

## WHAT DO YOU MEAN BY GOOD TEACHING?

Working to challenge physical education students' assumptions of quality teaching and learning

WENDY CREBBIN

Faculty of Education, Ballarat University College  
and  
Faculty of Education, Deakin University (Geelong)

All teachers have strongly held, but not necessarily conscious, assumptions about 'good' teaching and learning. We have developed an introduction to teaching practice in the Post-Primary Physical Education course at B.U.C. in which we work to enable students to become aware of their assumptions, to critically reflect upon how those assumptions have been structured, and how they influence teaching practices. This paper focuses on our 'evolving' program which is designed to challenge students' assumptions and the role of tutors when they work with, and through their students' learning. Some students' assumptions and the difficulties which they experience as they try to come to grips with different ways to conceptualise their chosen profession, are demonstrated with some examples of students' discussions.

The idea that most student teachers have been socialized into the cultures of teaching through a long 'apprenticeship of observation' was first introduced by Lortie (1975). In support of that view, Schempp (1989, p.29) found that the majority of student teachers in physical education courses had strongly held, but frequently unconscious views about themselves as teachers, based upon that apprenticeship. Critical theorists such as Apple (1982), Freire (1970), Giroux (1981), Popkewitz (1990), and Tom (1984), claim that most of the messages which are learned by young people about knowledge, teaching and learning are based on traditional views of the teacher as expert; learners as passive consumers of pre-packaged and pre-determined systems of knowledge; and knowledge as a neutral, "value-free" commodity separate from everyday life. By contrast in critical views of teaching and learning, issues related to gender, social class, race, ethnicity, or physical handicaps, and value issues of equity and social justice, rather than being peripheral, are seen as central to the educational debate. Supporting that position Parry stated "all teachers are teachers of values, since whatever content they present to students will have value presuppositions, and so will whatever methods they use - there is no escape from responsibility in these matters" (1986, p. 149).

Student teachers' 'apprenticeship of observation', and the assumptions which they bring to their training become important when those ideas intersect with the values underlying their teacher education course. Graber (1989, p.63) argued that "if recruits enter training programs with many preconceived beliefs about teaching, it is not surprising that they also

enter with expectations for what their training should offer .... recruits believe they already know what teaching is about". In the past the interaction between the values of students and their courses has not been an issue for two reasons. The first is that the views of students and the values underlying their courses have generally been the same. Many students have defined becoming a teacher as being a process of learning pre-defined curriculum knowledge, mastering skills of discipline, or motivation. And in many teacher training institutions there has, and continues to be, an almost exclusive focus on the technical approach, and the techniques of teaching as ends in themselves without recognition of the inherent value positions (Kemmis & Fitzclarence, 1986).

The second is that value positions have been ignored, and any differences therefore have been removed from the agenda. Giroux argue that teacher-education programs have made a major contribution to the continued legitimisation of traditional "value-free" approaches to teaching and

learning because they "directly or indirectly 'educate' future generations of teachers to accept uncritically those skills, attitudes and dispositional qualities that support the dominant social order" (1981, p.156).

Learning to become a physical education teacher too has frequently been presented as a set of pragmatic and unproblematic solutions. As Tinning (1992, p.14) states "learning to teach in physical education most often focuses on what can be regarded as utilitarian practices which have been found effective in dealing with certain key features of teaching, such as classroom management and class control". Because of this, Kemmis & Fitzclarence (1986) claim, many teachers are unaware that there are other curriculum theories than those which espouse separation of knowledge into 'subjects', or the possibility of planning and teaching other than through using the behavioral specification of objectives, and the measurement of achievement by testing. Consequently physical education students, like other student teachers, have not learned to recognise different value positions; be able to question existing social organisation; or to imagine different ways of doing things.

