

Taking Seriously the Productive Nature of Pedagogic Relations in Preservice Teacher Education: A Poststructuralist Contribution

Mary Klein
James Cook University
Cairns 4870

Abstract

New understandings of how students learn engender new interpretations of what it means to prepare competent and generative teaching professionals for challenging futures. For example, poststructuralist notions of professional competence and identity as *produced* in interactive pedagogic encounters challenge prior notions of inherent personal competence and skill. These new understandings force teacher educators to attend closely to the productive quality of teaching/learning relationships with students. In this paper I use poststructuralist notions of the constitution or production of professional identity and agency to (a) analyse some common aspects of current pedagogic practice in preservice teacher education, and (b) provoke debate on practical imperatives for the future.

Introduction

I begin this paper at the end – looking at the competencies and skills that might be demanded of teaching professionals in the new millennium. As remembered facts and skills are no longer the precious commodity they once were, policy documents (Education Queensland, 1999) call for new paradigms of teaching and learning. Not only must students leave school with a variety of tools to search and sort vast amounts of information, generate new data, analyse, interpret meaning and transform it into something new, they must also be able to work with others to develop plans, broker consensus, communicate ideas while co-operatively generating joint products (Education Queensland, 1999). Teachers are being asked to go beyond the construction of intellectual knowledges and skills to ensure that students have the necessary disposition and skills to work co-operatively in the generation of new knowledge. The attention has moved to “more productive pedagogies” and “the need to shift teachers’ attention and focus beyond basic skills and factual recall to key aspects of higher order thinking and more substantive conversations with students” (The State of Queensland Department of Education, 2001, p. 15). Implied in these mooted changes, and significant to our work in preservice teacher education, is the movement away from seeing ‘teaching’ as an identifiable practical skill to an interactive productive relationship with an implicit emphasis on the scholarship of student learning. With this new emphasis comes a fracturing of the traditional power/knowledge nexus of teaching/learning relationships.

Teacher educators have probably not taken seriously enough the sheer magnitude of the proposed changes confronting them and their students, nor the urgency of carefully considered action. Preservice teachers enter the programs with romantic notions of teaching, centered around knowledge transfer and nurturing relationships where teacher and text author the instructional process. Teacher education largely reproduces this interactional mode and re-imposes old patterns of educational work and thought (McWilliam, 1993). However, the preservice teachers are expected to orchestrate collaborative teaching/learning partnerships that are qualitatively different from those they have experienced themselves; they are expected to demonstrate “new

kinds of professionalism that connect teachers with, rather than elevate them above, others in their school and community” (Hargraeves and Fullan, 1998, p. 48). In the twenty-first century preservice teachers find themselves in an era where they cannot ‘own’ the teaching act - student presence, comprising prior knowledge and identity, is to be affirmed in pedagogic interaction as learning is recognised as an inherently social product of the relations of the teaching/learning process. Terry Moran reiterates the importance of pedagogic relationships: “The central aspect of education – the point at which learning takes place – is undoubtedly the relationship between teachers and their students” (Education Queensland, 1999, p. 1).

The nature and outcomes of this relationship though, whether in schools or teacher education, are always problematic. Poststructuralist theorisations of the discursive construction of knowledge make clear that all interactive relationships are constitutive of identity and position participants selectively. Where the Education Queensland documents refer to ‘productive’ pedagogies they are referring to the production of intellectual and social knowledges and skills; it is assumed that where these are realised student confidence and the ability to apply knowledge in new contexts will follow. Because these reforms are premised on a humanist notion of the individual as rational and autonomous, identity and agency are taken for granted. A poststructuralist postscript, however, adds a cautionary note to the effect that while students are constructing intellectual knowledge they are themselves produced with/in the relationships of power in a discourse – agency and identity are precarious and tentative. In the context of teacher education, as the preservice teachers grapple with the various intellectual and practical demands of the program, they are able to establish themselves as teaching professionals only within the discursive possibilities made available to them. Thus not only must teacher education concentrate on the pedagogic and disciplinary content knowledge, but also on the qualitative nature of participation which is constitutive of the teachers of the future.

