LINDA VALLI

Introduction

What does being a good teacher mean? And how does teacher education contribute to the development of good teachers? Surprisingly, these questions are not always central to the design of programs to prepare teachers. All too often images of good teachers and knowledge about good teaching are left unarticulated, presumed to be part of a shared, but tacit, understanding. As a result, one of the most fundamental aspects of teacher preparation is left unexamined. In place of a coherent conception of good teaching, tradition, institutional forces, and external constraints often shape the teacher education curriculum, a curriculum which has become so standardized (almost reified) in its basic course requirements that conflicting purposes and unformulated assumptions have been obscured.

This standardized approach to teacher preparation is, of course, not without its critics. In their review of research on teacher education, Lanier and Little (1986) use the terms technical, fragmented, and shallow to characterize a curriculum they perceive as having been relatively static over the past few decades. Goodlad's recent *Study of the Education of Educators* faults teacher education for not clearly linking the curriculum "to a conception of what teachers do and should do" (Goodlad, 1990, p. 186). Barnes (1987) argues that programs lacking powerful, thematic, or conceptual orientations fail to dislodge prospective teachers' naive notions of teaching. And Tom is concerned that "without a concept of good teaching, a teacher education curriculum becomes nothing more than a means for preparing teachers to replicate current school practice" (1986, p. 11).

Departing from this fragmented approach to teacher education, the programs described in the first part of this book are characterized by a commitment to curricular reform around a conception of good teaching. They are further united by agreeing that this concept must embody a reflective orientation to practice, an orientation which emphasizes the knowledge, disposition, and analytic skills needed to make good decisions about complex classroom phenomena.

The authors of the seven cases have all worked to infuse reflection throughout the entire professional education component of their preservice programs. As implied by the preceding paragraphs, this work stands in marked contrast to the easier and more dominant practice of altering individual courses or instructional strategies (Zeichner, 1987; Ross, 1990). While numerous books (Schön, 1987; Grimmett and Erickson, 1988; Clift, Houston, and Pugach, 1990; Tabachnick and Zeichner, 1991) have discussed the possibilities and ambiguities of fostering reflective practice, none has provided an in-depth and comparative look at attempts to implement reflection at a programmatic level. The purpose of this volume is to provide such a perspective. As an introduction to the case study and critique chapters, I first explore the questions of why reflective teaching has attracted so much interest and whether or not it is a distinct approach to teacher preparation. This latter issue is revisited in the concluding chapter.

THE SOCIAL CONTEXT OF REFLECTION

The reader might well ask why an interest in reflective teacher education has emerged at this time and how this emphasis can benefit teachers, schools, and students? As with most trends, a combination of factors converge, including the perceived limitations of process/product research, the impact of cognitive psychology, renewed attention to the moral basis of education, interest in teacher empowerment, and the legitimation of ethnographic research.[1]

Recent years have witnessed what Doyle (1990) calls the breakdown on consensus about "technical rationality" being an appropriate model for the preparation of teachers. Process/product research has failed to generate a substantial and significant set of findings to guide the preparation of teachers. Even more damaging, the research paradigm itself has been seriously challenged as an inadequate way to explain and guide teaching (Shulman, 1987; Richardson, 1990; Tom and Valli, 1990). The fragmentation of knowledge into small, discrete elements and the treatment of knowledge as independent of goals and context hamper process/product researchers from even roughly approximating the real work of teachers. This failure explains much of the renewed interest in Dewey's notion of reflective practice and the appeal of Schön's concept of the reflective practitioner with its emphasis on uncertainty, artistry, and context-specificity as more helpful, relevant images of good teaching.

A related factor in explaining renewed interest in reflection is the increased dominance of cognitive over behavioral psychology. Focusing on thinking rather than observable behavior, cognitive psychologists seek to describe and explain the mental processes which underlie complex activities. When they study teaching, these researchers ask questions like: How do expert teachers plan? What are differences in the ways expert and novice teachers think about teaching? What is involved in teacher decision-making? This shift in psychology has provided fertile ground for explorations into teachers' thinking, problem solving, and reflectivity. In 1986, Clark and Peterson reviewed the wide array of studies on teachers' thought processes. This tradition has also produced highly personalized accounts of teaching (Elbaz, 1983; Grossman, 1990) as well as cognitively grounded, theoretical models of pedagogical reasoning and action (Shulman, 1987; LaBoskey, 1991).