Physical education, like all other curriculum, portrays a range of values, beliefs and attitudes. According to Dodds (1989) physical education student teachers usually learn such values from long-term participation in both education and sport. The messages can be either positive and negative. Parry listed some of the potential negative values which he called "possible candidates for the hidden agenda" for physical education. These were the

- perpetuation of racist attitudes
- reinforcement of gender stereotypes
- collusion with commercial interests
- bias towards competitive and aggressive activities

- authoritarian and paternalistic attitudes
  - greater attention given to good performers
  - anti-intellectualism
  - compulsion, coercion and corporal punishment
- (1986, p. 153)

Because of the potential perpetuation of such negative views; to counteract the unreflective, common-sense view which has, in the past, restricted teachers capacity to imagine things differently; and to confront the dominant view that educational phenomena are natural and capable of detached analysis, I argue, as does Smyth (1989) that teachers and student teachers require a viewpoint that embraces the essential political, historical and theoretical nature of teaching. Therefore like Tom (1984) I believe that teachers need to learn to consider education as a moral endeavour where decisions are always based upon value positions. My claim is that teaching and education should not be taken-for-granted, but should be understood as problematic, political and subjected to contestation from a wide range of interest groups within our society. Teachers need to be able to articulate the reasons (theories) which inform their own professional choices and decisions, and be able to unpack their complex ideological positions.

For teachers to be able to truly understand the many layers of messages they communicate in the act of teaching their taken-for granted assumptions must be laid open for questioning. I believe that teacher education has an important role to play in challenging student teachers' pre-conceptions. This view is supported by writers like Graber who states that if teacher training is to be successful in enabling students to challenge their prior assumptions then those beliefs must be deliberately examined and confronted as part of the explicit curriculum (1989, p.75), and Schempp who argued that in teacher education there is a need to start from past experiences and give validity to the apprenticeship of observation so that students can become conscious of the impact which that is making on their teaching (1989, p.37). From a slightly different perspective Dodds argues (1989,

p.99-100) that field experiences must be deliberately designed to enable the students to integrate relevant theoretical and pedagogic activities in a reflective approach so that they become aware of the choices which they make. Whilst Tinning (1992, p.17) states that conscious reflective teaching needs to be an essential ingredient embedded within the pedagogy. That reflective teaching should be the pedagogical process through which student teachers learn about pedagogical and curriculum knowledge in all special methods courses in physical education (underlined in the original).

Whilst not disagreeing with either of these proposals, my experiences have lead me to support Grundy (1987, p.111) who warns that assumptions cannot be challenged through processes of reflection alone, because a person's assumptions "distorts reality by making the cultural appear natural ... it saturates our consciousness and is embedded in our meanings and practices".

That it is not easy to become aware of the values implicit in our teaching was also noted by Bain (1989, p.310) who acknowledges that a teacher's behavior is often the expression of tacit beliefs that are so "taken-for-granted" that they cannot be recognised or verbalised, therefore raising them to a level of awareness is a difficult process. Nias (1987) also recognises the complexity of influencing assumptions, or 'personal theories,' saying that once a person develops their view of how things are done, that 'view' becomes a tool which helps that person to understand their social world, and, like a filter, it influences what that person sees and understands in any future situation, and the judgements they make.

Our student teachers have learned their beliefs, or theories, unconsciously, as part of the hidden curriculum, in the meanings, symbols and practices which are part of daily school experience. They have limited opportunities for other views to be presented, therefore those beliefs are accepted unquestioningly, as the natural and right way for things to be done (Bullough, Gitlin and Goldstein, 1984; Giroux, 1985; McLaren, 1989).

Yet despite the power of a person's assumption to influence the way they interpret experiences, it is possible for those assumptions, or theories, to be changed. Nias (1987) stated that because each person's views are so strong, old views needed to be changed incrementally over time. She argued that what we are working with is not simply a changing of ideas, but an emotional experience. Therefore any change in perspective, especially a change to those views which are central to our perceptions of our self, such as those of a teacher's perception of themselves in their professional role, are disturbing, painful and often take a long time to achieve.

