Competition, economic rationalization, increased surveillance, and attacks on diversity: Neo-liberalism and the transformation of teacher education in the U.S.☆

Ken Zeichner*

University of Washington, Curriculum & Instruction, 211L Miller Hall Box 353600, Seattle, WA 98195, USA

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

This paper discusses recent developments in U.S. teacher education that are tied to the global neo-liberal project. The focus is on how changes experienced throughout the world have played out in the U.S. Three areas are addressed in particular: the commodification of teacher education, hyperrationality and increased accountability, and attacks on multicultural education. The paper closes with a look at the future for teacher education in the U.S.

© 2010 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

The principles of the market and its managers are more and more the managers of policy and practices in education (Bernstein, 1996).

No one will have the freedom to seek better teaching and stronger education… until the intellectual stranglehold exerted by the teacher education cartel is broken (Holland, 2004).

Today teacher education in many parts of the world is engaged in a major transformation. Although my perception of this situation is highly influenced by my experience with the U.S. federal government's efforts under the Clinton, Bush Sr. and Jr., and Obama administrations to further privatize public education and deprofessionalize the work of teaching (e.g., Baines, 2006a, 2006b, 2010; Raphael & Tobias, 1997), it is clear that what is discussed below is true in some form in many countries because of the wide influence of the neo-liberal, new managerial, and neo-conservative thinking that is guiding efforts to dismantle public education and teacher education in the U.S. and elsewhere and promoting the spread of neo-liberal corporate capitalism (Bates, 2007; Carnoy, 1995; Compton & Weiner, 2008; Freeman-Moir & Scott, 2007; Grimmett, Fleming, & Trotter, 2009; Hypolito, 2004; Sachs, 2003). The promotion of these ideas has often taken place using liberal-humanist human rights discourses (e.g., "Education for All, "quality.") that hide from

view the consequences of taking up these ideas and mask other ways of thinking about the issues (Tamatea, 2010).

A variety of policies are continuing to emerge that seem directed at taking control of education away from teachers and teacher educators, and eliminating − under efficiency arguments − the very mechanisms that can help teachers to effectively increase education quality the professional character of teaching with all that it brings, such as a deeper knowledge of the subjects they will teach. A deeper knowledge of how to teach those subjects to an increasingly diverse population, critical thinking, cognitive growth, among others. (Tatto, 2007a).

There have been several major trends occurring in initial teacher education programs throughout the world that will be discussed in this paper in relation to the U.S. These include the commodification of the work of preparing teachers and making teacher preparation subject to market forces, excessively prescriptive accountability requirements from government bodies and accreditation agencies that seek to control the substance of the teacher education curriculum, consistent and painful cuts in the budgets of public institutions including those charged with the education of teachers, and attacks on efforts to educate teachers to teach in socially just ways such as preparing them to engage in multicultural or anti-racist education (Duthilleul, 2005a, 2005b; Furlong, Cochran-Smith, & Brennan, 2009). I will conclude with some reflections about the future for teacher education in the U.S. and propose a direction for responding to these trends.

Although references will be made throughout the discussion to how these trends exist in other countries, the focus in the analysis will be on the situation for teacher education in the U.S. Because of

---

the differences in systems of schooling and teacher education and cultural traditions in different parts of the world (Steensen, 2006), both the analysis of the problems and the proposal for combating the negative effects of neo-liberalism in teaching and teacher education may not be appropriate in other countries.

1. The commodification of teacher education

Many of the pressures on teacher education today are a result of the spread of neo-liberal ideas and policies about markets, privatization, deregulation, and the private vs. public good (Ball, 2004) from the world of elementary and secondary education – into teacher education (Beyer, 2007; Dahlstrom, 2009; Hinchey & Cadiero-Kaplan, 2005; Kumashiro, 2010).[1] According to Robertson (2008) these policies have three central aims:

(1) The redistribution of wealth upward to the ruling elites through new structures of governance, (2) the transformation of educational systems so that the production of workers for the economy is the primary mandate, and (3) the breaking down of education as a public sector monopoly opening it up to strategic investment by for-profit firms (p. 12).

What we are seeing in the U.S. is the tremendous growth of alternatives to traditional college and university-based teacher education that include many new for-profit companies and universities that have gone into the business of preparing teachers.[2] These alternatives (e.g., Kaplan, I-Teach Texas, the University of Phoenix and Laureate) have actively been supported by the federal government under both Republican and Democratic party administrations (a former secretary of education said in a major report on teacher quality that he thought participation in a teacher education program should be made optional)[3] and by state policies in certain parts of the country that have actively encouraged alternatives to college and university-based teacher education.[4] In 2001, $40 million dollar non-competitive grants from the U.S. Department of Education led to the founding of the American Board for the Certification of Teaching Excellence (ABCTE) which currently certified teachers in 9 states based on two online examinations in content knowledge and professional knowledge. ABCTE does not require enrollment in a teacher education program or demonstration of teaching competence in a classroom for a teaching license.[5]

The federal government's current support of teacher residency programs that require a stronger role for schools and possibly communities in pre-service teacher preparation and that disrupt traditional and hierarchical university-based teacher education models is another example of governmental support of shifting teacher education programs more into schools and communities and away from universities (Howey, 2007). New York State has also recently aided the spread of non-university teacher education programs by empowering non-university providers like "Teach for

America" to award master's degrees to teachers thereby enabling them to meet the state requirement for earning a master's degree within the early years of their careers without having to enroll in a college or university-based program (Foderaro, 2010).

The current push by the U.S. government to encourage deregulation and competition in initial teacher education is very similar to what has been happening for a number of years now in the UK and in other parts of the world (e.g., Furlong, Barton, Miles, Whiting, & Whitty, 2000). As Steensen (2006) points out though in her analysis of neo-liberal influences on teacher education in Denmark and Sweden, the push toward markets and greater external controls in teacher education takes place differently in different parts of the world because of the interplay of local cultural traditions with the global trends that circulate from country to country. Thus, there is always a tension between the local and the global that determine the specific ways in which neo-liberal ideas influence both teaching and teacher education. Steensen's (2006) point is demonstrated by a recent collection of case studies of reforms in teaching and teacher education in 10 different countries (Tatto, 2007b). The case of Germany in this set of cases illustrates how global ideas have been borrowed and then transformed in some areas to help serve local interests (Blomeke, 2006). In other cases, such as in Ontario, Canada (Pitman, 2007), there is some evidence that global forces play a more powerful role. There is also of course much variation within certain countries in terms of how policies related to teaching and teacher education play out (Tatto & Plank, 2007).