Attention given the moral and political foundation of teaching by increasingly vocal and influential groups of feminists, multiculturalists, critical theorists, and mainline researchers has further eroded the orientation to teacher education as the prescription of pedagogical and managerial skills. These groups have been successful in arguing that the rightful agenda for teacher education is much broader than teaching technique and must include consideration of the goals and purposes of schooling, whose interests schools serve, and whose knowledge they legitimate (Valli, 1990). They have argued that in a pluralistic society, the goals of education cannot be taken-for-granted but must be debated and negotiated; that answers to complex, value-laden problems of schooling are not ready-made; and that the preparation of teachers able to function in such a society requires critical reflection on the normative issues of teaching and schooling.

Renewed concern about teacher empowerment and professionalization has also stimulated interest in reflective teacher education. Autonomous, self-renewing, and self-directed professionals must be capable of more than executing the curriculum designs conceived by others. They must be dispositionally and cognitively prepared to engage in dialogue about the proper goals of schooling and the educational needs of an increasingly diverse population of school aged children. Within the context of this social responsibility, teachers must be prepared to solve complex educational problems, make wise decisions, reflect in and on action, and collaborate with colleagues. Prospective teachers will not be prepared for this type of practice if they have merely learned to transfer findings from effective teaching research to their practice.

Although not directly accounting for the emergence of reflective teacher education, the increased interest in and legitimation of ethnographic and action research has also contributed to its development. More and more teacher educators are becoming trained in naturalistic and ethnographic methodologies. Because these research orientations emphasize the context dependence of research findings and the importance of attending to the meanings actors give to and take from their milieu, they tend to support the type of goals associated with reflective teacher education programs. Teacher educators who themselves use these methodologies are apt to promote reflection by encouraging teacher candidates to use ethnographic and action research to examine and improve classroom life.[2] The fact that feminists and critical theorists are among those most strongly proposing the use of action research is no small coincidence. Regarded as a form of authoritative knowledge, action research can empower the typically female and relatively powerless classroom teacher. It can liberate teachers from being regarded as lesser partners in school reform—as the subordinate element in the thinker/doer, scholar/practitioner dichotomies.

The convergence of interest in teacher thinking and reflectivity by scholars ranging from cognitive psychologists to critical theorists suggests a broad based and long-term commitment to understanding and fostering reflective practice. In contrast to mechanistic, behavioral models of teacher preparation, reflective models are more in keeping with the holistic way in which teachers actually think and act in classrooms; they have more intuitive credibility (Richardson, 1990; Shulman, 1987). Moreover, reflective approaches to teacher preparation hold out the promise of a new cadre of teachers ready to be active partners in school renewal—teachers who can make wise classroom decisions and who can help define the direction of schooling as we approach the start of a new century.

REFLECTION AS A CONCEPTUAL ORIENTATION

Several attempts have been made to distinguish conceptual orientations or paradigms of teacher preparation. These typologies are generally developed for the purpose of illuminating implicitly conflicting conceptions of good teaching. They are useful guides for action and can serve as "heuristic device(s) for organizing discussion about desirable teacher education practices" (Zeichner, 1983, p. 3). Some typologists are primarily descriptive, some advocate a particular vision of teaching and teacher education, while still others examine strengths and weaknesses across paradigms. Most often, reflective or inquiry-oriented teacher education is described as one of these paradigms.

While most typologists distinguish four or five conceptions of good teaching and teacher education, Kennedy (1989) offers just two: the reflective practitioner model and the professional standards model. In her schema, reflective practitioners have a thoughtful, contextualized sense of teaching and must ultimately make their own choices about preferred goals and practices. They construct working knowledge out of various frames of reference and alternative viewpoints. This ambiguous working knowledge, which favors personal experience but also includes theory, research, values, and beliefs, is used to critically analyze and continually improve teaching.

