrick, W. (Ed.). (1933). *The educational frontier*. New York: Century.

Kirk, D. (1986). Beyond the limits of theoretical discourse in teacher education: Towards a critical

pedagogy. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 2,* 155-167.

Kliebard, H. (1975). The rise of scientific curriulum making and its aftermath. *Curriculum Theory Network,* 5(1), 27-38.

Kliebard, H. (1986). *The struggle for the American curriculum 1893-1958.* Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Koerner, J. (1963). *The miseducation of American teachers.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Lanier, J., & Little, J. (1986). Research on teacher education. In M. Wittrock (Ed). *Third handbook of research on teaching,* (pp. 527-569). New York: Macmillan.

Limbert, P. (1934). Political education at New College. *Progressive Education, 11*(2), 118-124.

Liston, D., & Zeichner, K. (in press). *Teacher education and the conditions of schooling.* New York: Routledge.

Lynd, A. (1953). *Quackery in the public schools.* Boston: Little, Brown.

MacIntyre, A. (1988). *Whose justice? Which rationality?* Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.

Maher, F. (in press). Gender, reflexivity, and teacher education: The Wheaton program. In B. R. Tabachnick & K. Zeichner (Eds.), *Issues and practices in inquiry-oriented teacher education.* London: Falmer.

Maher, F., & Rathbone, C. (1986). Teacher education and feminist theory: Some implications for practice. *American Journal of Education, 94,* 214-235.

Martin, J. R. (1987). Reforming teacher education: Rethinking liberal education. *Teachers College Record, 88,* 406-410.

McDonald, F. (1973). Behavior modification and teacher education. In C. Thoresen (Ed.), *Behavior modification in education* (pp. 41-76). Seventy-second yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Mitchell, L. S. (1931). Cooperative schools for student teachers. *Progressive Education, 8,* 251-255.

Nash, R., & Agne, R. (1971). Competency in teacher education: A prop for the status quo. *Journal of Teacher Education,* 22(2), 147-156.

National Center for Education Statistics. (1977). *The state of teacher education.* Washington, DC: Author.

New College. (1936). *Teachers College Record, 38*(1), 1-73.

Perrone, V. (1989). Teacher education and progressivism: A historical perspective. In V. Perrone (Ed.), *Working papers: Reflections on teachers, schools, and communities.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Pollitzer, M. (1931). Growing teachers for our schools. *Progressive Education, 8*(3), 247-250.

Powell, A. (1976). University schools of education in the twentieth century. *Peabody Journal of Education, 54*(1), 3-20.

Reynolds, M. (Ed.). (1989). *Knowledge base for the beginning teacher.* New York: Pergamon Press.

Ross, D., & Kyle, D. (1987). Helping preservice teachers learn to use teacher effectiveness research. *Journal of Teacher Education,* 38, 40-44.

Rugg, H. (1952). *The teacher of teachers.* New York: Harper.

Sandefur, W. S., & Nicklas, W. L. (1981). Competency-based teacher education in AACTE institutions: An update. *Phi Delta Kappan,* 62, 747-748.

Saxe, R. (1965). Evaluating the breakthrough programs. *Journal of Teacher Education, 16,* 202-209.

Schneider, B. (1987). Tracing the provenance of teacher education. In T. Popkewitz (Ed.), *Critical studies in teacher education* (pp. 211-241). New York: Falmer Press.

Schram, P., Wilcox, S., Lanier, P., & Lappan, G. (1988). *Changing mathematical conceptions of preservice teachers.* (Research Report No. 88-4). East Lansing, MI: National Center for Research on Teacher Education.

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

Shulman, L. (1986). Paradigms and research programs in the study of teaching. In M. Wittrock (Ed.). *Third handbook of research on teaching.* (pp. 3-36). New York: Macmillan.

Shulman, L. S. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review,* 57(1), 1-22.

Simon, A., & Boyer, G. (1967). *Mirrors for behavior.*

Philadelphia: Research for Better Schools.

Stanley, W., Jr. (1985). Social reconstruction for today's social education. *Social Education, 49*(5), 384-389.

Stone, J. C. (1968). *Breakthrough in teacher education*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Strang, H. R., Badt, K., & Kaufman, J. (1987). Micro computer-based simulations for training fundamental teaching skills. *Journal of Teacher Education, 38*(1), 20-26.

Stroh, M. (1931). No title. *Progressive Education, 8*(3), 260.

Sykes, G. (1984). Teacher education and the predicament of reform. In C. E. Finn, D. Ravitch, & R. Fancher (Eds.), *Against mediocrity* (pp. 172-194). New York: Holmes & Meier.

Tetreault, M. K. (1987). The scholarship on women and teacher education. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 14*(2), 77-83.

Tetreault, M. K., & Braunger, J. (1989). Improving mentor teacher seminars: Feminist theory and practice at Lewis and Clark College. In J. DeVitis & P. Sela (Eds.), *Building bridges for educational reform: New approaches to teacher education* (pp. 63-86). Ames, IA: Iowa State University Press.

Tom, A. (1980). The reform of teacher education through research: A futile quest. *Teachers College Record, 82*(1), 15-30.

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

Travers, E., & Sacks, S. (1987). *Teacher education and the liberal arts: The position of the Consortium for Excellence in Teacher Education*. Swarthmore, PA: Swarthmore College.

Turney, C. (1977). *Innovation in teacher education*. Sydney, Australia: Sydney University Press.

Uhler, S. (1987, April). *Alternative paths to entry: New Jersey and elsewhere*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, DC.

Wilson, S., Shulman, L., & Richert, A. (1987). 150 different ways of knowing: Representations of knowledge in teaching. In J. Calderhead (Ed.), *Exploring teachers' thinking* (pp. 104-124). London: Cassell.

Woodring, P. (1957). *New directions in teacher education*. New York: Fund for the Advancement of Education.

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

Zeichner, K. (1988a). *Understanding the character and quality of the academic and professional components of teacher education*. (Research Report 88-1). East Lansing, MI: National Center for Research on Teacher Education.

Zeichner, K. (1988b). Learning from experience in graduate teacher preparation. In A. Woolfolk (Ed.), *Research perspectives on the graduate preparation of teachers* (pp. 12-29). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Zeichner, K. & Liston, D. (1987). Teaching student teachers to reflect. *Harvard Educational Review, 57*(1), 1-22.

Zeichner, K. & Liston, D. (in press). *Traditions of reform and reflective teaching in U.S. teacher education*. East Lansing, MI: National Center for Research on Teacher Education.

Zumwalt, K. (1982). Research on teaching: Policy implications for teacher education. In A. Lieberman & M. McLaughlin (Eds.), *Policy making in education* (pp. 215-248). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.