One interesting development internationally in promoting alternatives to university-based initial teacher education is the founding in 2007 by Teach for America, a widely publicized pathway to teaching in the U.S. in collaboration with its British clone "Teach First," of a program called "Teach for All." This program is designed to support the development of entrepreneurs in other countries who would like to develop a Teach for America/Teach First like program in their area.[6]

The encouragement of alternatives to university hegemony over teacher preparation in and of itself is not necessarily a bad thing. Colleges and universities have only had a monopoly on pre-service teacher education in the U.S. during a very brief period, roughly 1960–1990. During all other times, there have always been multiple pathways into teaching that have not involved colleges and universities (Fraser, 2007). It is also the case that alternative non-university pathways to teaching sometimes have progressive elements and have been encouraged by some because of the failure of traditional university models to prepare teachers to be successful and stay in schools serving students living in poverty (Wilson & Tamir, 2008).

What is important to note about the alternatives being encouraged though is that they are often closely linked with a technicist view of the role of teachers and with efforts to erode teachers' autonomy and collegial authority. A number of scholars have carefully documented the transformation of the occupation of teaching in many parts of the world to what has sometimes been called "the new professionalism" that accepts the view that decisions about what and how to teach and assess are largely to be made beyond the classroom rather than by teachers themselves (e.g., Furlong, 2005; Robertson, 2000; and Smyth, Dow, Hattam, Reid, & Shacklock, 2000; Tatto, 2007a). The same ideas that have resulted in the new professionalism for teaching have now entered the world of teacher education to try and ensure that teachers are prepared to assume their limited roles as educational clerks who are not to exercise their judgment in the classroom (e.g., Johnson,

---

[1] According to Harvey (2005), "neoliberalism is in the first instance a theory of political economic practices that proposes that human well-being can be advanced by liberating individual entrepreneurial freedoms and skills within an institutional framework characterized by strong private property rights, free markets, and free trade. The role of the state is to create and preserve the institutional framework appropriate to such practices "(p.).

[2] This marketization of teacher education is a similar to the growth of for-profit higher education in general (Morey, 2001).

[3] Paige (2002).

[4] An example of state policies that encourage alternatives to college and university teacher education is the practice of placing a limit capping Education credits in a pre-service teacher education program See Zeichner and Hutchinson (2008) for a discussion of the evolution of alternative certification policies in the U.S.

[5] ABCTE.org. The states participating in this program are: Florida, Idaho, Mississippi, Missouri, New Hampshire, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, and Utah and Oklahoma.

[6] Miner (2010) documents the link between Teach for America in the U.S. and some of the major funders of efforts to privatize K-12 education such as the Walton Family Foundation (Wal-Mart) and the Doris and Donald Fisher Fund (The Gap).

Johnson, Farenga, & Ness, 2005).[7] This trend can be seen very clearly in many countries such as the widespread use of para-teachers in India (Kumar, Priyam, & Saxena, 2001) and "plasma" teachers in Ethiopia (Dahlstrom & Lemma, 2009) and in the growing focus on teachers as implementers of teaching scripts in many parts of the world (Compton & Weiner, 2008).

1.1. A note on teacher professionalism

Evetts (2009) distinguishes between two views of professionalism that now exist in knowledge-based work such as teaching — organizational professionalism and occupational professionalism. Her argument is that organizational professionalism (similar to what is referred to above as the "new professionalism) has changed the meaning of professionalism in education to a situation where a discourse of control has come to overshadow in practice more traditional views of occupational professionalism based on collegial authority. On the one hand, administrators espouse an ideology of professionalism that suggests traditional forms of occupational professionalism and collegial authority. In reality though, practice often reflects the reality of greater external controls and surveillance that comes with organizational professionalism.

> The appeal to the discourse by managers in work organizations is to a myth of an ideology of professionalism … which includes aspects as exclusive ownership of an area of expertise, autonomy and discretion in work practices and the occupational control of the work. But the reality of the professionalism that is actually involved is very different. The appeal to the discourse of professionalism by managers in work organizations often includes the substitution of organizational for professional values; bureaucratic hierarchical and managerial controls rather than collegial relations; managerial and organizational objectives rather than client trust based on competencies and perhaps licensing; budgetary restrictions and financial rationalizations, the standardization of work practices rather than discretion; and performance targets, accountability, and sometimes increased political controls (p. 24).

Apple (1996) discusses a third form of professionalism, "democratic professionalism" that is seen as an alternative to increased state control on the one hand which erodes teachers' abilities to exercise their judgment in the classroom and traditional occupational professionalism on the other hand that may be unresponsive to the needs of students and communities (Zeichner, 1991). Sachs (2003) argues that the core aspect of democratic professionalism in teaching is an emphasis on collaborative and cooperative action between teachers and other education stakeholders in a manner that is not common with more traditional forms of occupational professionalism. It is this democratic form of professionalism that I see as the needed response to growing forms of occupational professionalism and excessive bureaucratic controls in teaching and teacher education.

1.2. The nature and consequences of many non-university pathways to teaching

There is evidence that many of the non college and university programs in the U.S. focus on meeting only the minimum standards set by governmental bodies (e.g., Baines, 2010)[8] and that the goal is

to prepare "good enough teachers"[9] to teach children of the poor by obediently following scripted curriculum and instructional practices that are alleged supported by research (to raise standardized test scores), but which in reality have lined the pockets of friends of the government who own the companies that make the materials.[10] This approach serves to widen the gap between who gets to learn to be thinkers and authentic problem solvers and those who are forced to learn out of context and interact with knowledge in artificial ways (Kozol, 2005).

These attempts to further deprofessionalize teaching through scripting the curriculum and standardized tests at every grade level continue to ensure that spots will be available for the teachers produced by the growing number of teacher education programs outside of the formal tertiary education system. In many places, teacher professional development has become "product implementation" aligned with standards and standardized tests and is increasingly conducted by those employed by the testing companies and publishers who produce and sell the materials that are promoted by the government. Money that used to be available in schools for more teacher-initiated and controlled professional development like action research groups and study groups is largely disappearing from American public schools (Randi & Zeichner, 2004) and professional development has shifted from a professional model that focuses on the learning of individual teachers who identify their own learning needs to an institutional model that focuses on getting teachers to conform to institutional mandates (Young, 1998).

What is happening in public schools today has served to drive many good people out of teaching who are not willing to put up with the continued erosion of the dignity of public school teaching that is associated with these changes and actively undermines the goal of improving the quality of learning for all students (Goodnough, 2001; Ingersoll, 2003). Teachers have become easily replaceable technicians in the eyes of many policy makers. The continual openings for the products of the new alternative programs ensure higher profits for the investors in the new teacher education companies. There is a lot of money to be made if teacher education in the U.S. can be privatized.