In contrast, the vision of good teaching found in the professional standards model is more clear-cut and prescriptive. Good teachers apply special knowledge and engage in practices widely agreed upon. Using prescribed knowledge, not personal judgment, is the key to successful teaching. This model is commonly referred to as technical rationality, the goal of which is to ensure that teachers conform to acceptable patterns of behavior (Doyle, 1990).

Unlike Kennedy, Zeichner (1983) offers four alternative paradigms of teacher education which are "held together by a set of common assumptions that distinguishes the basic goals of one general approach from another" (p. 3). In the behavioristic paradigm, good teachers are those who carry out the prespecified competencies and principles of effective teaching. The personalistic paradigm equates good teaching with psychological maturity and personal growth; professional beliefs and perceptions are reconstructed around students' perceived needs. Good teaching in the traditional-craft paradigm results from assimilating the often tacit, cultural knowledge of expert teachers. In Zeichner's preferred inquiry-oriented paradigm, good teachers skillfully and reflectively act upon ethical, political, as well as pedagogical issues involved in their everyday practice. A fifth paradigm, the academic, is briefly mentioned. Equating it with a sound liberal education, Zeichner assumes this paradigm is a basis for the others.

Drawing upon Zeichner's paradigms and Joyce's earlier conception of economic, progressive, academic, personalistic, and competency orientations to teacher education, Doyle (1990) identifies five themes which determine the direction and substance of teacher education: the good employee, the junior professor, the fully functioning person, the innovator, and the reflective professional. These themes roughly correspond to Zeichner's craft, academic, personalistic, behavioristic, and inquiry-oriented categories and seem to be partially determined by the different interest groups who advocate the various themes. School administrators, for example, would tend to promote preparation of good employees while phenomenologically-oriented education professors would advocate the reflective professional. For Doyle:

> the knowledge base for the preparation of reflective professionals includes personal knowledge, the craft knowledge of skilled practitioners, and propositional knowledge from classroom research and from the social and behavioral sciences. (p. 6)

Though he emphasizes critical analysis and deliberation, Doyle gives less weight to consideration of normative questions of "what ought to be" than Zeichner does in his inquiry-oriented paradigm.

Despite some variation in the number and types of categories and in the specific ways they define each category, Kennedy, Zeichner, and Doyle each view reflection or inquiry as a distinct model of teacher education. Feiman-Nemser (1990), on the other hand, has recently challenged that perspective by omitting reflection from her list of conceptual orientations, which includes the academic, the practical, the technical, the personal, and the critical. Rather than a conceptual orientation, she calls reflection a generic professional disposition. To explain this conclusion, Feiman-Nemser states that many of the programs she reviewed "explicitly endorse the goal of reflection, even though they embody different conceptual orientations" (p. 221). Since models of reflective teaching and teacher education differ on substantive goals, she concludes, these models cannot be grouped into a distinct category or conceptual orientation.

The implicit definition of "substantive goals" offers a key to Feiman-Nemser's conclusion. Referring to van Manen's (1977) ways of knowing, she defines substantive goals as different levels or foci for reflection. Van Manen offers three levels of reflection: the technical, the interpretive, and the critical. (These levels, as the reader will see, are used in many of the teacher education programs described in this volume.) The examples offered by Feiman-Nemser (1990) equate different levels or foci for reflection with content of reflection. Thus, "a technological orientation might focus reflection on the most effective or efficient means to achieve particular instructional objectives" (p. 221). In that same vein, the academic orientation would focus reflection on the explicit school curriculum or subject matter; the practical orientation on the messy problems of teaching; the personal orientation on the (re)construction of self as teacher; and the critical orientation on the school's role in creating a more just and democratic society. These differences in substantive focus, Feiman-Nemser concludes, mean that reflection is not so much an orientation as a disposition underlying other legitimate orientations.