This paper is written to contemplate, through the lens of poststructuralist notions of agency and identity, the potential of teacher education in Australia to produce generative and agentic teachers of the future. My aim is not to prove, but to improve, through making visible aspects of practice in teacher education that may actually suppress, rather than support, meaningful engagement and participation. It appears there is a wide scope for analysis: Luke, Luke & Mayer (2000) make the point that at the moment teachers are prepared for technological and economic environments that no longer exist while “teacher education remains a bastion of traditional educational practices” (p. 10). This is a serious and damning charge and should not be taken lightly; to the extent that teacher education does not rise to the challenges of the present and the future it will be increasingly seen as ineffective and irrelevant, with concomitant cuts in funding and support. Teacher education will be handed over to those who are better equipped to meet the demands of challenging futures!

The Discursive Construction of Knowledge

Whereas teacher education programs are largely premised on humanist understandings of the individual as essentially rational and autonomous, the poststructuralist concept of identity recognises the person as the effect of a production, produced in power relations in overlapping and intersecting discourses (Henriques et al., 1984). Identity is not an individual perception of feelings, actions or

ideas but is an, often unconscious, emotional and intellectual *knowing* about ourselves in a particular field of endeavour (McNaughton, 2000). This means that preservice teachers are not solely cognitive, rational beings who can objectively confront new ideas and challenges in teacher education and, convinced of their suitability, implement them in practice. It means that the preservice teachers have constituted knowings of what 'education' is, its knowledges and processes, that are largely beyond the realm of cognitive (re)construction. Lather (1991), for example, reminds us that in our *actions* is our constituted *knowing*. What this means for teacher education is that preservice teachers' identities and actions are influenced by what they have come to know about 'how' education is done through their many years of growing up and their time in school; they have lived it and know (though not necessarily consciously) its 'truths' and interactional patterns. For example, a preservice teacher (cited in Tillema & Knol, 1997, p. 31) states:

My own experiences are important to me, no matter what I learn here. They are the ones that have left a deep mark. I remember a very nice female teacher who treated us to sweets when we learned a lesson well and a male teacher who could tell exciting stories in history class. I would like to be that way; it gives you a comfortable feeling to try to be that way because you know it worked out so well when you were there.

Teacher educators, too, have similar sorts of constituted knowledges that largely govern their interactional patterns with students (and schools). There are probably few teacher educators who would feel uncomfortable enough with *what* is taught in teacher education, and *how*, to want to initiate drastic changes. The professional identities of teacher educators are arguably well served, making the extant culture highly resistant to change (McWilliam, 1993).

Although poststructuralist understandings of the social construction of knowledge do not countenance the notion of autonomy, there is a place for a kind of agency that is discursively produced, fragmentary and fragile. Individuals do not *have* agency: power in this sense is not a commodity or something that can be given or taken, though persons may act in agentic ways where discursive practices allow. Thus learners can experience a feeling of agency where they have a sense of themselves as respected and competent in (a) speaking and writing the commonly accepted truths of a discourse (teaching), in (b) enacting established ways of being, and in (c) going beyond these to forge something new (adapted from Davies, 1991). Agency has to do with authority, not in the sense of control over another but in the sense of authorship; authorship of voice and action in making personal sense of experience. The extent to which one is able to establish oneself as agentic affects identity, which in turn influences the ability to take oneself up in agentic ways...and so on. Preservice teachers who would want to come to know themselves as generative, innovative, peripheral thinkers can only do so within the possibilities made available to them; they will not move 'outside the square' if their voices or actions are censured. 'Censure' may come in the form of poor marks, dismissive comments or any action that positions the student poorly. Teacher educators, too, though one would expect them to experience themselves as agentic, labour within the discursive parameters through which they were (and are daily) (re)constituted. For example, many teacher educators devote an enormous amount of time to teaching preparation and delivery, often to the detriment of their own scholarly pursuits and research.

These concepts of identity and agency foreground the idea that both *what* students

learn and *how* they are positioned (in power relations) *matter*; professional identity and agency are at least to some extent predicated on the ‘truths’ made available in teacher education and the instructional process. Power relationships can operate in ways that support or suppress agentic behaviour. In the following section I examine some ways that teacher education appears to ignore the workings of power/knowledge relationships and reproduce tired old ways of thinking about the educational enterprise. I then contemplate how teacher education could use power/knowledge in pedagogic relationships more appropriately given new understandings of what it might mean to teach and to learn.