The solution to the teacher quality problem according to some is to deregulate teacher education and open the gates to individuals who have not completed a teacher education program prior to certification (e.g., Hess, 2009; Walsh, 2004) rather than to improve the conditions in public schools that are driving teachers out. Andrew Rosen, president of Kaplan College, which is part of one of the major for-profit teacher education companies to enter the U.S. teacher education market in recent years stated the following in an online conversation about teacher education that clearly illustrates this stance:

> Teaching is less lucrative and is rife with work environment issues that many deem not to be worthy of investment… by reducing the barriers for bright-minded professionals, we can increase the population of qualified candidates. (Rosen, 2003).

Many of these new alternative programs use a "learn while you earn" model where the teacher candidates are fully responsible for a classroom (usually of poor children of color) while they are

---

[7] Sachs (2003) correctly points out that this same kind of corporate managerialism has also become more common in other parts of the public sector in addition to education.

[8] Many of these programs use standardized course syllabi and employ mostly adjunct faculty to teach courses. Baines (2006a, 2006b, 2010) has also shown how some colleges and universities are now designing "minimalist programs" to be able to compete with the non college and university programs.

[9] The term was used by a high ranking official in the U.S. Department of Education at a meeting held at the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching in June 2002.

[10] Two examples of this are the scandal over the Reading First program initiated by a government audit (Grunwald, 2006) and criticisms of the inappropriate use of money in 3 states to buy educational products from a company owned by the president's brother, Neil Bush (Thompson, 2007). There is strong evidence that the so called "Texas miracle" on which Bush Jr. administration policies emphasizing standardized testing were based did not produce the kinds of success for students that were claimed by the Bush administration. (e.g., Haney, 2000; Valenzuela, 2005).

completing their minimalist program.[11] The standards to get into these programs are often very low, sometimes only requiring "a heartbeat and a check that clears the bank." (Baines, 2006a, p. 327). The Education Trust, has closely monitored the achievement test scores and other educational opportunities made available to various groups of learners in public schools. They have consistently found that if you are poor and particularly if you are poor and a student of color (i.e., African American, Latino, Native American, Asian American) you are many more times likely in many areas of the country to be taught by inexperienced teachers, teachers who have not completed a full-scale teacher education program, or teachers teaching outside of the fields in which they were prepared (Peske & Haycock, 2006; Also see Darling-Hammond, 2004; National Research Council, 2010).

Although most teachers going into teaching in the USA still enter teaching through traditional college and university programs (National Research Council, 2010), in some parts of the U.S. (Texas and California for example) nearly as many teachers enter through an alternative route which is often one of the "fast track" programs that provide minimal preparation to teach (Feistritzer & Haar, 2008).[12] In these fast-track or "early-entry" programs most of the initial education for teaching takes place after teachers have become fully responsible for classrooms (Grossman & Loeb, 2008).

2. Defunding public K-12 and higher education

A second aspect of current developments in U.S. teacher education is the continuing cuts in state government financial support for public universities where the majority of teachers in the U.S. are still prepared. Even before the recent crisis in the global economy, the states have had to address increased healthcare costs for the elderly, the building of prisons to house the minorities and other poor people whom the public schools have failed to educate, and to make up for the shortfalls in federal support for various programs in public elementary and secondary schools that the states are obligated by law to provide (for example programs for special education students),[13] they have reduced funding to public universities (Lyall & Sell, 2006; Newfeld, 2008). As the demands on university teacher educators have increased with expanding accountability requirements, their resources have gone down and highly rationalized corporate budgeting models such as activity-based budgeting have been introduced into public universities to manage the distribution of the diminished resources.

For example, in Wisconsin, state appropriations to the University of Wisconsin system's 13 campuses adjusted for inflation decreased by 22% or $223 million dollars between 2000 and 2007 the public contribution to this so called public university in Madison was reduced to approximately 19 percent of the total budget in 2007 (Clark, 2007). The rest of the money needed to run the university has had to come from research grants, private gifts and student tuition. Another example of the defunding of public universities is at the University of Washington where between 2009 and 2011, the university lost $132 million dollars (33%) of its state support (Emmeret, 2010).

There is hardly any difference anymore between a public and private university in the U.S. This pressure to reduce the size of teacher education in universities by starving the education schools and universities that prepare teachers serves to support the growth of non-university programs and the corporatization of teacher education.

With regard to elementary and secondary school education, with the exception of a few energy-rich states,[14] state governments have for a number of years been facing huge budget deficits that together with soaring energy costs have resulted in continual cuts in the budgets of many school districts in the U.S. that have affected the quality of educational programs and the availability of professional development for teachers. The budget situation was so bad in the largest school district in Wisconsin (Milwaukee Public Schools) that the school board came close a few years ago to dissolving the school district (Aarons, 2008; Borsuk, 2008; McNeil, 2008).

3. Hyper-rationality16 and increased accountability[15]

A third aspect of current developments in U.S. teacher education are the increased and often excessive accountability demands that are placed on teacher education programs by state governments and national accrediting bodies. In just about every state, teacher education graduates are required to pass a series of standardized tests to enter and complete their programs and to demonstrate mastery of a set of detailed teaching and subject matter standards. Teacher educators are required in submitting their programs to states and sometimes also to a national accrediting body for approval to spend inordinate amounts of time preparing detailed assessment plans showing how each course in their programs is aligned with state standards, and performance indicators showing exactly what competencies student teachers are required to meet.[16]

There is nothing wrong per se with testing teachers in basic skills, and content knowledge or with holding teacher education institutions accountable to have performance-based assessment systems that determine that their students are prepared to successfully meet a set of agreed upon standards of practice to receive an initial teaching license.[17] In fact, these kinds of data about what program graduates know and are able to do in classrooms not only can be valuable as sources of knowledge about program effectiveness, but can also become important sources for stimulating ongoing teacher education program renewal (Zeichner, 2005b).

The problem arises when those who accredit and approve programs take the process beyond the bounds of reasonableness to a point where the level of details teacher educators are required to produce for evaluators begins to interfere with the accomplishment of the goals of teacher educators and is loosely if at all connected to

[11] Feistritzer and Haar (2008) report that in 2006, approximately 50,000 individuals were teachers of record in schools across the country while they were still in the process of completing their pre-service teacher education programs.

[12] In 2005, the number of individuals certified through alternative routes in just three states (California, New Jersey, Texas) accounted for nearly one-half of all teachers in the United States certified through alternative routes that year. In this same year, New Jersey reported that nearly 40 percent of new hires entered through alternative programs while the percentage in Texas and California was about one third (Feistritzer & Haar, 2008).

[13] For example, between 2002 and 2006, Title I funding was under funded by $31.5 billion dollars and IDEA was under funded by $ 37.6 billion dollars. Retrieved from the National School Board Association website on September 8, 2006. (www.nsba.org/site/docs/38600/38542.pdf.

[14] Alaska, North Dakota, and Wyoming.