Like Feiman-Nemser, many who have compared approaches to inquiry-oriented or reflective teacher education have also noted that variation exists among them. Their claim, however, is that, as in all paradigms, variation is bound to occur. The task they set for themselves is to systematically explicate differences within the paradigm rather than to fuse it with other approaches. Some authors identify differing dimensions of reflection; others develop classification schemas within the reflective paradigm.

Tom (1985), for example, found three dimensions upon which inquiry-oriented teacher education could be distinguished: the arena of the problematic, or that aspect of teaching which is the object of problematic thinking; the model of inquiry, or mode of reflection brought to bear on a particular problem; and the ontological status of education phenomena, or how real, observable, and law-like one views the components of schooling. In an analysis of instructional strategies used to prepare reflective teachers, Zeichner (1987) adds to these dimensions. Among important differences he finds are the degree to which program goals are linked to broader changes in schools and society, and the degree to which the approach is justified by reference to theory.

Grimmett, MacKinnon, Erickson, and Riecken (1990), Valli (1990), and Tabachnick and Zeichner (1991) have each developed different classification systems for reflective programs. Focusing on the role of knowledge in reflective teacher education, Grimmett, MacKinnon, Erickson, and Riecken find three distinct perspectives on reflection: as instrumental mediation of action, as deliberating among competing views of teaching, and as reconstructing experience. Valli, on the other hand, limited her scope of inquiry to examples which had an explicit commitment to examining teaching as a moral enterprise. Even within this more narrow scope she found three approaches: the deliberative, the relational, and the critical. And based on an historical analysis of educational philosophies and traditions, Tabachnick and Zeichner offer four conceptions of reflective teaching practice: academic, social efficiency, developmentalist, and social reconstructionist.

How one determines an orientation depends on how it is defined, what its elements are, its level of generality, and on what basis distinctions are made. At the highest level of generality is Kennedy's distinction between a model of good teaching based on the image of a reflective practitioner and one based on professional standards or technical rationality. The basis for Feiman-Nemser's categories seems to be sources of knowledge or content for reflection. Doyle arrives at his classification scheme by looking at the perspectives of various advocates for teacher education reform. Kennedy's are derived from contrasting views of good teaching, while Grimmett, MacKinnon, Erickson, and Riecken emphasize epistemological criteria. Categorizes can also be a function of what are perceived as dominant and supporting goals: is reflective practice the dominant goal for a number of aspects of teaching (e.g., content delivery, personal growth) or is it the primary goal for a particular aspect of teaching which reflection refines and supports?

While the authors of the cases presented in this volume view reflection as either the organizing principle or an essential organizing theme of their programs, the reader is encouraged to ponder the question of whether or not reflection is a distinct conceptual orientation in teacher education. Do the programs present such differing approaches to the preparation of teachers as to be separate paradigms? Or are they varying approaches within one basic paradigm? Is it possible to have diversity about the purposes and goals of reflection, what is reflected upon, sources of reflection, how reflection occurs, what happens as a result of reflection, and still have a conceptual orientation? Do the programs presented here vary so widely on these dimensions that any sense of conceptual coherence is lost, or are there commonalities which provide an underlying unity?

OVERVIEW OF CASES AND CRITIQUES

The seven case studies in the first part of this volume represent public and private institutions, four and five year programs, undergraduate and graduate programs, alternative programs, as well as efforts to transform all teacher education programs at particular institutions. Some programs have a generic (K-12) learning to teach emphasis; others maintain the traditional divisions between elementary and secondary preparation. The authors describe the history and assumptions of their program, their understanding of reflection, implementation strategies, evaluation procedures, and difficulties they encountered. The chapters also reveal authors' struggles to answer core questions. How do prospective teachers reflect? Upon what content should they reflect? How can reflective qualities be fostered? Are some teacher candidates disposed to reflection while others are not? What do we mean by reflection, anyway?