Coercive Inertia in Teacher Education?

Though changes have taken place in teacher education programs over the years, the changes have been small compared with those that must be made in/for life and work of the new millennium. McWilliam (1993) makes the point that the a-contextual, a-political notion of teacher preparation has not responded to the functionalist logic of policy makers, nor embraced epistemological shifts characteristic of ‘postmodern’ challenges to traditional ways of theorising and doing educational work. Luke et al (2000) suggest that from the safety of canonical curricular boxes, traditional university pedagogy and conventional departmental structures, the traditions of teacher education may be complicit in modelling and reproducing the very antithesis of what is deemed to be appropriate practice in schools. In this section of the paper I examine how we continue to reinforce a type of knowing (epistemology) and being (ontology) appropriate to times long past. I propose that this is regressive because the modelled ‘truths’ are (re)lived by the teachers of the future, they are constitutive of their knowing about teaching and not easily erased.

Constructs of Knowledge in Teacher Education

The epistemological or knowledge constructs that are often (re)constituted in preservice teacher education are an initial cause for concern: these are shaping professional identities and will inform future teaching. A quick perusal of Faculty handbooks shows the compartmentalisation of disciplinary knowledge that makes up a large part of the teacher education program. It appears that everything has to be ‘covered’, nothing can be left out or left to chance. A certain arrogance appears to lead to the assumption that a comprehensive coverage of what is in the Handbook will be realised as competence and confidence in practice. Individual lecturers tend to stack as much ‘content’ as they possibly can into their subjects, often ignoring what has come before or what follows in other subjects.

There is, too, an accompanying concern for the effects of preservice teachers’ reliving an educational process concerned primarily with ‘covering’ content knowledge. Does the emphasis on disparate disciplinary study (the Key Learning Areas in Queensland) (re)constitute a particular way of knowing where the legitimating rules for knowing are denotative – a statement’s truth is the criterion determining its acceptability? Is knowledge taken to be an objective body of facts and theories, untainted by human values and group interests? To the extent that this is so, particular ways of coming to know are reinforced for the preservice teachers who simultaneously experience teaching as “a matter of conveyance, [where] the authority and communicative competence lie only with the teacher who is positioned as a knowledge broker of

sorts” (Phelan, 2001).

As well, there is the constitutive effect of how the preservice teachers are relatively positioned as they are encouraged to (re)produce all this knowledge. They are teaching professionals-in-process yet are expected to regurgitate ideas and information on teaching handed down from texts, classroom teachers and teacher educators. I imagine that where the binaries expert/neophyte, teacher/student are legitimated in practice, the preservice teachers are stripped of any chance of establishing themselves as genuinely generative teaching professionals and knowledge brokers. As Luke et al (2000, p. 9) make clear :

...most current programs are geared not so much toward the creation of a ‘generative’ teacher for new ecologies and technologies, but more towards the representation and reproduction of particular historical models of ‘good teaching’, as culturally generalisable and as universally practical.

Cultures of Teaching and Learning in Teacher Education

Cultures of schooling, where participants work together in blended communities of collaborative, interdisciplinary inquiry generating visionary teaching/learning relationships and environments (Luke et al., 2000) are largely conspicuous by their absence in many teacher education programs. Interactional patterns are based on the expert/neophyte binary; the teacher educator and classroom teachers transmit important pedagogic and theoretical knowledges to students. Deferring to humanist meritocratic understandings of persons as essentially rational and autonomous, teacher educators are free to perpetuate teaching/learning relationships where knowledge is taken to be capably received (and constructed) and put into practice by rational, autonomous learners. Those learners who do not engage as expected are seen to be in some way aberrant or pathological, and appropriately labelled. Framing teacher education programs and imposing the dead weight of tradition on interactional patterns are (a) ‘essentialist’ readings of the nature and needs of preservice teachers, (b) the faith put in reflection/research/rational thought to bring about change and (c) ignorance/denial of how power operates in teaching and research relationships. I will briefly examine each of these in turn.