[15] By hyper-rationality, I mean extreme pressure on teacher education institutions to rationalize their programs and student assessment systems to a point where the demands for accountability and compliance begin to interfere with and undermine the accomplishment of the goal of educating teachers (See Wise, 1979 for a discussion of this term with regard to K-12 education).

[16] See Bullough, Clark, and Patterson (2003) for a discussion of some of the problems in current accreditation methods based on the experience of teacher educators at one university.

[17] It has been shown by research however, that some forms of teacher testing have had a negative effect on efforts to develop a more ethnically and racially diverse teaching force (Darling-Hammond & Chung Wei, 2009).

actual program quality (Johnson et al., 2005).[18] This excessive level of bureaucratization of teacher education program approval was a major problem for competency-based teacher education in the 1970s (Zeichner, 2005a) and is one again becoming a concern.

As the associate dean for teacher education at my university in Wisconsin, I spent 3 months several years ago, essentially fulltime, preparing the reports to our state education department on our teacher education programs so that the state could review our programs for their compliance with state certification laws. While some aspects of this work were valuable to us in better understanding the opportunities for our students to learn and what our students actually are learning in our programs, other aspects (e.g., aligning hundreds of arts and science classes across our campus with state content guidelines) were clearly less useful and marginally related to program quality. So while some forms of accountability for teacher education institutions are reasonable and necessary, in a growing number of states, current demands for teacher educators to rationalize their programs have gone beyond the realm of reasonableness and are beginning to interfere with teacher educators being able to accomplish their goals.

For example, recent studies in Maryland and California have shown that while teacher educators in some situations have been able to meet the increasingly prescriptive program approval requirements while still maintaining intellectual control over their programs (Kornfeld, Grady, Marker, & Ruddell, 2007; Rennert-Ariev, 2008), precious resources were spent in both of these cases on meeting requirements that teacher educators felt did not enhance the quality of their programs. These resources could have been used for other things that would contribute to improving program quality like strengthening school-university partnerships. Rennert-Ariev (2008) who conducted the study in Maryland, found the practice of what he called "bureaucratic ventriloquism" where "superficial demonstrations of compliance with external mandates became more important than authentic intellectual engagement." (p. 8). In many teacher education programs across the country, a clash has been created by current accountability demands between authenticity (doing what one knows is in the best interest of the learning of one's students) and performativity (doing what one needs to do to meet accountability demands even when one knows it is not in the best interest of one's students).

A whole new industry in electronic portfolios has emerged with these requirements, where a few companies (e.g., Live Text, Chalk & Wire) aggressively market portfolio systems to colleges and universities so that they can provide the necessary data to gain approval for their programs. These portfolio systems have emphasized the bureaucratic aspects of keeping track of student teachers' performance on standards and for the most part have failed to take advantage of the potential in portfolios to deepen teacher learning (e.g., Bullough, 2008). Several of the portfolio companies and the two companies that make most of the tests used nationally (ETS and NES) have come to sponsor parts of the annual meetings of the major national teacher education association in the U.S. — The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE). When people walk into a plenary session at the AACTE conference, they are likely to see giant screens with the logo of one of the testing companies such as Educational Testing Service (ETS) the maker of most of the tests used in U.S. teacher education programs or of one of the companies that market electronic portfolio systems such as Live Text.

One extreme form of accountability expectations referred to as the "positive impact mandate" (Hamel & Merz, 2005) is being seriously pushed by policy makers in a number of areas in the country[19] and there are predictions by some that the "results-based" teacher education that will come from using the positive impact mandate will become the norm in the country in a few years. With this requirement, teacher education institutions will be evaluated and ranked based on the standardized test score results of the pupils taught by the graduates of the teacher education programs. This is analogous to evaluating and approving medical schools on the basis of how many of the patients of their graduates are helped by their medical care or get sicker. There are several reasons why the positive impact mandate is a bad idea even if one accepts the ability of value-added assessment to link pupil performance with individual teachers in a way that rules out other explanations for student test performance: (a) No other professional school is held accountable for the performance of its graduates after they have left the preparation program, (b) Even if one accepts the ability of value-added assessment to link student test performance with individual teachers in a manner that rules out other explanations of student test score differences, the costs involved in implementing this kind of assessment would divert enormous resources away from other teacher education activities that arguably would do a lot more to improve the quality of teacher preparation programs (Zeichner, 2005a, 2005b), and (c) there are serious technical and educational problems associated with the technique of using value-added assessment of curriculum-specific pupil test scores to evaluate teacher education programs. For example, Darling-Hammond and Chung Wei (2009) argue:

> In addition to the fact that curriculum-specific tests that would allow gain score analysis are typically not available in most teaching areas and grade levels, these include concerns that readily available tests do not measure many important kinds of learning, are inaccurate measures of learning for specific populations of students (for example new English language learners and some special education students), and that what appear to be the "effects" of a given teacher may reflect other teachers and learning experiences, home differentials, or aspects of the school environment that influence teaching (e.g., curriculum choices, resources and supports, class sizes, whether a teacher is assigned out of field, etc.). Furthermore, value-added analyses have found that teachers look very different in their measured effectiveness depending on what statistical methods are used, including whether and how student characteristics are controlled, whether school effects are controlled, and how missing data are treated. In addition, effectiveness ratings appear highly unstable: a given teacher is likely to be rated differently in his or her effectiveness from class to class and from year to year… Thus, while value-added models may prove useful for looking at groups of teachers for research purposes, and they may provide one measure of teacher effectiveness among several, they are problematic as the primary or sole measure for making decisions about individual teachers or even teacher education programs (p. 54).

Several years ago, the lead story in our national education newspaper *Education Week* praised the state of Louisiana for implementing this system for its teacher education programs (Honawar, 2007). Louisiana spends close to the least amount of money on education, healthcare and other social service systems in the country. Under the logic of the current government though, the states that

---

[18] A recent study by the National Research Council on teacher education in the U. S. concluded that there is no empirical evidence supporting the effectiveness of any of any of these state and national teacher education program approval practices and has called for a major study of this area (National Research Council, 2010).

[19] Currently, teacher education institutions are publically ranked according to the standardized test scores of pupils taught by program graduates in Louisiana and Florida.

most support its policies (e.g., Texas, Louisiana, and Mississippi) are ranked higher in educational quality reports because of their compliance rather than because of the actual quality of their education systems. The states with the highest overall educational quality are often the ones least supportive of the accountability mandates (Zeichner, 2009).

All of this together − the requirements for extremely detailed information about institutional assessment systems, testing, and so on have been forcing teacher educators to spend time on things that they do not believe will help them do their jobs better just to appear that they are doing what is expected to get approval for their programs. This is time and money that could alternatively be spent on actually improving their programs. Lots of time and money are currently being spent on things in U.S. teacher education institutions that have no relation to improving program quality (Johnson et al., 2005).