The second part of the volume comprises chapters which critique reflection as a conceptual orientation and assess the implementation of reflection in these specific programs. Authors approach this work from varying perspectives: developmental, narrative, social reconstructionist, feminist, and postmodern. All active teacher educators, the critics use their backgrounds in cognitive psychology, curriculum studies, sociology, and philosophy to analyze what is present in and what is missing from the programs. They propose new possibilities and reconsiderations.

The Case Studies

The first two chapters represent five year programs at public, research universities. The first program, at the University of New Hampshire, dates back to 1974 when faculty began to formulate a program to prepare reflective decision makers and autonomous teacher leaders. In the intervening years this image of a good teacher has shifted to teachers as co-explorers whose personal teaching styles and philosophies develop through participation in communities of inquiry and support. The New Hampshire program rejects traditional notions of preservice teachers being either practice teachers, who merely apply professional knowledge in their field sites, or apprentices, who merely imitate the wise practice of their mentors. Instead, preservice teachers are co-explorers who, as part of communities of inquiry and support, commit themselves to hearing the varied perspectives of group members, to empathic understanding, and to voicing their own emerging decisions and philosophies. Small group meetings also support and challenge supervisory teams as they identify common goals, expand their knowledge, and explore mutual concerns.

While both the University of New Hampshire and the University of Florida (chapter 2) stress the importance of the personal development, reflective judgment, and autonomy of new teachers, Florida's PROTEACH program puts additional emphasis on the knowledge base for teaching. At Florida, PROfessional TEACHers "master the expanding knowledge base about teaching" (p. 4). But unlike many uses of the term knowledge base, which are restricted to propositional knowledge about generic, effective teaching behaviors, Florida's definition is broadly inclusive of pedagogical and ethical knowledge, subject matter knowledge, "knowledge of ways to increase self-knowledge," and so on (p. 5). Moving from a more dominant concern with the process of reflective judgment, the program now balances that concern with simultaneous attention on the content of reflection. Faculty now communicate to students that reflection is "a way of thinking about educational matters that involves the ability to make rational *and ethical* choices and to assume responsibility for those choices" (p. 7). In keeping with their constructivist beliefs about the teaching/learning process, faculty have been developing ways to deal with students' tacit perspectives on teaching. That collaborative work, which includes reflective modeling and think aloud procedures, typifies the evolving nature of the program.

Developed as a selective, fifth year alternative route for prospective elementary and secondary teachers, the University of Maryland's Masters Certification program (chapter 3) emphasizes three Rs: reflection, research, and repertoire. Like New Hampshire, Maryland views the small cohort group as a powerful source of learning to teach. Like Florida, it considers the knowledge base for teaching a primary source for reflection. Students' grasp of this knowledge base (research on teaching, learning, teacher education, and school effectiveness) is essential to the program's goal: the development of reflective scholar-teachers committed to improving teaching. This model of good teaching orients candidates to Dewey's notion of problem solving: having "the ability to look back critically and imaginatively, to do cause-effect thinking, to derive explanatory principles, to do task analysis, also to look forward, and to do anticipatory planning (p. 13). Prospective scholar-teachers are given numerous opportunities to examine the uniqueness of various teaching situations, to explore the fit between theory and practice, and to avoid unthinking adoption of research findings.

Although a four year undergraduate program, the Academically Talented Teacher Education Program (ATTEP) at Kent State University (chapter 4) is also an alternative for scholastically strong and conceptually flexible students. Four seminars distinguish this program. Besides the student teaching seminar, the program is structured around learning, teaching, and schooling seminars in which students are urged to question teaching practice, use different modes of inquiry (psychological, sociological, and critical), and engage in complex problem solving. In the ATTEP model, a good teacher is an inquiry-oriented teacher researcher who makes reasoned choices by analyzing knowledge generated from research in light of their own values and ideas and the ambiguous nature of teachers' work. A culminating "Learning to Teach Autobiography" indicates that ATTEP students engage in three types of reflection: about themselves as teachers, about the practice of teaching, and about critical issues involved in the process of schooling.