### The students

Many of the student teachers who come into the programs on which I am basing this study bring strong, traditional, views about teaching and learning because they all have been 'successful' secondary students, and frequently successful sports-people as well. Usually our students also have preconceptions of themselves in the role of 'teacher', and as expected, the majority of their views of good teaching are as the giving of a dynamic performance in which they are in control of the knowledge and the students. In their view there is very little which is problematic about teaching, except perhaps the students. They see the curriculum, the textbooks, and the knowledge as given. They see knowledge cut up into subjects and timetables as 'natural'. And they see classroom management (control) and evaluation of learning as unquestionably the domain of the teacher. Their assumptions about students in this picture is that the 'good' students will passively consume what they, the teacher, decide to present, and that the 'bad' students are either lazy, dumb, or misguided. These 'personal theories', plus the fact that they have chosen to be teachers, I believe, are both very significant in the context of their reactions to, and resistance towards, our pedagogy, where we deliberately set out to discover and challenge their deep seated and persistent, but largely unspoken assumptions and expectations.

Resistance to what we have to say, to question their own personal theories,

and perhaps to change, is very understandable. Fay (1977, p. 213) warned critical theorists that they must expect resistance from their audiences when they begin to challenge strongly held, if "false consciousness or self-misunderstandings", especially if those illusions are shared by a "whole group of persons whose roles in society are the same". Because the student-teachers ideas are part of a tightly woven net of other beliefs that make up their world view, Berlak & Berlak (1987,p.170) argue that the sources of resistance are both personal and structural - the resistance is from within, and towards the particular situations they are in. In this instance I am talking about resistance from students who have accepted a 'traditional' 'authoritative' mode of teaching as unquestionable and unproblematic, who in most cases have not been the school resisters, but who are now facing contradictions between their personal theories and the messages they are being confronted with; between their expectations, and what they are experiencing in our programs.

I believe that we need to recognise the legitimacy, from their point of view, of our students' ideas. We also need to understand the reality of the emotional investment which they have in their ideas of being a 'good' teacher, and therefore the legitimacy of the students' resistance. They are very comfortable with their 'world view'. They do not want to have their personal views challenged. Having your 'personal theories' brought to a conscious level and confronted in this way is not just a cognitive, but an emotional experience. If the right conditions are not established students can interpret such challenges as a personal attack because they can feel that their self-concepts, as well as their ideas, are being threatened.

### Critical reflection

There are many writers, from a range of different ideological positions, who nowadays agree that teachers should reflect upon their practices. But, like Tabachnick and Zeichner (1991), I believe that not all forms of reflection are powerful enough to challenge or make a person uncomfortable, nor will all forms of reflection lead to an ability to question personal theories, or to deeper moral or social understandings. As Griffiths & Tann (1992 p.74) state "without an awareness of the need to probe personal theories, students reflections will remain constrained by the 'what works' test". To get beyond the 'what works', to a point where a teacher is able to question the very social environment of which they are a part, requires quite different kinds of thinking. I agree with Smyth (1989 pp.6-7) who stated "theorizing and describing one's practice is one thing, but being able to subject those theories to a form of interrogation and questioning that establishes something about their legitimacy and their legacy is altogether a different matter". In order to achieve this level of reflection, and understand the true origins of our behavior we must "seriously entertain alternative and oppositional historical, political,

economic, and social perspectives in society and see the interconnectedness between individuals, schooling and society" (Berlak & Berlak, 1987, p.176). Therefore, because our intention is to critique and uncover those connections that exist between particular teaching practices and the larger cultural and social contexts in which they are embedded, I believe, most forms of reflection, are not enough.

Reflection in our programs is seen as a kind of thinking in which we seek to make sense of processes, problems, issues and constraints, by raising questions; on our own, and through discussion with others; through considering consequences both intended and unintended; through looking at how other people react; and by taking into account other people's perspectives. Critical reflection is all of this, plus an ability to recognise instances in teaching which demonstrate the injustice and inequality which are embedded in everyday school experiences; to be able to acknowledge the social and political agendas of the environment in which our practices are situated; and be willing to "deliberate upon the substantive issues that raise instances of value positions within schooling and society" (Tabachnick and Zeichner, 1991, p,7). This process of critical reflection and critique, I believe, is best achieved in discussion with

others within a critical community (Grundy 1987; Tabachnick and Zeichner 1991). "The challenge and support gained through social interaction is important in helping us to clarify what we believe and to gain the courage to pursue our beliefs (Zeichner, 1991(a)).