4. Attacks on multicultural education

A final element of teacher education in the U.S. currently is the attacks stemming from neo-conservative views about the proper content for a teacher's education. These attacks have focused on the increased emphasis on multicultural education in American teacher education programs an on preparing teachers who can contribute to eliminating the achievement gaps between students from different racial, ethnic and social class backgrounds that not only have persisted in elementary and secondary schools but which have grown larger under current government policies. These attacks equate a focus on social justice and multiculturalism with a lowering of academic standards and blame university teacher educators for the continued problems in educating public school students who are increasingly poor and of color. These attacks on multicultural education divert attention from the real influences on the problems in public schools − a variety of factors including the under funding of public education, the lack of access to affordable housing, transportation, healthcare and jobs that pay decent wages.

One example of the criticism of social justice and multicultural education efforts by external groups was a successful effort in 2006 to force the major national accrediting body in teacher education in the U.S. (The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education) to drop the term social justice from its accrediting standards for teacher education programs (Wasley, 2006).[20]

A second aspect of the critique of Education Schools involves the construction of an oversimplified distinction between teacher-centered and learner-centered instruction and the creation of a caricature of teacher educators as advocates of an unrestrained form of learner-centered instruction. Multicultural education in teacher education programs is often equated with a lack of concern for academic standards (e.g., Greene & Shock, 2008). For example, in a report on teacher education in California done by the Pacific Research Institute for Public Policy, Izumi and Coburn (2001) quote Florida State University psychologist K. Anders Erickson who describes college and university teacher educators as "radical constructivists" who act in extreme ways that few teacher educators would actually support.

Radical constructivists recommend educational settings where students are forced to take the initiative and guide their own learning. Many radical constructivists even discourage the teacher from correcting students when their reasoning and ideas are invalid because such criticism may jeopardize their

self-confidence in their independent reasoning and challenge their self-respect (p. 9).

While all of these forces are operating on teacher education from the outside (cuts in resources, privatization, increased accountability, and attacks on multiculturalism), inside college and university teacher education programs, teacher educators everywhere are claiming to have programs that prepare teachers to teach for social justice, to provide everyone's children with a high quality education, and to work against the forces that are leading to increased inequality and suffering in the world today (McDonald & Zeichner, 2009). Social justice teacher education has become a slogan like reflective teaching was in the 1980s and 1990s and it is hard to find a teacher education program in the U.S. that does not claim to have social justice as a central part of their mission in preparing teachers.

The reaction of college and university teacher educators in the U.S. to the outside forces of privatization, increased accountability, budget cuts and attacks on multiculturalism has understandably been a defensive one, but has resulted in an oversimplification of the motives of external critics and a failure to acknowledge and address some of the weaknesses in the still dominant college and university system of pre-service teacher education (Wilson & Tamir, 2008). Currently news articles and academic papers are being published, and major addresses are being presented at important national conferences questioning whether colleges and universities should continue to be involved in pre-service teacher education to the degree that they have historically in the U.S. (e.g., Duncan, 2009; Hartocolis, 2005; Levine, 2006; New York Times, 2009; Payzant, 2004). Following, is a brief overview of how I think teacher educators in the U.S. should respond to the current situation in a way that will enable the U.S. to do a better job of preparing a corps of teachers who will be prepared to provide a high quality education to everyone's children.

5. The future for teacher education in the U.S.

From my perspective, college and university teacher educators should not seek to uncritically defend all college and university-based teacher education programs from external criticisms. It is very clear from research and observation that there is a wide range of quality in both traditional and alternative teacher education programs in the United States (Cochran-Smith & Zeichner, 2005; Cochran-Smith, Feiman-Nemser, & McIntyre, 2008; Darling-Hammond, 2006), from those that are rigorous and high quality to those that should probably be shut down.

It is also not a question of determining the best single type of program from research studies because there is not currently a consensus about the desired outcomes for teacher education programs. For example, preparing teachers to obediently use scripted curriculum materials is a very different goal than preparing teachers to be reflective professionals who can exercise wise judgment in their classrooms and adapt their instruction to meet the changing needs of their students. Although research can potentially make important contributions to policy and practice in teacher education, decisions about policy and practice are inevitably mediated by moral, ethical, and political considerations whether acknowledged openly or not (Zeichner, 2005a, 2005b).

Recent syntheses of research in teacher education in the U.S. (e.g., Cochran-Smith & Zeichner, 2005; Cochran-Smith et al., 2008; Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005; National Research Council, 2010) have demonstrated the need for several things to happen to improve the quality of college and university-based teacher education including an increased focus on preparing teachers to teach the diverse students who attend U.S. public schools (e.g.,

---

[20] NCATE didn't actually have "a 'social justice' requirement": it had a requirement that all teacher education programs who listed "social justice" as a goal had to individually assess the disposition of each student to promote social justice. Since virtually all programs had such a goal, the guideline amounted to a de facto social justice requirement.

English learners), forming closer connections between the campus-based components of teacher education programs and the schools and communities in which teacher candidates teach, greater engagement of arts and science faculty in teacher education programs, and so on. Research has also begun to illuminate the characteristics of pre-service teacher education programs that are effective in preparing teachers to teach a wide range of students in meaningful ways (e.g., Boyd et al., 2008; Darling-Hammond, 2006; Zeichner & Conklin, 2005). We need to find ways to ensure that these characteristics are present in all forms of pre-service teacher education, traditional or alternative and doing so will require a greater investment of societal resources in teacher preparation and in research on teacher education (Zeichner, 2005a, 2005b).

The solution to the current problems in American public education where the teaching force is at about 3.6 million teachers who teach in about 90,000 schools or in other systems where these same forces are now operating is not to continue to supply under funded and overregulated public schools with teachers who meet minimum state standards and who are only positioned to raise standardized test scores by implementing external directives and teaching scripts. We must not give up on the idea of preparing teachers who are able to exercise their judgment in their classrooms in the best interests of their students and with giving teachers access to meaningful professional development that recognizes the knowledge an expertise that teachers bring to these experiences and treats them with respect. Underlying efforts to improve the quality of teacher education is the need to fight for the survival of public education and for the dignity of the work of teaching in public schools. To do this, we of course also need to address all of the "rotten outcomes" and injustices that exist beyond schools (providing access to housing, nutritious food, healthcare, jobs that pay a living wage… Berliner, 2006).

Attempts to defend college and university teacher education in the U.S. that are isolated from other struggles for social justice in public schooling and in the broader society will be seen as largely self-serving and will fail. In responding to these problems and to external critiques, we need to recognize and confront the underlying neo-liberal and neo-conservative forces that are connected to the current troubles of public education and teacher education and begin to challenge them rather than demonizing and blaming particular individuals. It has been very rare in the U.S. teacher education literature for there to be any discussion of the neo-liberal and neo-conservative thinking connected to current developments (see Hinchey & Cadiero-Kaplan, 2005; Sleeter, 2008; Weiner, 2007 for exceptions) and of the global nature of their existence. What I have described in this paper with regard to teacher education in the U.S. is clearly going on in many parts of the world, often aided by the efforts of organizations like the World Bank and OECD (Dahlstrom, 2007; Reimers, 1994; Zeichner & Ndimande, 2008).