The last three case chapters describe four year programs designed for the general undergraduate population. In Michigan State University's Multiple Perspectives program (chapter 5), students learn that reflective decision making is dependent upon interrelationships among principles from the various academic disciplines and that teacher decisions must balance competing demands and expectations placed on the school: demands that it simultaneously promote academic learning, personal responsibility, social responsibility, and social justice. These four functions (or multiple perspectives) of schooling can cause conflict within a teacher's role and demand wise professional judgment. Thus, a good teacher is one who is capable of making sensible and sensitive decisions in the face of competing expectations. These decisions require an interactive ability to think and act on a number of levels: technical, clinical, personal, and critical. Multiple perspective teachers must learn to situate technical concerns within a broad set of social and value-oriented considerations.

A similar orientation to framing technical issues within normative ones governs the teacher education program at the Catholic University of America (chapter 6). Competing "dilemmas" of schooling are analogous to the Multiple Perspectives' four functions and both programs draw on notions of levels of reflection and commonplaces of schooling. This is not, however, where the problem-solving program at Catholic University began. Rather, this conceptual framework of dilemmas, commonplaces, and reflective levels, was introduced after faculty realized that problem solving was an insufficient guide for reflection—that students needed an explicit framework to expand the scope of their reflection and improve its quality. To become good teachers, graduates of this program are expected to critically examine their own teaching behaviors as well as the school context in order to bring about desirable change. They are taught to view classroom situations from multiple perspectives, to envision alternatives to and ethical implications of their actions, and to resolve teaching problems by assessing experiential and theoretical knowledge. By using this conceptual framework as an overarching instructional strategy, faculty hope to reconstruct the way students view the act of teaching: to move them beyond short-term, efficiency oriented decisions to decisions based on long-term, ethically oriented criteria.

TABLE 1
Features of the Seven Reflective Programs

Site	*Type of Program*	*Guiding Image of a Good, Reflective Teacher*
University of New Hampshire	5 year, leading to master's degree	A supportive, inquiry-oriented co-explorer
University of Florida (PROTEACH)	5 year, leading to master's degree	Personally defines good teaching using personal definitions and professional knowledge; makes rational and ethical choices about teaching
University of Maryland (Master's cert.)	5th year, alternative master's degree program	A scholar-teacher committed to improving teaching
Kent State University (ATTEP)	4 year program for academically talented undergraduates	A teacher-researcher who uses psychological, sociological, and critical modes of inquiry
Michigan State University (Multiple Perspectives)	4 year, alternative undergraduate program	Considers the competing demands of schools in decision making
Catholic University of America	4 year undergraduate program	Analyzes teaching in its normative context; considers ethical implications
University of Houston (RITE)	4 year undergraduate program	Inquires into teaching practice in ways which foster continuous professional growth

The last of the seven cases is the Reflective Inquiry Teacher Education (RITE) program at the University of Houston (chapter 7) where reflection is officially defined as "the disposition and ability to consider education as the result of many social, political, and individual factors accompanied by an understanding of the need to base subsequent action on careful analysis of the results of such inquiry" (p. 14). This orientation toward deliberative action (called a strategic conception of reflection) is similar to the orientation guiding many of the programs described in preceding chapters. Also like a number of the other programs, RITE engages students in different types or levels of reflection. But despite this deliberate range of reflection built into the program, the Houston faculty realized that their diverse assumptions about good teaching and learning to teach did not consistently support this definition. These diverse perceptions, coupled with student input, state legislation, and other external regulations ultimately undermined the RITE program. One way out of this increasingly common problem, the authors suggest, is to treat curriculum as a negotiated process requiring reflective conversations.

The Critiques

A number of the themes alluded to in this introduction are played out more systematically in the critiques which follow the case studies. Taking a developmental perspective, James Calderhead (chapter 8) compares the models of professional learning in these seven programs to what we know from the literature on learning to teach. In so doing, Calderhead analyzes the extent to which these programs conceptualize a developmental process of learning to teach; how they allow for individual differences in student teachers' learning; and ways in which they deal with the diverse conceptions of teaching, learning, and curriculum that student teachers bring to their professional preparation. By discussing institutional and developmental impediments to reflective preparation, he raises questions about the feasibility of reflective goals, recommends a research agenda, and suggests strategies to support ongoing reflective practice.