I recognise, like Tinning (1992, p.22), that the foremost concerns for many of our students are issues relating to teaching skills and therefore initially we focus on those as a way of opening up the broader issues of the nature of values in physical education and schooling, and the assumptions which the student teachers use to frame their thinking about them. To become aware of their assumptions, and to be reflective, student-teachers need experiences in classrooms; they need opportunities to articulate their own theory, and to hear other theories; and they need opportunities and guidance to question those theories. These processes also need to occur in a climate where practitioner knowledge is valued, but where all knowledge is tentative, and problematic (Smyth, 1986;1989; Ross and Hannay, 1986; Ross, 1989). If these challenges are going to be successful in bringing new ideas, and if the change is to be sustained, there is a need for peer support in an environment which encourages experimentation (Nias,1987; Smyth, 1987). For student-teachers to be able to become critically reflective I believe that teacher-education programs need to also provide opportunities for students to experience different ideas about teaching and learning in ways which allow them to critique their own views of 'good learning, and to develop an awareness of the historical perspectives of their cultural and structural ideologies. I agree with Bates (1983(a); 1983(b)) who said that until teachers can do this they cannot clearly understand or express their own attitudes, feelings, interests or motives as positions which have a cultural history

and a social context.

### Our programs

Our units are organised so that student-teachers can have the opportunity to experience, and to experiment with, a wide range of different teaching roles and to discuss the kinds of assumptions about learning and teaching which underlay those processes. There are a number of interlocking processes which are used to create the kind of learning environment where students can become aware of their 'personal theories' of teaching and learning, and be able to place those theories within a cultural and sociological context.

\* Early in first semester the student-teachers are placed in school settings where, with a partner, they plan and teach full lessons .

\* The students are required to videotape their teaching.

\* They review their videotape with their teaching team, and then

\* share their tapes with their peers in group review sessions.

\* Students participate in, and discuss a range of teaching strategies including inquiry and discovery methods of teaching physical education.

\* All students keep journals in which they

(a) write description of what they think of as good teaching;

(b) reflect on their teaching experiences; and

(c) write a critical analysis of their own teaching using the videotape and their peers' and supervisor's comments;

(d) define specific areas of their teaching which they would like to improve and then selects one of these for specific emphasis in the next teaching cycle;

(e) make notes about the issues which come up in the group review sessions;

(f) write about any issues from their own, or their peers' teaching, or their observations of students' behavior, which they want to think about later;

(g) and record their thoughts about the reading they do in relation to the issues which they have identified as important or interesting.

During these processes the student-teachers spend considerable time looking at their videotapes as a means of focusing on different issues. The video also enables our students to see many things which occurred during their teaching sessions which they were not aware of whilst they were working with the class. If necessary it gives time and space for our students to consider alternative ways of responding to similar situations in the future. In this way, whilst having the time to stand back and think about why they interpreted a given situation in the way that they did, they become more aware of the complexity of classrooms. It seems that whilst seeking to understand the complexity of their profession, it is in standing back from their teaching experience, that student-teachers are likely to start asking critically reflective questions.

All of this is designed in the hope that the students will be placed in situations where they will begin to recognise, and then to question their own assumptions. Not only about what they consider as 'appropriate' roles, but also about knowledge; about evaluation; and about the 'rightness' of the school system. This is not done to argue that their ideas are wrong, but rather to enable these student-teachers to see that they do have strong ideas and to trace within their own learning histories where those ideas have come from, and to demonstrate that not all existing schooling practices are socially justifiable.

The nature of this study

The data presented here has been gathered during the time I have been co-ordinating these programs. The extracts used have been taken from my teaching journal which I have kept since 1986. Whilst some of the examples may seem like instances of learning, I do not see them as that, but rather as points, of which I am aware, of my students' struggles to understand.

The concept of 'critical incidents' or 'pedagogical moments' as a way of collecting and analysing information about the impact of a teaching - learning experience has been demonstrated in a number of studies including Lather (1989), Lewis (1990), and Ellsworth (1989 &1991). Like Lather this is not an example of 'pure' research but rather is a process of self reflection on some 'critical moments' which both demonstrate my students' resistance, and caused me to continue to re-think and question my own direction and purpose. I do not present this as a statement of answers but as a wrestling with data and an attempt to see my own teaching as a "situated discourse" (Lather, 1989, p.166). By its very nature the data presented is decontextualized, haphazard and fragmented and not all of the issues which are raised are fully analysed here. But the quotes which I use are "used to provide a profuse and divers specificity ... authority comes not from adherence to "objective" method, but from engagement and the willingness to be self-reflexive" (Lather, 1989, p.172).