Within the culture of preservice teacher education ‘commonsense’ or taken-for-granted, folkloric readings of preservice teachers’ needs and aspirations are constructed and maintained. Unfortunately, many of these constructed ‘truths’ about preservice teachers position them as unwilling or unable to engage competently in the activities and practices of teacher education. For example, preservice teachers are said to always differentiate between ‘theory’ and ‘practice’ and eschew the former; to prove themselves basically conservative in their failure to comprehend the political nature of the teaching act; and to be less competent/skilled than they used to be (McWilliam, 1993). More recently new storylines have arisen around the lack of student engagement in course work and these continue to lay blame at the feet of the students and deflect attention from the curricula, pedagogies and structures of teacher education. The preservice teachers relive a culture of blaming those who do not autonomously and fully engage with stipulated activities and practices, a culture that effectively ignores differences that matter!

Although interaction between students and their teachers in lectures is primarily of a

didactic nature, collaborative reflection and research are common features of teacher education programs. ‘Communities of inquiry’ have become popular; within these ideas and problems are shared and discussed leading to new understandings and possibilities for action. Such engagements are premised on the humanist notion of an essentially unitary, non-contradictory, rational identity who can decide what is best and implement change (Henriques et al., 1984). However, this particular framing of practice acts in highly conservative ways; in upholding the notion of the autonomous individual it conceals the politics of pedagogic and research relations. For example, teacher educators continue with business-as-usual, assuming that students will say or do something if they are not satisfied with the program. Teacher educators may be able to ignore the fact that *what* they are teaching appears irrelevant to the students who merely swallow the bitter pill, or it may be that *how* they are teaching silences them due to their dependence on good grades and/or favourable positioning amongst peers. All players, the preservice teachers and teacher educators alike, have investments in playing according to the ‘rules’ which conceal the co-ercive nature of interactional relationships.

Where relationships of power are not seen, or are ignored, little about how education is done can change. This is because if students do not learn the stipulated content, they are seen to be choosing to act in ways that show a lack of autonomy or some form of irrational thought. Little speculation is given to the qualitative status of the extant pedagogic interactions and relationships that may negatively impact on learning. For example, in some research I carried out with preservice teacher in the area of mathematics education (Klein, 2001), I found student learning hampered by the relationships of power circulating throughout the learning environment. The students, though asked to investigate mathematical concepts, were more concerned to do what the lecturer wanted, to quickly get the correct answer and not look too ‘dumb’ in front of peers. Where a humanist reading of these students would label them anxious and under confident and deflect attention from power relationships in pedagogic interaction, a poststructuralist analysis reveals power at work and the suppression of meaningful intellectual engagement. The humanist understandings framing activities and practices trap teacher educators in the very world they are trying to move beyond!

Implications for Teacher Education

I have examined how pedagogic interactional patterns in preservice teacher education support and maintain humanist notions of identity and autonomy; these are seen to be negatively productive in that they entrench oppressive structures and practices not appropriately constitutive of agentic teaching professionals of the future. Framing this paper is the notion that new classroom practices will only be realised when educators *know* education differently; this means that in teacher education what it means to teach and learn must be emancipated from traditional discursive strictures and structures. It is not immediately clear if, or how effectively this could ever be done, though teacher educators committed to the notion of language as constitutive could interrupt business-as-usual and effect changes. Through language, what it means to teach and learn in teacher education could conceivably be re-written (the likelihood of this eventuality will be discussed later in the paper).

A Poststructuralist Reading of Change

The preservice teacher is configured at the intersection of multiple intersecting discourses that are largely framed by positivist notions of knowledge and the individual as 'naturally' able to be competent and autonomous. A new discourse, with new 'truths' and ways of interacting is needed to bump into, to confront and interrupt the power/knowledge plays of these discourses in the interests of redefining notions of the teacher, and teaching, for the twenty-first century. New discourses can supposedly re-write the world as participants live/act in and between them finding comfortable spaces and investments (not necessarily conscious) in discourses that enact new 'truths' and ways of operating. Change is accomplished as a result of a contradictory positioning, due to the co-existence of the old and the new; every relation and every practice to some extent articulates such contradictions and therefore is a site of potential change as much as it is a site of reproduction (Hollway, 1984, p. 260). Of significance is that what is at issue when one contemplates changes to educational practice is not only the thinking individual, but also the operation of discourse(s).