Because of the growing influence of the neo-liberal agenda in both K-12 schooling and teacher education, the very idea of public education as we have known it in the U.S. is in serious jeopardy right now. Hess's (2006) comments in an American Enterprise Institute's publication advocating an increased role for the market in public schooling and teacher education even questions the need for public schools.

> There is growing recognition that it may be possible to serve public purposes and cultivate civic virtues in places other than state run schools. Consider that public schools may be those that serve public ends regardless of how they are funded, operated and monitored… any school that helps children master reading, writing, and mathematics and other essential elements is advancing significant and public purposes.(p. 62–63).

This neo-liberal logic transforms education from a public good into a private consumer item. Apple (2001) argues that this begins to transform the very idea of democracy (of the common good)

making it an economic concept, not a political one and that one of the effects of this thinking is the destruction of what might best be seen as "thick democracy" substituting a much thinner version of possessive individualism.

A strong, and well-supported system of public education is essential to the realization of the democratic society that the U.S. aspires to be. Barber a prominent scholar on democracy, has argued in response to recent attacks on public education:

> In attacking… public education critics are attacking the very foundation of our democratic civic culture. Public schools are not merely schools for the public, but schools of publicness: institutions where we learn what it means to be a public and start down the road toward common national and civic identity. They are the forges of our citizenship and the bedrock of our democracy… Vilifying public school teachers and administrators and cutting public school budgets even as we subsidize private educational opportunity puts us in double jeopardy: for as we put our children at risk, we undermine our common future, at the same moment, in constraining the conditions of liberty for some, we undermine the future of democracy for all (Barber, 1997, p. 22).

It is essential that teacher educators stand up and be counted in collaboration with public school educators and parents and students in the struggle to protect and strengthen both public K-12 education and a strong role for college and universities in teacher education. The survival of our hopes to build a genuinely democratic society depend on it.

This new and more collaborative form of teacher education that is required in the U.S. to support the development of more democratic forms of professionalism in teaching and teacher education must lead to a greater democratization of knowledge in teacher education programs and to the building of strong alliances across the boundaries of universities, schools and communities that are less hierarchical and more inclusive of the expertise that exits in all three spheres. University teacher education in the U.S. will need to become more closely linked with and more relevant to supporting progressive struggles in schools and communities than it is currently if it is to survive. Because of the knowledge histories that exist in universities that often undermine genuine collaboration with those outside of the academy (e.g., Duffy, 1994), there may be a need to develop new hybrid spaces where more egalitarian forms of interaction in teacher education are possible such as has begun to occur in some counties such as Israel (Gorodetsky & Barak, 2008).

This is both a very exciting and dangerous time for teacher education in the U.S. There is both a real opportunity to establish forms of democratic professionalism in teaching and teacher education where universities, schools, and communities come together in new ways to prepare teachers who will provide everyone's children with the same high quality of education. There is also a real danger however, that teacher education in the U.S. will be dismantled into a purely market economy divorced from universities and that the "good enough" teacher who can only faithfully implement teaching scripts (but no more) with "other people's children" will become the norm. In order to achieve the former of these worlds, university teacher educators in the U.S. must look beyond a purely defensive reaction to the forces discussed in this paper and take a more offensive stance learning how to do things in ways that they have not been done before.

References

Aarons, D. (2008, August 27). Districts cut back bussing, seek ways to save energy. *Education Week*. Retrieved from. www.educationweek.org on 27.09.08.
Apple, M. (1996). *Cultural politics and education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
Apple, M. W. (2001). *Educating the "right way"*. New York: Routledge.

Baines, L. (2006a). Deconstructing teacher certification. *Phi Delta Kappan, 88*(4), 326–329.

Baines, L. (2006b). The transmorgrifcation of teacher education. *The Teacher Educator, 42*(2), 140–156.

Baines, L. (2010). *The teachers we need vs. the teachers we have*. Lanham, MD: Roman Littlefield.

Ball, S. (June, 2004). *Everything for sale: The commodification of everything*. The annual education lecture. London Institute of Education.

Barber, B. (1997). Public schooling: education for democracy. In J. Goodlad, & T. McMannon (Eds.), *The public purpose of education and schooling* (pp. 21–32). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Bates, R. (2007). Regulation and autonomy in teacher education: system or democracy. In T. Townsend, & R. Bates (Eds.), *Handbook of teacher education: Globalization, standards and professionalism in times of change* (pp. 127–140). Dordrecht: Springer.

Berliner, D. (2006). *Our impoverished view of educational reform*. Teachers College Record. Retrieved from. www.tcrecord.org on 10.09.06.

Bernstein, B. (1996). *Pedagogy, symbolic control and identity*. London: Routledge.

Beyer, L. (2007). Teacher education and the new professionalism: the case of the USA. In J. Freeman-Moir, & A. Scott (Eds.), *Shaping the future: Critical essays on teacher education* (pp. 25–42). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Blomeke, S. (2006). Globalization and educational reform in German teacher education. *International Journal of Educational Research, 45*, 315–324.

Borsuk, A. J. (2008, September 25). MPS board backs away from ideas of dissolving the district. *Milwaukee Journal Sentinel*. Retrieved from. jsonline.com on 26.09.08.

Boyd, D., Grossman, P., Hammerness, K., Loeb, S., McDonald, M., Ronfeldt, M., et al. (2008). Surveying the landscape of teacher education in New York City: constrained variation and the challenge of innovation. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 30*(4), 319–343.

Bullough, R. (2008). *Counter narratives: Studies of teacher education and becoming and being a teacher*. Albany, N.Y.: SUNY Press.

Bullough, R., Clark, C., & Patterson, R. (2003). Getting in step: accountability, accreditation and the standardization of teacher education in the United States. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 29*(1), 35–51.

Carnoy, M. (1995). Structural adjustment and the changing face of education. *International Labor Review, 134*(6), 653–674.

Clark, K. (July, 2007). *Declines in spending on public higher education in Wisconsin: An analysis of the University of Wisconsin system budget*. Madison: WISCAPE Policy Brief, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Cochran-Smith, M., Feiman-Nemser, S., & McIntyre, D. J. (Eds.). (2008). *Handbook of research on teacher education* (3rd ed.). New York: Routledge.

Cochran-Smith, M., & Zeichner, K. (Eds.). (2005). *Studying teacher education*. New York: Routledge.