Some of the issues

In this paper I intend to give only a small sample of the kinds of comments which have come from students and which I believe demonstrate their grappling with, and their resistance to, the complexity of the task of developing new ways to understanding teaching, learning and education. The issues are not mutually exclusive, but are part of the whole interlocking set of ideas, values and beliefs which form each person's model of 'teaching'.

The incidents which I have chosen to focus on demonstrate some of the issues mentioned previously, such as classroom control as a major concern for student teachers; values which potentially could be part of the physical education 'hidden curriculum', for example - authoritarian

attitudes; reinforcement of stereotypes; competition; plus one students' reaction to what she saw as 'different' teaching methods.

#### Teacher being in control

Bain found in her research with physical education teachers that they were consistently emphasising order and control rather than achievement (1989, p.294). Here is one example from our experience.

This year, for a range of reasons, our Physical Education students had to commence their teaching-practice with 3-5 year olds in creches and kindergartens. One male student wanted to begin his lesson with whistle drill.

I asked him why, having met the children, he felt that he needed to begin in this way.

He said " Because they have to learn that I am in control".

I asked "But why a whistle drill?"

To which he replied "Because if I can't control them, I can't teach them".

This example demonstrates both the student's preconceptions about control, and his difficulties with moving to different ideas about teaching. Because this conversation occurred before his first teaching experience I did not press the situation with this student too much further at that time. I found, from observation, that the other student-teachers working in similar settings, were able to establish positive learning/ teaching experiences without whistles. Which meant that I was then able to go back to this student and in a private conversation again open up questions about why he wanted to use his whistle, and where those ideas had come from.

#### Authoritarian attitudes

In the process of negotiating some work tasks, one student took the opportunity to talk about his ideas and where they had come from. He told me that he grew up in a family where his father was very authoritarian, and that he had gone to a private boy's school which was also very structured and disciplined. Therefore he said he could see why he had come into training to be a physical education teacher with the idea that he was going to be the kind of teacher who was "very strict" and "in control". But he also said that mine was the only class at university in which he was enjoying learning because it was the only class where he could ask questions.

When I pointed out the contradiction in these two statements, he said that he was very well aware of it, and that he was giving it some "serious thought".

#### Stereotypes

Bain argues that the physical education context frequently communicated implicit values of "how to relate to particular groups of people based on gender, race, social class, or skill" (1989, p.308). The secondary school

where our students do their videotaped-teaching has several 'integrated students'. These students come out to physical education with their regular

classes and it is always interesting to observe and talk with our student teachers when they find that they (or their peers) have, for example a blind girl, or a boy with no hands, in their classes.

These instances provide excellent opportunities for our students to confront their own, and each others, assumptions about the rights, and abilities, of their pupils who they define as 'different'.

### Competition

Griffin, (1989, p.225-7) makes strong arguments that sport, and physical education as it is currently constructed in schools, remain male domains as training grounds where boys are socialised into male gender roles of competition and aggression. In my experience this is an issue which comes up frequently, and in a number of different guises. For example, in planning their lessons, whether it is ball skills, athletic skills, or some form of team activities, our student teachers almost invariably include competition.

When I asked one group of our students why they did that they argued that competition was a good, and necessary, part of the lesson for a number of reasons, for example, they say - it motivates the students; it makes the students try harder; and it tests the pupil's skills in a 'real' situation. Yet when our students organise competitive activities and encourage their pupils to "really try hard", they also frequently find that problems of control arise.

After one of our students had an experience where, to use the student teacher's words "the kids just went overboard", I asked them what they had expected to happen.

Their response was "the kids should have known better, they should've known I didn't mean for them to hurt each other".

This focus on competition, the encouragement of aggression (although usually unconsciously on the part of the student teachers), and the resultant control problems which ensue, provide an excellent opportunity for us to open up questions like - what do you really mean by motivated? Why, if the teacher should be "in control", do you expect students to control their own actions within the pressure of competition? Or what assumptions do you, and your pupils, have about rules, competition, and control?