An alternative discourse of/for teacher education would work at the borders of the discourses comprising teacher education and schooling and construct and enact new 'truths' and discursive practices. As previously mentioned, students experience a sense of agency where they know themselves to be respected and competent in (a) speaking and writing the commonly accepted truths of a discourse, in (b) enacting established ways of being, and in (c) going beyond these to forge something new (adapted from Davies, 1991). While striving to equip preservice teachers with the intellectual and pedagogic skills they will need for teaching in the twenty-first century (a and b, above), they will also be constituted through a discourse that is sensitive to, and makes explicit, the students as teacher/learners *in process* and knowledge as *socially* or discursively constituted. Thus the preservice teachers, while accessing the knowledges and skills of teaching, will be engaged in a 'border pedagogy' (Davies, 2000) that re-vision takes-for-granted understandings of what teachers and teaching might be (as in c, above). This is undertaken not on the assumption that the preservice teachers will act upon these new understandings, but rather that through their engagement (constitution) in this alternative discourse they will sense how the construction of teachers and teaching is always contingent, tentative, provisional.

Effecting Change in Teacher Education

Central to my argument in this paper is that teaching/learning relationships in teacher education have an educational and constitutive force. True to poststructuralist conceptions of the social construction of knowledge, I understand these relationships to produce both intellectual and social knowledges, which are constitutive of identity. The constitution of a truly collaborative and participative dialogue is founded on new relationships of power and a continuous (re)working of agency, identity and difference. In the following two sections of the paper I ponder pedagogic imperatives, constitutive of professional identity, that would appear appropriate for teacher education in/for the twenty-first century. I contemplate practices that, in taking account of student voice and already constituted identity, impact on the ability to establish oneself as a legitimate professional, before considering extra work that might be done in the interests of agentic participation, in and beyond teacher education.

Establishing oneself as legitimate professional...

It is important that students can make sense of the program of study in teacher education. Although students' voices can be strident, they are perhaps not often enough taken seriously. For example, students are often subjected to the study of disparate discipline areas, educational foundations and instructional psychology with little explanation, and no debate, as to how these are deemed to map together into a coherent plan of study appropriate to educators of the future. McWilliam & Knight (1993, p. 106) are rather forthright in stating: "The fact that students are left so often to make sense out of a program driven more by timetabling and power struggles than by pedagogical rationality cannot be denied". Where students can find little coherence in a program, depth of engagement is more than likely to suffer.

A related concern is where students ask for more 'practical' skills in teacher education. For example, Nicol (1997, p. 114) quotes one of her students: "show us ... what we are supposed to be teaching and how we should teach... we want to know what works". The students are asking for practical pedagogic skills that will make them recognisable as teachers in the wider professional community (and to themselves, as identity). The onus is upon teacher educators to acquaint students with these practical skills as preservice teachers must, as it were, *stand* before they can *walk*. Although we know the walk will be tentative, contingent and shaky in new contexts, the students are at least learning 'ways of being' a teacher as commonly practised. The importance of these skills, as I see it, is that preservice teachers establish a language, a knowledge and skills base from which they can grow as professionals-in-process. 'Practical' skills and knowledges are foundational to and constitutive of identity.

Although preservice teachers often ask to be shown 'what works', demonstrating a technicist understanding of teaching as a reproducible skill and of themselves as a neophyte who has to be told and shown, the *authoring* of the learning process, should, where possible, belong to them. In making this assertion, I defer to the contributions of cognitive psychology and add a poststructuralist postscript. Teachers do need intellectual knowledges to teach well, and these must be robust, deep and comprehensive; they must be personally constructed through active participation. As well, it is important that the process of their construction, the teaching/learning process makes space for the learner to experience her/himself as a valued and respected participant, authorised to reproduce and go beyond established meanings. Because of the increasingly easy access to information, the teacher educator no longer needs to be seen as the fount of all knowledge; students can access knowledge from a variety of sources, engage in collaborative dialogue with the wider community and construct folios and web-based presentations to be shared and debated in the university context. What is important is that the preservice teachers are experiencing themselves as knowledge developers and knowledge workers; hopefully constituting themselves as lifelong teacher/learners in the process. It is in this *process* that potential agentic action lies.