The next two chapters analyze the seven cases according to what the authors see as different conceptions of reflective practice. Georgea Sparks-Langer (chapter 9) proposes that three approaches to reflective practice (the cognitive, critical, and narrative) are found to varying degrees within the seven programs. The cognitive approach emphasizes "the knowledge and processes involved in teacher decision making" (p. 1). The critical approach presumes that schools are not value-neutral, that they work for those with power and influence and against those without it. Prospective teachers, therefore, are asked to examine and change teaching practices and contexts to effect a more just society. The narrative approach includes the voices of teachers. It proposes that the source and context of reflection should primarily be the practical experience of complex and uncertain teaching situations. Though trained in the cognitive approach, Sparks-Langer argues for more consideration of the other two approaches.

Seeing four rather than three orientations which have informed reflective teacher education, Kenneth Zeichner (chapter 10) analyzes the seven programs by situating them in relation to the traditions of reform mentioned earlier: academic, social efficiency, developmentalist, and social reconstructionist. Through this analysis, Zeichner illustrates how contemporary teacher education reforms emerge out of traditions of practice that have been developing throughout the twentieth century. Like Sparks-Langer, he argues for a particular tradition, the social reconstructionist, and cautions against a vague, generic orientation to reflective teaching.

Two critics view the programs from feminist perspectives. Jesse Goodman (chapter 11), like the two previous authors, supports a notion of reflection which includes a critical perspective. But for Goodman, the critical perspective best suited to inform reflective teaching is derived from feminist pedagogy. The chapter describes three aspects of this pedagogy—teaching as an occupation, classroom dynamics, and fostering reflection—and argues that reflective programs would be enriched if teacher educators incorporated these areas of concern into the curriculum.

Taking a more constructivist (or in Sparks-Langer's terminology—narrative) approach in her feminist critique, Anna Richert (chapter 12) centers her analysis on the concept of "teacher's voice." She sets forth a two-pronged argument. The first is that in order to learn to teach, prospective teachers must be encouraged to examine their beliefs, become self-conscious, and, hence, speak their own truth. The second is that for any sort of empowerment to occur, the voices of these prospective teachers must be heard. Though this might seem commonsensical, the author reminds us that a teacher's audience is usually herself alone, and that norms for listening to co-workers are often absent in schools. Teachers are often the silent (or silenced) ones. To break this pattern, Richert encourages the development of voice such as she found in these seven reflective programs.

The final critic, Lynda Stone (chapter 13), casts a philosopher's eye on the case studies. Two claims begin the chapter. One is that the philosophical question of the nineties concerns the debate between modernism and postmodernism. It is a question best understood as the problem of essentialism. The other claim is that reform conceptions of teaching and teacher education ought to take account of this debate. Further they ought (perhaps) to be moving toward postmodernism. Stone sets out the components of the debate as viewpoints about "the quest for certainty" and examines the exemplary programs with regard to the modernist/postmodernist tensions within them. Though the author does not use terms like technical rationality and reflective practice in her chapter, the reader will no doubt connect them with essentialism and non-essentialism. Closing the chapter is a postmodern reflection which emphasizes multiplicity, remaking, identity, and contextuality.

CONCLUSION

The institutions exemplified in the first seven chapters have not found ideal ways to prepare teachers. As the reader will soon discover, conflicts arose over definitions of reflection, implementation strategies, the time involved in delivering such a program, and faculty autonomy and responsibility. In some cases, due to either internal or external forces, programs are already in the process of being radically reconceptualized. Moreover, program implementation has been restricted to the professional education component of teacher education. As in most institutions, little progress has been made in integrating reflection into the general studies or specialty area components. Nonetheless, the cases selected for this volume are among the few examples in the United States where sustained, scholarly inquiry has been brought to bear on a program-wide approach to reflective teacher education. They represent current thinking in the field: programs which treat reflection as an important and complex construct.[3]