### Problems with 'different' teaching methods

Parry points out that each different teaching method is based on, and demonstrated different values and assumptions about knowledge and the roles to be played by teacher and student (1986, p. 149). This incident occurred during a 'model lesson', using guided problem-solving, in which groups of students were doing different activities. I could see that one student in

particular was becoming uncomfortable with the experience, so I took her aside and asked her what the problem was. Her answer was "I came here to learn to be a teacher, not a child-minder". This is all so messy, so disorganised. How do you control it?" My response to this student was "What do you mean by 'being a teacher'?"

In this situation I felt that I could guess by her comments about organisation and control that she had a fairly 'traditional' view of the role of the teacher, but I wanted her to take the opportunity to try to articulate those ideas.

She shrugged her shoulders and said "You know! Being in control, having the kids do what you want them to do." I said, "But they are all doing what I want them to do - they are experimenting". Her reply was "But you've got no control over what they are learning".

I believe that the ideas about who has control, and who owns the teaching and learning mark some of the strongest differences between traditional and constructivist, or critical pedagogies. In this example the student demonstrated some of the difficulties which I have found many teachers experience when asked to articulate why they are more comfortable with one teaching method, or why they see one method so much better than another.

#### The roles of the tutors

Out tutors need to be very good listeners, and to teach their students to listen to each other, so that together they can recognize how their teaching is embedded in a fabric of meanings which are socially constructed. They need to be good at asking questions, and at enabling their students to ask questions of each other, as together the groups learn to examine how they have learned to assign meanings, and how those meanings impact upon their practices.

Initially the task of the tutors is to establish the group into a 'community of learners' which will provide care and support, as well as challenge, to sustain each other's growth. To begin this process the tutor, and then the student-teachers, talk about themselves as learners. This is done for three reasons. Firstly, because we have found that many of our students are not accustomed to being asked to talk about their own ideas, therefore we see it important that this form of communication is both learned and valued within our classes. Secondly, we believe that through telling we bring our experiences into consciousness, and in so doing come to know them in different ways. As Gomez and Tabachnick (1992) stated, in retelling experiences we begin to reveal our understands to ourselves, and to consider how our audience might perceive us. And thirdly we have found that this process is an effective place to begin bringing

students' personal theories into consciousness.

Tutors need to be aware of the difficulty which student-teachers have in bringing to a conscious, verbal level, their own unconsciously held, social and cultural assumptions. Their own taken-for-granted. The role of the tutor in this is to help the student-teacher tune into their own speech habits and metaphors rather than impose other people's language and metaphors (Griffiths & Tann, 1992, p.76).

The tutors also need to be sensitive to the difficulty which teachers, including student-teachers, have in making connections between their personal theories and their teaching practices. Yet, as Griffiths & Tann (1992, p.80) state "To recognise the crucial way one's own personal theory affects one's own practice is a critical prerequisite for any attempt one might make to change one's practice". We have found that an effective way to open up this kind of discourse is through the student's videotapes. In the group viewing sessions, when the students show each other segments of their tapes, other students are encouraged to ask questions about why they made the choices and decisions they did.

To ensure that this questioning process does not become some form of blaming-the-victim it is essential that the tutor always places the arising issues within the context of social practices and public theories. Like Zeichner, 1991(b) p.2 our tutors "pay particular attention to helping our

students see how their everyday actions in the classroom are necessarily joined to issues of social continuity and change and to the relations of inequality that dominate our society". To do this the tutors encourage and enable our students to examine, compare and critically analyse their own 'personal theories' against a range of 'public theories', which challenge and encourage retheorising (Griffiths & Tann, 1992). In this way the student-teachers become aware of their personal theories, they learn to see their choices and actions as being informed by their personal histories, and to relate these to public or 'academic theories'. To be effective in this role the tutors need to be aware of the wide range of public theories, including critical theory, but to have a strong personal commitment to critical theory.