Compton, M., & Weiner, L. (Eds.). (2008). *The global assault on teaching, teachers and their unions*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Dahlstrom, L. (2007). When eagles are allowed to fly: a global and contextual perspective on teacher education in Ethiopia. *International Journal of Progressive Education, 3*(3), 6–19.

Dahlstrom, L. (2009). Education in a post-neoliberal era: a promising future for the global south. *Power and Education, 1*(2), 167–177.

Dahlstrom, L., & Lemma, B. (2009). Critical perspectives on teacher education in neo-liberal times: experiences from Ethiopia and Namibia. *SARS, 14*(1–2), 29–42.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2004). Inequality and the right to learn: access to qualified teachers in California's public schools. *Teachers College Record, 106*(10), 1936–1966.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2006). *Powerful teacher education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Darling-Hammond, L., & Bransford, J. (Eds.). (2005). *Preparing teachers for a changing world*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Darling-Hammond, & Chung Wei, R. (2009). Teacher preparation and teacher learning: a changing policy landscape. In G. Sykes, B. Schneider, & D. Plank (Eds.), *Handbook of education policy research* (pp. 613–636). New York: Routledge.

Duffy, G. (1994). Professional development schools and the disempowerment of teachers and professors. *Phi Delta Kappan, 75*(8), 596–600.

Duncan, A. (October, 2009). *Teacher preparation: Reforming an uncertain profession*. New York City: Remarks by U.S. Secretary of Education Arne Duncan at Teachers' College, Columbia University.

Duthilleul, Y. (2005a). *Developing teachers' knowledge and skills: Policy trends in OECD countries*. Paris: UNESCO International Institute for Educational Planning.

Duthilleul, Y. (March, 2005b). *Teacher education, professional development and certification policies in Latin America*. Paris: UNESCO International Institute for Educational Planning.

Emmeret, M. (April 16, 2010). *Letter to the university community*. Seattle: University of Washington.

Evetts, J. (2009). The management of professionalism: a contemporary paradox. In S. Gewirtz, P. Mahony, I. Hextall, & A. Cribb (Eds.), *Changing teacher professionalism: International challenges and ways forward*. London: Routledge.

Feistritzer, E., & Haar, C. (2008). *Alternative routes to teaching*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education Inc.

Foderaro, L. (April 18, 2010). *Alternative pathway for teachers gains ground*. New York Times. Retrieved from. www.newyorktimes.com on 18.04.10.

Fraser, J. W. (2007). *Preparing America's teachers: A history*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Freeman-Moir, J., & Scott, A. (Eds.). (2007). *Shaping the future: Critical essays on teacher education*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Furlong, J. (2005). New labour and teacher education: the end of an era. *Oxford Review of Education, 31*, 119–134.

Furlong, J., Barton, L., Miles, S., Whiting, C., & Whitty, G. (2000). *Teacher education in transition: Re-forming professionalism*. Buckingham: U.K. Open University Press.

Furlong, J., Cochran-Smith, M., & Brennan, M. (2009). *Policy and politics in teacher education: International perspectives*. London: Routledge.

Goodnough, A. (June 14, 2001). Strain of fourth-grade tests drives off veteran teachers. *New York Times*. P.A-1. Retrieved from. nytimes.com on 24.06.03.

Gorodetsky, M., & Barak, J. (2008). The educational–cultural edge: a participative learning environment for co-emergence of personal and institutional growth. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 24*, 1907–1918.

Greene, J., & Shock, C. (2008). Adding up to failure: Ed schools put diversity before math. *City Journal, 18*(1). Retrived from www.city-journal.org/2008 on January 10, 2010.

Grimmett, P., Fleming, R., & Trotter, L. (2009). Legitimacy and identity in teacher education: a micro-political struggle constrained by macro-political pressures. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 37*(1), 5–26.

Grossman, P., & Loeb, S. (Eds.). (2008). *Taking stock: An examination of alternative certification*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.

Grunwald, M. (October 1, 2006). *Billions for an inside game on reading*. The Washington Post. Retrieved from. www.washingtonpost.com on 10.10.06.

Hamel, F., & Merz, C. (2005). Reforming accountability: a preservice program wrestles with mandated reform. *Journal of Teacher Education, 56*(2), 157–167.

Haney, W. (2000). The myth of the Texas miracle in education. *Educational Policy Analysis Archives, 41*.

Hartocolis, A. (July 31, 2005). Who needs education schools? *New York Times Education Life* 22–28.

Harvey, D. (2005). *A brief history of neo-liberalism*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Hess, F. (2009). The human capital challenge: toward a 21st century teaching profession. In D. Goldhaber, & J. Hannaway (Eds.), *Creating a new teaching profession*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute Press.

Hess, F. M. (2006). *Tough love for schools: Essays on competition, accountability, and excellence*. Washington, DC: AEI Press.

Hinchey, P., & Cadiero-Kaplan, K. (2005). The future of teacher education and teaching: another piece of the privatization puzzle. *Journal of Critical Educational Policy Studies, 3*(2). Retrieved from. http://www.jceps.com on 17.09.07.

Holland, R. G. (2004). *To build a better teacher: The emergence of a competitive education industry*. Westport, CT: Prager.

Honawar, V. (October 26, 2007). Gains seen in retooled teacher education. *Education Week*. Retrieved from. www.edweek.org on 27.10.07.

Howey, K. (September, 2007). *A review of urban teacher residencies in the context of urban teacher preparation, alternative routes to teaching and a changing teacher workforce*. Washington, DC: National Council of Accreditation for Teacher Education.

Hypolito, A. M. (2004). Teachers' work and professionalization: the promised land or dream denied? *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies, 2*(2). Retrieved from. www.jceps.com on 19.08.07.

Ingersoll, R. (2003). *Who control's teachers' work: Power and accountability in America's schools*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Izumi, L. T., & Coburn, K. G. (April, 2001). *Facing the challenge: Teacher training and teacher quality in California's schools of education*. San Francisco: Pacific Research Institute.

Johnson, D., Johnson, B., Farenga, S., & Ness, D. (2005). *Trivializing teacher education: The accreditation squeeze*. Lanham, MD: Roman & Littlefield.

Kornfeld, J., Grady, K., Marker, P., & Ruddell, M. (2007). Caught in the current: a self-study of state-mandated compliance in a teacher education program. *Teachers College Record, 109*(8), 1902–1930.

Kozol, J. (2005). *The shame of American education: The restoration of apartheid schooling in America*. New York: Crown.

Kumar, K., Priyam, M., & Saxena, S. (2001). The trouble with para-teachers. *Frontline, 18*(22). Retrieved from www.hinduonnet.cim/fline/fl1822/18220930.htm on January 15, 2010.

Kumashiro, K. (2010). Seeing the bigger picture: troubling movements to end teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 61*(1–2), 56–65.

Levine, A. (2006). Will universities maintain control of teacher education? *Change, 38*(4), 36–43.