Agency?

At the beginning of this paper I suggested that agency cannot be taken for granted: preservice teachers (or teacher educators, students in school) can have a lot of

intellectual and pedagogic knowledge without being able to act in agentic ways. To be agentic one has to be proficient with the established 'truths' and activities of a discourse yet be comfortable in speaking/acting beyond these when appropriate. Persons who are able to establish themselves in these ways have a constituted sense that *how* something is understood or done could be different; and they are keen to follow up the possibilities. These are the lifelong learners, inquirers, who are constituted to know learning as an engaging and pleasurable process with power implications. We would hope that the preservice teachers could come to know learning in these ways.

Were this to be realised, new 'truths' about the teacher and teaching, as socially constructed and always in process, would also need to be recognised. In practice, then, teacher education must orchestrate a pedagogic form, a 'border' pedagogy (Davies, 2000), framing all intellectual and pedagogic knowledge construction, that interrupts the humanist notions of identity and agency which, as I have argued, militate against change. Somehow students must recognise that identities are constituted through interaction in the social domain. As Davies (1991, p. 51) states:

Agency is never freedom from discursive constitution of self but the capacity to recognise that constitution and to resist, subvert and change the discourses themselves through which one is being constituted.

The notion of what it means to teach could perhaps be (re)worked as prospective teachers confront the underlying theories, 'truths' and practices of discourses such as child development, behaviour management, inquiry based learning and teacher education. While developing theoretical and instructional knowledges, the preservice teachers could contemplate how these discourses relatively conceptualise the teacher, and teaching. They could examine how each one positions the teacher and learner in teaching/learning engagements. Teacher educators and their students need to share with each other which of these constructions are intuitively appealing and comfortable. Why? They need to consider the various constructions and contemplate the economic, political and moral consequences of thinking of teaching and the teacher in these ways (Phelan, 2001).

As well, teacher educators would want their students to celebrate difference, and recognise and attend to this in their teaching. Perhaps in being 'up front and personal' about power, the preservice teachers could come to know human subjects as produced out of engagement in multiple discourses throughout life; they could share narratives of how they themselves were differently constituted (and achieved themselves) as legitimate students and contemplate alternative stories of what it might mean to be a learner/student/teacher. It would be interesting to share, with reference to the various schooling experiences, which differences were allowed and which contained and silenced. Hopefully the preservice teachers would begin to sense the constitutive and co-ercive forces of the working of the various discourses comprising their lived experiences. This might unsettle essentialist binaries of good/poor students and teachers and a coherent sense of self as in humanist based discourses. After all, it is in the performance of differences that prospective teachers have the opportunity to rework the meanings of who they are as educators (Phelan, 2001).

Practical Imperatives for the Future

In the past the rationale for education, and the role of educator, has been founded on the humanist idea of a certain kind of subject who has the inherent potential to be self-motivated and self-directing; a rational subject capable of exercising individual agency (Usher and Edwards, 1994). In teacher education it has been thought that preservice teachers, given new theoretical, disciplinary and pedagogical insights, could implement new and innovative instructional processes in the classroom. My alternative argument is contentious because it is based on the notion that preservice teachers don't do what they do because of the knowledges and theories constructed in teacher education programs alone...they do what they do in classrooms because of what they learned, came to know, about teachers and teaching during their formative years. They act the way they do according to their constituted *knowing* about how education happens (Lather, 1991). A special effort has to be expended in teacher education to disrupt or overwrite this constituted knowing.

To this end I have contemplated a re-culturing of teacher education recognising the productive potential of pedagogic relationships. This reculturing emphasises:

- New dialogic forms enacting new teaching/learning relationships respecting and valuing student authorship of voice and action;
- 'Constructivist', collaborative, co-authored engagements celebrating intellectual depth and comprising new technologies, new partnerships and new ecologies; and
- An extension of the intellectual demands of teacher education to include an analysis of *how* discourses shape identity and support or suppress agentic participation.

My argument hinges on the notion that "Remaking the teacher and the school and redesigning teacher education for new times go hand in hand (Luke et al., 2000, p. 210)". Preservice teachers must come to know new teaching/learning 'truths' and relationships in teacher education programs!