Tutors also needs to be aware of all of the different forms of reflection which relate to different views of knowledge and practice so that they can encourage and enable their students to reflect about all of the different layers of meaning involved in being a teacher. Without pushing themselves, and their students, to reflect on many levels, the tutors find that reflections stay within the 'safe frames' of existing consciously held ideas and 'acceptable' theories.

Finally tutors need to be very cognizant of the turmoil which their students are likely to experience as they begin to challenge and confront their personal theories. One way which we have found to be effective in

alleviating some of the students' emotional stress and resistance is for the tutor to talk to their group about the feelings which people commonly have when they go through a process of rethinking strongly held views and re-shaping self-concepts.

## Conclusion

Each year as I work with a different group of students I question whether I, or any teacher, has the right to deliberately place students in a learning experience which I know will not be cognitively or emotionally comfortable. And then I ask myself whether I have a right not to. As in all things in teaching there are no easy answers to such questions. But for me, if my student-teachers are going to be able to recognise the value positions inherent in their decisions, and in their practices, then there is no choice, and no easy way.

To enhance the chances that my student-teachers will become critically reflective about their practice, to give them the opportunity to widen their spheres of thought they need many things. As Fay (1977) stated we cannot force a person to change their beliefs and become critically reflective. I have accepted that in the time which I work with them not all students will confront their own preconceptions about teaching and learning. However I believe it is possible to define and create necessary, but not sufficient conditions, for that to happen.

Firstly, I believe that we need to recognise and understand the legitimacy of the students' resistance. As stated previously, they come into our programs assuming, from their apprenticeship of observation, that they know what teaching is about. They do not want to have their personal views challenged.

Secondly, because we believe that they need to recognise that learning and teaching are neither simple, nor unidirectional, they need a program which will provide them with experiences in teaching, preferably both first-hand and through observing others, followed by opportunities to talk, to think, and to question. Within that program they need to feel that they can take responsibility for their own teaching and learning; they need opportunities to articulate their own theories about teaching and learning and to listen to others; and they need encouragement to question their own theories, and to be able to question 'expert' knowledge as well as their own, so that all knowledge becomes problematic. To support the students in their learning they need a critical friend who is aware of the whole range of types of

reflection (Tom, 1987), but is committed to developing, modelling and practising critical reflection. Whilst this friend is committed to critical reflection they must also be able to allow the one who is learning these processes to move at their own pace.

Thirdly, because we cannot forget that the students are there because they

want, amongst other things, to gain certification, we need to be explicit about the evaluation processes and the criteria for the evaluation. I use a range of evaluation techniques including negotiation of criteria and/or marks, student self-assessment, and criterion-referenced assessment. I also try to ensure that the students know and understand how those evaluation procedures work and the values about teaching and learning which they demonstrate.

Finally, because the process of investigating and possibly changing strongly held beliefs and values is difficult, it should be done slowly and with a great deal of respect for the learner. Therefore it is essential, I believe, to create a learning environment where there is feelings of security through collegial support for each other and where due recognition is given to the emotional experiences of students. But for the same reasons the environment should also be challenging, a place where questioning and risk-taking are actively encouraged, and a place where new possibilities can be imagined, as they learn and un-learn what it means to be a teacher.

#### REFERENCES

- Apple, M., 1982, *Education and power*, Routledge & Kegan Paul; Boston.
- Bain, L., 1989, *Implicit values in physical education*, in T. Templin and P. Schempp, (eds), *Socialization into physical education: Learning to teach*, Benchmark Press, Lorain, Ohio.
- Bates, R., 1983(a), *Administration, culture and critique: Towards a reflexive practice of educational administration*, in T. Sergiovanni & J.E. Corbally, (eds), *Administrative leadership and organizational culture*. University of Illinois Press; Urbana.
- Bates, R., 1983(b), *Educational administration and the management of knowledge*, Deakin University Press; Geelong.
- Bullough, R. V. Jr., Gitlin, A.D., & Goldstein, S.L., 1984, *Ideology, teacher role, and resistance*, *Teachers College Record*, Vol.86, No.2, pp.339-58.
- Dodds, P., 1989, *Trainees, field experiences, and socialization into teaching*, in T. Templin and P. Schempp, (eds), *Socialization into physical education: Learning to teach*, Benchmark Press, Lorain, Ohio.
- Ellsworth, E., 1989, *Why doesn't this feel empowering? Working through the repressive myths of critical pedagogy*. *Harvard Educational Review*, Vol. 59, No. 3. pp. 277-324.
- Ellsworth, E., 1991, *Teaching to support unassimilated difference*. *Radical Teacher*,
- Fay, B., 1977, *How people change themselves: the relationship between critical theory and its audience*. In T. Ball (Ed.) *Political theory and praxis: New perspectives*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Freire, P., 1970, *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Seabury Press; New York.
- Giroux, H., 1981(a), *Ideology, culture and the process of schooling*, Falmer Press; London.
- Giroux, H., 1985, *Hegemony, resistance and the paradox of educational reform*, in P. Watkins, (ed), *Class, control and contestation in educational organisation*, Deakin University Press; Geelong.