Lyall, K., & Sell, K. (2006). *The true genius of America at risk: Are we losing our public universities to de facto privatization?* Westport, CT: Prager.

McDonald, M., & Zeichner, K. (2009). Social justice teacher education. In W. Ayers, T. C. Quinn, & D. Stovall (Eds.), *Handbook on social justice in education*. New York: Routledge.

McNeil, M. (May 7, 2008). State fiscal woes start to put squeeze on K-12 budgets. *Education Week*. Retrieved from. www.educationweek.org on 27.09.08.

Miner, B. (2010). Looking past the spin: teach for America. *Rethinking Schools, 24*(1). Retrieved from rethinkingschools.org on May 10, 2010.

Morey, A. (2001). The growth of for-profit higher education: implications for teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 52*(4), 300–311.

National Research Council. (2010). *Preparing teachers: Building evidence for sound policy*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

New York Times. (August, 2009). Do teachers need education degrees? *Room for Debate.*. Accessed at. newyorktimes.com on 11.10.09.

Newfeld, C. (2008). *Unmaking the public university*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Paige, R. (June, 2002). *Meeting the highly qualified teacher challenge: The second annual report on teacher quality.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

Payzant, T. (February, 2004). *Should teacher preparation take place at colleges and universities?* Invited address at the annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Peske, H. G., & Haycock, K. (June, 2006). *Teaching inequality: How poor and minority students are shortchanged on teacher quality.* Washington, DC: Education Trust.

Pitman, A. (2007). Ontario, Canada: the state asserts its voice or accountability supersedes responsibility. In M. Tatto (Ed.), *Reforming teaching globally* (pp. 97–118). Oxford, UK: Symposium Books.

Randi, J., & Zeichner, K. (2004). New visions of teacher professional development. In M. Smylie, & D. Miretszky (Eds.), *Preparing the teacher workforce: Yearbook of the national society for the study of education* (pp. 180–227). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Raphael, J., & Tobias, S. (1997). Profit-making or profiteering? Proprietaries target teacher education. *Change, 29*(6), 44–49.

Reimers, F. (1994). Education and structural adjustment in Latin America and sub-Saharan Africa. *International Journal of Educational Development, 14*, 119–129.

Rennert-Ariev, P. (2008). The hidden curriculum of performance-based teacher education. *Teachers College Record, 110*(1), 105–138.

Robertson, S. (2000). *A class act: Changing teachers' work, the state, and globalization.* New York: Falmer Press.

Robertson, S. (2008). Remaking the world: neoliberalism and the transformation of education and teachers' labor. In M. Compton, & L. Weiner (Eds.), *The global assault on teaching, teachers and their unions* (pp. 11–36). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Rosen, A. (2003). For-profit teacher education. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, Colloquy Live*, Thursday September 4, 230 pm. Transcript was retrieved from http://chronicle.com/colloquylive on 06.09.03.

Sachs, J. (2003). *The activist teaching profession.* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Sleeter, C. (2008). Equity, democracy, and neo-liberal assaults on teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 24*(8), 1947–1957.

Smyth, J., Dow, A., Hattam, R., Reid, A., & Shacklock, G. (2000). *Teachers' work in a globalizing economy.* London: Routledge.

Steensen, J. (2006). Global trends on local grounds – the case of teacher education in Denmark and Sweden. Umeå University. In L. Dahlström, & J. Mannberg (Eds.), *Critical educational visions and practices in neo-liberal times* (pp. 91–102). Sweden: Global South Network Publisher.

Tamatea, L. (2010a). The Dakar framework: constructing and deconstructing the global neo-liberal matrix. *Globalisation, Societies and Education, 3*(3), 311–334.

Tatto, M. T. (2007a). International comparisons and the global reform of teaching. In M. T. Tatto (Ed.), *Reforming teaching globally* (pp. 7–18). Oxford, U.K: Symposium Books.

Tatto, T. T. (Ed.). (2007b). *Reforming teaching globally.* Oxford, UK: Symposium Books.

Tatto, M. T., & Plank, D. (2007). The dynamics of global teaching reform. In T. Tatto (Ed.), *Reforming teaching globally* (pp. 267–278). Oxford, UK: Symposium Books.

Thompson, M. W. (November 7, 2007). Bush brother's firm faces inquiry over purchases. *New York Times*. Retrieved from. www.nytimes.org on 11.07.07.

Valenzuela, A. (Ed.). (2005). *Leaving children behind: How Texas style accountability fails Latino youth.* Albany, NY: SUNY Press. Sector Improvement Programme.

Walsh, K. (2004). A candidate-centered model for teacher preparation and licensure. In F. Hess, A. Rotherham, & K. Walsh (Eds.), *A qualified teacher in every classroom* (pp. 119–148). Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.

Wasley, P. (June 16, 2006). *Accreditor of education schools drops controversial "social justice" language.* The Chronicle of Higher Education. Retrieved from. http://chronicle.com on 24.06.06.

Weiner, L. (2007). A lethal threat to teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 58*(4), 274–286.

Wilson, S., & Tamir, E. (2008). The evolving field of teacher education. In M. Cochran-Smith, S. Feiman-Nemser, & D. J. McIntyre (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (3rd ed.). (pp. 908–935) New York: Routledge.

Wise, A. (1979). *Legislated learning: The bureaucratization of the American classroom.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Young, M. (1998). Rethinking teacher education for a global future: lessons from the English. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 24*(1), 51–62.

Zeichner, K. (1991). Contradictions and tensions in the professionalization of teaching and the democratization of schooling. *Teachers College Record, 92*(3), 363–379.

Zeichner, K. (2005a). Learning from experience with performance-based teacher education. In F. Peterman (Ed.), *Designing performance assessment systems for urban teacher preparation* (pp. 3–20). New York: Erlbaum/Routledge.

Zeichner, K. (2005b). A research agenda for teacher education. In M. Cochran-Smith, & K. Zeichner (Eds.), *Studying teacher education* (pp. 737–759). New York: Routledge.

Zeichner, K. (2009). *Teacher education and the struggle for social justice.* New York: Routledge.

Zeichner, K., & Conklin, H. (2005). Teacher education programs. In M. Cochran-Smith, & K. Zeichner (Eds.), *Studying teacher education* (pp. 645–735). New York: Routledge.

Zeichner, K., & Hutchinson, E. (2008). The development of alternative certification policies and programs in the U.S. In P. Grossman, & S. Loeb (Eds.), *Alternative routes to teaching* (pp. 15–29) Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press, 209–214.

Zeichner, K., & Ndimande, B. (2008). Contradictions and tensions in the place of teachers in educational reform: reflections on teacher preparation in the U.S.A. and Namibia. *Teachers & Teaching: Theory and Practice, 14*(4), 331–343.