Conclusion

While poststructuralist analyses of practice seek to improve through making visible previously unseen aspects of practice, preservice teachers and teacher educators have investments in the continuation of business-as-usual. Even though the qualitative nature of pedagogic interaction may restrict or curtail agentic participation, such interactional patterns may go unchanged because they are comfortable, desirable, the way things *should* be done. As Davies (1996, p. 2210) suggests, resistance may be experienced:

because the old discourses are still more convincing and desirable to them and can readily be used to destabilise the new, or because the new can readily be reworked to become the old, since any new discourse is always overlaid on the old, and does not replace it.

When educational change was a matter of adding or subtracting a new bit of content or a new text book or technological device it was relatively easy; in the twenty-first century educators are asked to change the world by changing themselves. In this way, teacher education will change as the contemporary structures are held in place by individuals who can also bring them down. Hargraeves and Fullan (1998, p. 6) cite de Gues:

to cope with a changing world, any entity must develop the capability of

shifting and changing, of developing new skills and attitudes: in short the capability of learning...the essence of learning is the ability to manage change by changing yourself...

References

- Davies, B. 1991. The concept of agency. *Social Analysis*, 30:42-53.
- Davies, B. 1996. *Power/knowledge/desire: Changing school organisation and management practices*. Canberra: Department of Employment, Education and Training.
- Davies, B. 2000. Eclipsing the constitutive power of discourse: the writing of Janette Turner Hospital. In: Pierre, E. A. & Pillow, W. S. (eds.) *Feminist poststructural theory and methods in education*. London: Routledge Press. 179-198.
- Education Queensland 1999. *The next decade: A discussion about the future of Queensland State Schools*. Brisbane: Author.
- Hargreaves, A. and Fullan, M. 1998. *What's worth fighting for in education?* Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Henriques, J., Hollway, W., Urwin, C., Venn, C. and Walkerdine, V. (eds.) *Changing the subject*. London: Methuen.
- Hollway, W. 1984. Gender difference and the production of subjectivity. In: Henriques, J., Hollway, W., Urwin, C., Venn, C. and Walkerdine, V. (eds.) *Changing the subject*. London: Methuen. 227-263.
- Klein, M. 2001. Correcting mathematical and attitudinal deficiencies in preservice teacher education: the conservative effect of blaming the victim. In: Bobis, J., Perry, B. and Mitchelmore, M. (eds.) *Numeracy and beyond*. Turrumurra: MERGA Inc. 338-345.
- Lather, P. 1991. *Getting smart*. New York: Routledge.
- Luke, A., Luke, C. and Mayer, D. 2000. Redesigning teacher education. *Teaching Education*, 11(1):5-12.
- McNaughton, G. 2000. *Rethinking gender in early childhood education*. St Leonard's, NSW: Allen and Unwin.
- McWilliam, E. 1993. Student talk/expert talk: Reconstructing contemporary teacher education needs. In: Knight, J., Bartlett, L. and McWilliam, E. (eds.) *Unfinished business: Reshaping the teacher education industry for the 1990s*. Rockhampton, Australia: University Publishing. 122-138.
- McWilliam, E. and Knight, J. 1993. Training competent teachers for the education industry? In: Knight, J., Bartlett, L. and McWilliam, E. (eds.) *Unfinished business: Reshaping the teacher education industry for the 1990s*. Rockhampton, Australia: University Publishing. 93-110.
- Nicol, C. 1997. Learning to teach prospective teachers to teach mathematics. In: Loughran, J. and Russell, T. *Teaching about teaching*. London: Falmer Press. 95-116.
- Phelan, A. 2001. Power and place in teaching and teacher education. Paper presented AERA, Seattle. April 4-10.
- The State of Queensland (Department of Education) 2001. *The Queensland school reform longitudinal study*. Brisbane: Author.
- Tillema, H. and Knol, W. 1997. Collaborative planning by teacher educators to promote belief change in their students. *Teachers and teaching: theory and practice*, 3(1): 29-46.
- Usher, R. and Edwards, R. 1994. *Postmodernism and education*. London: Routledge.

Weedon, C. 1997. *Feminist practice and poststructuralist theory*. 2nd edit. Oxford: Blackwell.