Gomez, M., & Tabachnick, B., 1992, Telling teaching stories, Teaching Education, (in Press).

Graber, K., 1989, Teaching tomorrow's teachers: Professional preparation as an agent of socialization, in T. Templin and P. Schempp, (eds), Socialization into physical education: Learning to teach, Benchmark Press, Lorain, Ohio.

Kemmis, S., and Fitzclarence, L., 1986, Curriculum theorising: Beyond reproduction theory, Deakin University Press; Geelong.

Lather, P., 1989, Getting Smart.: Empowering approaches to research and pedagogy, Routledge and Kegan Paul; London.

Lewis, M., 1990, Interrupting patriarchy: Politics, Resistance, and Transformation in the Feminist classroom, Harvard Educational Review, Vol. 60, No. 4, pp. 467 - 488.

Lortie, D., 1975, Schoolteacher, University of Chicago Press; Chicago.

McLaren, P., 1989, Life in Schools, Longman; New York.

Nias, J. 1987, Seeing anew: teachers' theories of action, Deakin University Press; Geelong.

Parry, J., 1986, Values in physical education, in P. Tomlinson and M. Quinton, (eds), Values across the curriculum, Falmer Press; Lewes, East Sussex.

Popkewitz, T., 1990, Whose future? Whose past? Notes on Critical theory and methodology, in E. Guba, (ed) The paradigm dialog, Sage Publications, Newbury Park; California.

Ross, E.W. & Hannay, 1986, L.M. Towards a critical theory of reflective inquiry. Journal of Teacher Education. 37(4), pp.9-15.

Ross, D.D., 1989, First steps in developing a reflective approach. Journal of Teacher Education. 40(2), pp.22-30.

Schempp, P., 1989, Apprenticeship of observation and the development of physical education teachers, in T. Templin and P. Schempp, (eds), Socialization into physical education: Learning to teach, Benchmark Press, Lorain, Ohio.

Smyth, J., 1986, Using Clinical Supervision to develop a 'Critical perspective' towards teaching. A discussion paper for presentation at colloquia at a number of universities in the U.S.A..

Smyth, W.J., 1987, A rationale for teachers' critical pedagogy: a handbook, Deakin University Press; Geelong.

Smyth, J., 1989, Developing and sustaining critical reflection in teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 40(2), pp.2-9.

Tabachnick, R., & Zeichner, K., 1991, The reflective practitioner in teaching & teacher education: A social reconstructionist perspective, A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

Tinning, R., 1992, Teacher education and the development of content knowledge for physical education, Keynote paper for Conference on 'The place of general and subject specific teaching methods in teacher

education', Santiago do Compostela, Spain.

Tom, A., 1984, *Teaching as a moral craft*, Longman; New York.

Tom, A., 1987, *Replacing pedagogical knowledge with pedagogical questions*, in J. Smyth, (ed), *Educating teachers: Changing the nature of pedagogical knowledge*, Falmer Press; Lewes, East Sussex.

Zeichner, K.M., 1991(a), *Connecting genuine teacher development to the struggle of social justice*, A revised version of a lecture given at the Institute in Teacher Education, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby BC, Canada.

Zeichner, K.M., 1991(b), *Teacher Education for social responsibility: The conception of teaching expertise underlying elementary teacher education at the University of Wisconsin-Madison*, A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.